A DISCOURSE-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE EXPOSITORY PARAGRAPHS WRITTEN BY THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMAN 1 KUBU IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2013/2014 BASED ON SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTIC THEORY

Wathi, Ni[1], Seken, I[2], Suarnajaya, W[3]

English Education Study Program, Postgraduate Program
Ganesha University of Education
Singaraja, Indonesia

e-mail:wahyusuprabawathi@gmail.com, ketut.seken@pasca.undiksha.ac.id, wayan.suarnajaya@pasca.undiksha.ac.id

Abstract

This study aimed at describing and explaining the experiential meaning, interpersonal meaning and textual meaning as well as the nature of schematic structure in the students' writings under study. This study used descriptive qualitative approach with content analysis as its technique. In collecting the data, some techniques were used such as content analysis, document analysis and also interviewing. This study involved 24 students of the eleventh grade of SMAN 1 Kubu in the academic year 2013/2014. Thus, the object of this study was 24 students' expository writings analyzed through Systemic Functional Linguistics.

From the result of the study, it was found that the students expressed the experiential meaning by using six processes. Mostly, they used material process (52%) and relational process (35%). The students expressed the interpersonal meaning of the text through the use of declarative, imperative, modality and personal pronoun. It was revealed that the expository texts under study were mostly constructed in declarative forms (97%). The students expressed the textual meaning of their expository texts through developing themes and rhemes of the clauses constructing the texts. For that reason, the thematic development or progression was analyzed to recognize the textual meanings. Meanwhile, it was identified that twenty three expository writings were built in three main stages, while there is one text which was constructed in two stages or generic structures. The three stages cover introduction (thesis), main body (arguments) and conclusion (reiteration).

Keywords: Discourse Semantics, Expository Writing, Systemic Functional Linguistics

INTRODUCTION

Communication involves social interaction among people. In doing communication, there are some components involved such as the participants (e.g. the speaker/the hearer or the writer/the reader) and the information/messages being conveyed or expressed as well as the context in which the language is used. Social context tries to describe the different ways by which different people use language. Social context views the relationships between language and society and looks at language as people use it. That is to say, people use language by considering the context where it is used and the social relationship among the participants.

The way language is used in a social context to make meaning is the field

of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis as stated by McCarthy (1991:5) is focused on the study of the relationship between language and the contexts where it is used. He furthermore adds that the main scope of discourse analysis is to examine or analyze either written texts/printed words of all types or spoken texts from conversation to very institutionalized forms of talk (1991:5-12). Celce-Murcia & Olshtain (2000:4) also adds that discourse analysis walks through two trails that are the extension of grammatical analysis and the study of institutionalized language use within certain cultural setting. The former deals with certain area of linguistics analysis such as formal linguistics or systemic linguistics and the latter has something to do with real communication within established contexts. Discourse analysis has several methods to analyze a language and one of them is analyzing the language through Systemic Functional Linguistics theory. Discourse analysis was highly affected by M.A.K. Halliday's functional approach to language which is concerned with the social functions of language and the thematic and informational structure of speech and writing (McCarthy, 1991:6).

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) developed by Halliday (1985) is both theory of language as a social process and a methodology for analysing texts and their contexts of use (Eggins, 1994:23). He then mentions that SFL aims to explain how individuals use language and how language is structured for its different usages. From this points, it is said that systemic linguists evolve four main theoretical claims about language. Those are that "language use is functional, that the function is to make meanings, that the meanings are influenced by the social and cultural context in which they are exchanged, and that the process of using language is a semiotic process, a process of making meaning by choosing" (Eggins, 1994:2).

Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) or Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) takes a functional approach to grammar into account and analyzes language as a social-semiotic of communicative meaning-making (Halliday, 1994 as cited in Agbedo, 2012). Eggins (1994:16) then explains that language is viewed as a semiotic system because series of meaningful choices or oppositions are entailed. That language as a social semiotic entails two main principles: language is a semiotic system, that is, a sign system in which a sign is meaningful only in the context of its relationship with other signs, and language is a social phenomenon, in which it should be seen as an intrinsic part of social reality (Webster, 2003 as cited in Treimane, 2011).

According to Halliday, SFG describes how contextual meaning is expressed in grammar. SFG is 'systemic' since the grammar covers a series of choices produced in order to express ideas. That is to say, language represents a system in which language choices are meaningful in connection with other choices that are restrained. It is functional since the systems reach certain functions recognized in the lexico-grammar of the language (1994 as cited in Agbedo, 2012). In line with that, Simpson (2011:629) states that "SFL focusing on how users exchange meanings in different socially situated contexts is a theory of meanings represented as sets of choices".

Baxter (2010, as cited in Almarri, 2012) states that systemic functional grammar has put a great emphasis on the "relationship between the grammatical system and the social and personal needs that language is required to serve". Lock (1996:3) then adds that the grammar of a language functioning as a resource for making and exchanging meaning is the central tenet of systemic functional linguistics. Systemic functional linguistics is applied to understand how people make and exchange meanings in a wide range of contexts. The same meaning is not always determined by definite grammatical patterns and lexical choices; 'the same words can have different communicative functions in a different situation' (Bloor & Bloor, 2004:4 as cited in Darong, 2012:1). That is to say, different contexts involves different kinds of vocabulary and different expressions that are appropriate to the

particular context in which the language is used.

Coffin and Donohue (2012) claims that text in context or language use in context is the major unit of analysis in systemic functional linguistics. Eggins furthermore provides evidence that language and context are interrelated in which people are capable of predicting language from context (1994:7). Language is aware of the context where it is used. It is unfeasible for people to use language without taking the context of use into consideration (Eggins, 1994:8).

Systemic functional linguists separate a number of levels of context and those specific ones are the context of situation (register) and the context of culture (genre) (Eggins, 1994:9). To realize how people use language, it is necessary to regard either the context of culture and the context of situation. Context of culture (genre) is viewed as the general framework providing purpose to interactions of particular types and and is adjusted to particular contexts of situation (Eggins, 1994:32). Eggins furthermore asserts that context of situation has three main dimensions used to explain our sensitive understanding that people will use language in a different way. The three dimensions or the three register categories are field, tenor, and mode. Eggins (1994:52) explains that field refers to "what the language is being used to talk about". It concerns the topic or focus of what is being talked. Tenor is concerned with "the social role relationship between the interactants". It has something to do with the people taking part in the communication, the social roles and relationships of participant, the status and roles of the participants. Lastly, mode denotes "the role language is playing in the interaction". It refers to the channel of communication, such as spoken or written, monologic or dialogic, visual contact, computer-mediated communication, telephone, etc (Agbedo, 2012).

Those categories of register are associated with the structures of language to recognize the meaning. With regard to a multifunctional view of language, SFL divides the meanings realized by language into three types, namely ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings. The three meanings are referred to the metafunctions of language (Eggins, 1994:224). Metafunctions are broadly-categorized fundamental functions which each focuses on a different type of meaning within grammatical clauses (Halliday, 1994 as cited in Agbedo, 2012). The functional aspects of language are conveyed in the three types of meaning. *Ideational meanings* are connected with the way language signifies experiences of the physical, the psychological and the social world (Lock, 1996:9). These meanings are realized through the structure of transitivity and determined by field. The *interpersonal meanings* entails the structure of clausal elements and represents the interpersonal relationship between speaker and addressee (Lock, 1996:9). This meaning is realized through the structure of mood and represented by tenor. The *textual meanings* corresspond to the ways the text is organized in relation to its context and its message (Lock, 1996:10). The meanings are recognized through the structure of theme/rheme and influenced by mode.

Learning is regarded as active and as a part of the meaning-making process (Jakobson & Axelsson, 2012). Functionalists reveal that in relation to the study of second language acquisition, the purpose of language is for communication, and that development of linguistic knowledge requires communicative use (Mehrgan, 2012). In teaching, the knowledge of the target language needs to be integrated with skills and strategies so that language can be used effectively and appropriately in different social and cultural context (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000:3). In communicative language teaching (CLT), learners are assisted to understand how the structures of a language can be used meaningfully in context (Lock, 1996:265). CLT was born from linguists such as Halliday (1973) and Hymes (1972). Hymes then developed communicative competence, that is, "the ability not just to produce correct sentences, but to know when, where, and with whom to use them" (Lock, 1996:266).

Hymes considers that grammatical competence, a part of communicative competence, is incorporated in communicative language teaching emphasizing on the relationship between grammar and communication (Lock, 1996:266). It can be summarized that in spoken or written communication, communicative competence is strengthened by grammatical competence to reach appropriate and meaningful communication.

Halliday views language as 'meaning potential' (1973 in Lock, 1996:267). For Halliday, a language consists of systems of words and grammatical structures. Grammar is regarded as 'a network of interrelated system'. From these systems, speakers make selections in order to construct, simultaneously, wordings and meanings. The selection the speaker creates from a range of systems are recognized from grammatical items organized into structures. The systems of wordings and meanings thus available to a language user reflect the social and cultural context of the language as well as the needs of the immediate situation. So, the meanings that a speaker can express are strongly confined by the situations of use. Lock furthermore states that to communicate meaningfully, we should be able to (a) signify what the participants want to talk about, what is going on in a particular setting of space and time, (b) make the content interpersonally relevant and appropriate or the relationship among the participants, (c) organize the messages in ways that indicate how they correspond with other messages around them and with the wider context, meaning that appropriate thematic organization and suitable reference are selected (1996:267).

Systemic functional linguistics developed by Michael Halliday (1985) has greatly influenced the teaching of language. It construes language as interrelated sets of options for making meaning and aims to provide an apparent relationship between functions and grammatical systems both in spoken and written communication (Halliday, 1994 as cited in Ning, 2008). In functional linguistics, a text, spoken or written, is analyzed from a functional point of view. Butt, et al (2000, as cited in Ning, 2008) state that text is "a harmonious collection of meaning appropriate to its context". As what has been explained previously, context is viewed from two viewpoints: context of situation and context of culture. With regard to the context of situation, the situational differences between texts can be described by three aspects of the context, namely, field, tenor, and mode (Ning, 2008). The three metafunctions of language are revealed in those three aspects of context. Halliday (1985) describes the three metafunctions of language as ideational/experiential metafunction, interpersonal metafuction and textual metafunction. In the systemic functional approach to language study, the three metafunctions are found concurrently in each sentence and after all in a larger written text.

Halliday's systemic functional linguistics has great contribution to the teaching of writing. It is a methodology for analysing texts and their contexts of use. The social and cultural contexts where the writing is carried out influence the act of writing. Reid (1993) and Bruffee (1986) as cited in Aidinlou, 2011 state that writing always develops in relation to previous texts, contexts, situations and experiences. In constructing a written text, students need to represent the focus or the topic of their talking (ideational/experiential meaning), the social relationship between the writer and the reader (interpersonal meaning), and the organization of the structure to create a logical and coherent text (textual meaning).

Ning (2008) outlines that in writing, students express their experiences by using different language choices. These choices involve various kinds of processes (e.g. material, mental, verbal, etc), the different participant roles related to process types (e.g. goal, actor, carrier, sayer, sensor, token, etc.), and the types of circumstances (e.g. extent, location, manner, quality, means, etc.). Ning (2008) furhermore mentions that when students

write, they need to build and maintain social relationship between the writer and the reader. The grammatical structures applied by the students reveal the relative power and status of speakers, and the level of personal involvement. Lastly, students have to create logical and coherent texts by using appropriate textual themes and topical themes. These can be characterized through the use of grammatical features such as topic sentences, reference like pronouns, conjunctions, and so on.

It is necessary for language teachers to analyze the students' writings in order to recognize how students use language resources in their writings. Besides, it is also necessary to identify how students express their meaning in context using the choices of grammatical patterns and lexical items. In this case, analyzing students' writing through the approach of systemic functional linguistics can assist teachers examine how students make contextual meaning in their writing through the use of grammatical structures and how the organization of the students' writings are structured.

On the basis of the fact stated above, the writer conducted a study with reference to analyzing the students' texts based on the theory of systemic functional linguistics. In this study, the writer emphasized on the discourse-semantic analysis since a text is the discourse-semantic unit. Eggins (1994:111) explains that discourse semantics describes language through discourse and semantics perspective. From the view of discourse, cohesion and coherence are the main focus at the text level which include reference, lexical relations, conjunctive relations, and conversational structures. Context of situation affects the type of cohesion building a text. Meanwhile, from semantic point of views, three layers of meanings (ideational, interpersonal and textual) are examined at the clause level. Those meanings are explored through the lexico-grammatical organization of the clauses building a text (Eggins, 1994:111-112).

In this study, the writer analyzed the exspository texts written by the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Kubu in the academic year 2013/2014. This research was conducted to investigate and analyze the written texts which aims at illustrating how the metafunctions or the three meanings are expressed in the students' writings. This study tried to discover the grammatical and lexical items used in the students' writings to construct a cohesive and coherent text. In other words, it is to reveal how the schematic structures are organized or arranged to show the genre of the texts.

METHOD OF STUDY

This qualitative research was aimed at discovering and describing the semantic function of the lexico-grammatical usage of the expository texts written by the eleventh grade students of SMAN 1 Kubu. Therefore, this research used content analysis as its technique. The study was conducted in SMAN 1 Kubu, Kubu subdistrict, Karangasem regency. The subjects were the eleventh grade students of SMAN 1 Kubu in academic year 2013/2014.

The object of this study was the students' expository writings analyzed through Systemic Functional Linguistics. This research used descriptive qualitative approach and the methods of data collection were through content analysis, document analysis and interviewing. The data obtained in this research will be analyzed qualitatively. The steps of analyzing the data are modifying texts, analyzing field, tenor, mood and genre of the text.

In modifying texts, the three register categories (field, tenor, and mode) and genre conveyed in each student's writing will be examined. Then, each written text will be changed into clauses. Then, in analyzing field, the transitivity structure of each student's written text will be analyzed. To know the tenor of the texts, the mood structure of each student's written text will be analyzed. To find out the mood of the texts, the theme structure of each student's written text will be analyzed. To realize the genre of the text, the types of schematic structure/generic

structure of each student's writing are described and analyzed.

FINDINGS

The Experiential Meaning of the Students' Writings under Study

Based on the analysis of the transitivity structure of the texts under study, it was found that the students expressed the experiential meaning by using six process types with its participants and circumstances. However, not all students employed the six process types in their writing. On average, each student utilized between three until five process types to realize the experiential meaning of their expository writing. The results can be synthesized as follows:

Student s' texts	Process types					
	Mat	*Ment*	*Verb*	*Behav*	*Exist*	*Rel*
Text 1	36	3	0	0	1	13
Text 2	20	2	0	0	0	6
Text 3	10	4	0	1	0	17
Text 4	26	4	0	0	6	13
Text 5	16	3	0	0	2	21
Text 6	26	11	0	2	3	15
Text 7	12	1	0	0	2	13
Text 8	23	0	0	0	2	12
Text 9	21	2	0	0	2	21
Text 10	14	3	0	0	0	26
Text 11	29	1	0	2	1	12
Text 12	17	2	0	0	0	17
Text 13	16	3	0	0	1	16
Text 14	12	0	0	0	3	13
Text 15	12	2	0	0	1	16
Text 16	52	1	0	3	4	7
Text 17	41	4	0	0	1	21
Text 18	10	0	0	0	1	13
Text 19	16	2	1	1	1	15
Text 20	20	6	0	1	2	6
Text 21	24	1	1	0	2	13
Text 22	18	5	0	2	1	13
Text 23	16	10	0	2	1	11
Text 24	14	1	0	0	1	13
Total number of each process	*502*	*71*	*2*	*14*	*38*	*343*

As it is shown in the table above, it was noted that material process was predominantly employed in the students' expository writings. Then, it is followed by relational process. Types of relational process frequently used are attributive relational process and causative relational process. It was also revealed that the fewest process types used by the students is verbal process type and followed by circumstancial.

The Interpersonal Meaning of the Students' Writings under Study

To realize the the interpersonal meanings of the texts under study, the analysis of mood, modality and pronoun was accomplished. From the results of the analysis, it was found out that the students expressed the interpersonal meaning of the text through the use of declarative, imperative, modality and personal pronoun. The results of the mood structure analysis can be synthesized in the following table:

Students' expository writings	Modality				
	Ab (can)	*Fut /Inclination (will)*	*Ob (must /have to)*	*Perm (may)*	*Pos (may)*
Text 1	13	7	1	0	0
Text 2	8	3	0	0	0
Text 3	13	2	0	0	0
Text 4	6	5	1	0	0
Text 5	9	7	1	0	0
Text 6	3	0	2	1	0
Text 7	14	0	0	0	0
Text 8	6	1	4	0	0
Text 9	10	6	0	0	0
Text 10	13	0	0	0	0
Text 11	7	5	1	0	0
Text 12	7	3	0	0	1
Text 13	5	0	0	0	0
Text 14	4	0	2	0	0
Text 15	13	1	0	1	0
Text 16	14	11	1	0	0
Text 17	9	6	1	0	0
Text 18	5	0	0	0	0
Text 19	7	0	0	0	0
Text 20	5	3	3	0	0
Text 21	9	0	2	0	0
Text 22	7	5	0	0	0
Text 23	2	2	1	0	1
Text 24	5	1	2	0	0
Total	*194*	*68*	*22*	*2*	*2*

Students' expository writings	Typical Clause Mood			Personal pronoun	
	Dec	Imp	Int	"We/us"	Others (i.e they,she/he)
Text 1	51	0	0	1	12
Text 2	30	0	0	2	7
Text 3	30	1	0	0	4
Text 4	37	7	0	3	2
Text 5	38	0	0	2	5
Text 6	42	0	0	6	16
Text 7	29	0	0	5	1
Text 8	30	4	0	4	0
Text 9	47	0	0	0	0
Text 10	38	0	0	0	4
Text 11	34	5	0	6	0
Text 12	27	4	0	1	2
Text 13	29	1	0	0	4
Text 14	26	0	0	0	1
Text 15	28	0	0	1	4
Text 16	53	3	0	2	6
Text 17	56	4	0	10	1
Text 18	24	0	0	0	0
Text 19	31	1	0	4	3
Text 20	30	0	0	4	4
Text 21	38	0	0	0	10
Text 22	36	0	0	6	3
Text 23	37	1	0	0	12
Text 24	27	0	0	5	3
Total	848	26	0	62	104

Remarks:

Ab : ability   Perm : permission   Imp : imperative
Fut : futurity   Pos: possibility   Int : Interrogative
Ob : obligation Dec : Declarative

From the results of the analysis, it can be concluded that in constructing an expository text, the students realize the interpersonal meaning through the use of declarative, imperative, modality and personal pronoun. The frequent use of declaratives in the texts under study signifies the writer's proficiency in explaining and exposing information about the issue or topic being discussed. Besides declaratives, the writers also employed imperatives to realize the interpersonal meaning of the text. When the typical mood clauses are imperatives, the speech functions are commands addressed to the readers. In this case, the command is the writers' plea to give a non-authoritative order or suggestion to perform an action. It means that the writers provided persuasive and inspiring advice to do the actions. The use of modal "can" conveys the meaning of ability or capacity of of the participants to cause something to happen. The use of "can" in the texts under study communicates the meaning of the less intensity of tension in which someone gives an option to perform what he or she wants to do. In addition, modal "will" which brings the meaning of futurity or inclination was also apllied by the writers. The use of modal "will" in the students' expository writing indicates that some actions or events will happen or be performed in the forthcoming time. Modal "must" was in the third position in terms of the frequency. Modal "must" was used to uphold an obligation. This constitutes the high intensity of pressure on the person to carry out an action. The writer signaled a firm determination, so that the readers would like to perform such an action. The use of "we" represents the equal status between the writers and the readers. The writer invited the readers to be in the same position in response to the issue or phenomenon being discussed. That is to say, the writer attempted to shorten the distance with the readers.

The Textual Meaning of the Students' Writings under Study

The results of the study show that the expository writings constructed by the students are wholly in written language. To realize that the texts under study are definitely in written language, some characteristics of language use were examined. In this manner, there are six features of language use which were uncovered to signify that the expository texts written by the students are certainly in written language. Those characteristics involve lexical density of the text, grammatical intricacy, organization, context, structure and spontaneity. It was found out that the texts under study have high lexical density since the result of the calculation is above the average level of written text (above 42%). However, the percentage of lexical density is different from one text to the other texts. Averagely, the lexical density of the texts under study ranges from 44.74% to 59.74%. The next fields needed to be

examined to ensure that the texts under study is in written language are the organization, context, structure and sponteneity phenomena. It is obvious from all texts under study that the language was organized in a monologic way. The text also represented written language because it needs to be context-independent. It stands more or less by itself. To understand the meaning or intention being communicated, the readers do not have to consider the context of the communication. the structures of the text were designed synoptically. It means that the texts under study have the beginning, middle and the end type of generic structure. In addition, the language of the texts was not expressed spontaneously. To construct an expository text, the writers/students made planning and draft before writing.

From the results of the analysis, it can also be concluded that the students expressed the textual meaning of their expository texts through developing themes and rhemes of the clauses constructing the texts. Therefore, the thematic development or progression was analyzed to recognize the textual meanings of the texts under study.

It was revealed that the expository texts under study had mostly been developed coherently and cohesively. Viewed from the point of coherence, the writers had mostly interrelated the themes and rhemes of the clauses from one paragraph to the next paragraphs. In other words, the themes and rhemes have been interdependent each other. Meanwhile, the cohesiveness of the texts has been proved through the use of cohesive devices such as repetition, reference, synonym and conjunctions. Besides the analysis of the thematic development and cohesive devices, the appearance of the textual themes also helps the texts under study to be coherent because those words function to connect from one sentence to another sentence and from one paragraph to another paragraph.

Besides using conjunctions, the writer also used other cohesives devices such as repetitions, references and synonyms in developing the themes and rhemes of the clauses of the paragraphs. Those cohesive devices were used to keep the meaning on track. In other words, the meaning or intention being communicated can be kept focused. Most of the students applied repetitions to maintain the texts under study cohesive or unified.

The last thing needs to be viewed to show the text is indeed written is the concept of markedness. Eggins (1994:302) expresses that marked themes are seldom applied in casual conversation. Marked themes largerly occur at schematic structures in monologue piece. The use of marked themes appears to be one realization of a careful written language. In addition, Eggins (1994:298) also confirms that to improve the coherence of the text, the proficient writers or speakers need to choose marked themes. In the texts under study, most of the writers employed several marked themes in their writing. This signifies that the writers had planned the rhetorical development of the text. There are merely three expository texts which do not show marked themes in their writings (text 7, 14 and 15).

The Schematic Structures of the Students' Writings under Study

There are twenty three expository writings which were built in three main stages, while there is one text which was constructed in two stages or generic structures. The three stages cover introduction (thesis), main body (arguments) and conclusion (reiteration).

The result shows that there are twenty three expository writings which were contructed in three main stages, while the other one was built in two stages or generic structures. It was revealed that the expository writing constructed by student 9 only consists of introduction and main body without conclusion. From the result of the analysis, it can be concluded that the schematic structure of the most students' expository writings consists of three stages. The three stages cover introduction (thesis), main body (arguments) and conclusion (reiteration).

DISCUSSION

The Experiential Meaning of the Students' Writings under Study

The results of the study show that the students express the experiential meaning through employing the six process types. However, they are used differently in number. Process types most frequently used in writing an exposition texts are material process. This is because in exposition texts the students want to expose actions or events performed by the participants in the text. The second process type mostly employed is relational process. This is because the writers tend to show the condition or the situation description of the participants towards the issue or topic being discussed through the use of attributive relational. Furthermore, the writers also wanted to reveal the causes and effects of the issue being talked for the participants through the use of causative relational process. Mental and existential process are also applied in every exposition text written by the students. One of the characteristics of exposition text as stated by Emilia (2012) and Simon & Schuster (2002) as cited in Kemendikbud (2014:114) is the use of mental verbs. Here, the writers would like to express the feeling or thought of the participants towards the topic being discussed. Meanwhile, existential process exists in the texts since the students want to describe the existence of the event or phenomenon in the topic.

One function of expository text according to Olson (2003:161) is to explain facts or convey information. It is the presentation of information, opinions, or ideas. It exposes something about a topic. Thus, the information about something needed to perform, describe the condition or situation of the issue being discussed and reveal the causes and effects is delivered mostly through the use of material and relational process. It means that the verbal processes are rarely employed in exposition text.

The Interpersonal Meaning of the Students' Writings under Study

The results show that in constructing an expository text, the students realize the interpersonal meaning through the use of declarative, imperative, modality and personal pronoun. The exposition texts are mostly constructed in declaratives. The frequent use of declaratives in the texts under study indicates the writer's ability in explaining and exposing information about the issue or topic being discussed. This complies with the main concern of exposition text in which it functions as giving information or explanations or description of something. Imperatives are also used in expostion texts, but they are less used. This is in line with the exposition function in which one of the exposition functions is to persuade the readers or listeners to perform an action (Olson, 2003:161). The command is the writers' plea to give a non-authoritative order or suggestion to accomplish an action. It means that the writers give persuasive and inspiring advice to perform the actions.

The use of modal verbs in an expository writing implies the writer's attempt to place herself and mitigate her authority or power over the readers. She or he would like to soften the expressions through the use of modal auxiliary verbs. Modal auxiliary verbs mostly occur in the students' expository writings are "can", "will" and "must". Therefore, through the use of modal, the writer can establish a good relationship with the readers. Personal pronouns are also employed in the texts under study. It is the way of recognising the interpersonal meaning of the texts under study. It was proved that pronoun "we" was chiefly utilized in the texts under study. The use of "we" represents the equal status between the writers and the readers.

4.2.3 The Textual Meaning of the Students' Writings under Study

The results of the study show that the expository writings constructed by the students are wholly in written language. In spoken texts, lexical density is said to be lower, while it is higher in written text (Eggins, 1994:61). Eggins furthermore

reveals that the average of the spoken text is 33% lexical, while the written version is 42% lexical. The results show that the lexical density of the texts under study ranges from 44.74% to 59.74%. That is to say, the texts under study are highly constructed in written language. Halliday in Eggins (1994:61) clarifies that grammatical intricacy has something to do with the number of clauses in a text as a proposition of the number of sentences in the text. In spoken language, there are many clauses per sentence and as a result the text produced contains very long sentences. In contrast, few clauses per sentence tend to be employed in written language. In the text under study, the writer, on average, employed one to two clauses in a sentence. Only some of them consist of three clauses in a sentence. Thus, the texts under study greatly show written language. Moreover, all of the texts are constructed in monologic way, context-independent, designed synoptically and produced carefully. One thing needed to be considered is the concept of markedness. Eggins (1994:302) expresses that marked themes are seldom applied in casual conversation. Marked themes largely occur at schematic structures in monologue piece. The use of marked themes appears to be one realization of a careful written language. The results of the study show that most of the writers applied several marked themes in their writing. This points out that the writers have already planned the rhetorical development of the text.

Theme and Rheme structure of the clause is an important component in the construction of cohesive and coherent text (Eggins, 1994:305). Theme/Rheme structure of the clause can be regarded as the micro-level realization of textual organization. It can be inferred that the analysis of Theme/Rheme is essential to be accomplished to recognize the coherent and cohesive expository text. It means that to realize the textual meaning of the texts under study, the thematic development or progression of each paragraph was required to be examined. After all, the coherence and cohesion of the entire text can be achieved.

All of the texts under study used textual themes such as conjunctive adjuncts (conjunction) as one way to realize the textual meaning of the text. This is in line with the characteristics of the exposition text as proposed by Emilia (2012) and Simon & Schuster (2002) as cited in Kemendikbud (2014:114). They state that one of the exposition text language features is the use of connecting words such as *additionally, furthermore, also, in addition to, moreover*, etc and causal conjunction such as *because, consequently, for that reason, yet, first, second*, etc. It was revealed that in the texts under study, the writers utilized the textual themes such as *although, that, first, and, because, second, so, third, if, beside that, furthermore, moreover, as if, so that, secondly, firstly, thirdly, fourth, therefore, lastly, however, when, then, since, after, though, finally, thus, also, next, or, by, as a result, besides, in addition to, but, such as, for example* and *last*.

The Schematic Structures of the Students' Writings under Study

Successful communication in our culture needs a number of steps or stages (Eggins, 1994:36). A social convention in the society confirms that people should undergo a series of steps or stages. These steps/stages are called as *schematic structure* of a genre (Eggins, 1994:36). Genre in Systemic Functional Linguistics deals with a staged, goal oriented and decisive activity where speakers or writers involve as a member of the culture.

In line with that, twenty three expository writings were built in three main stages, while there is one text which was constructed in two stages or generic structures. The three stages cover introduction (thesis), main body (arguments) and conclusion (reiteration). Those three stages constitute the schematic structures of the text under study. In this manner, the writers have something to do with the way of delivering information to the readers through the organization of those stages. Through those stages, the readers are prompted to understand the meaning/intention

communicated. Each stage in the genre embodies a part of the whole meaning.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

From the results of the study, conclusion can be drawn. It can be concluded that The students expressed the experiential meaning by using six process types with its participants and circumstances. However, not all students applied the six process types in their writing. On average, each student utilized between three until five process types to realize the experiential meaning of their expository writing. Material process was predominantly employed in the students' expository writing. Then, attributive relational process holds the second position and the third position was achieved by the causative relational process. The students expressed the interpersonal meaning of the text through the use of declarative, imperative, modality and personal pronoun. It was revealed that the expository texts under study were mostly constructed in declarative forms. The texts under study are highly constructed in written language. There are six features of language use which were uncovered to signify that the expository texts written by the students are certainly in written language. The students expressed the textual meaning of their expository texts through developing themes and rhemes of the clauses constructing the texts. For that reason, the thematic development or progression was analyzed to recognize the textual meanings of the texts under study. It was revealed that the expository texts under study had mostly been developed coherently and cohesively. It was identified that twenty three expository writings were built in three main stages, while there is one text which was constructed in two stages or generic structures. The three stages cover introduction (thesis), main body (arguments) and conclusion (reiteration).

In accordance with the research conducted, the writer wants to give some suggestions for the teachers, students and other researchers. It is recommended that the teachers should integrate language and content in their planning because functional grammar provides a basis for predicting which linguistic features are likely to arise within a particular context. In producing a written text, the students should regard the topic they are talking, the social relationship with the readers and the channel communication of the text to create a coherent and cohesive text. Meanwhile, it is also suggested that other researchers should more work on Systemic Functional Linguistics particularly on language teaching. This is because analyzing texts using Systemic Functional Linguistics have expressed the usefulness of their analyses for the teaching of multiple genres.

REFERENCES

Achugar, Mariana.,Schleppegrell, Mary & Oteiza, Teresa. 2007. Engaging teachers in language analysis: A functional linguistics approach to reflective literacy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique.* Volume 6, Number 2, pp 8-24.

Ahlsen, Emelie. 2008. *Teaching Writing in Theory and Practice.* Dowloaded on June 26, 2013 at http://www.riksdagen.se/webbnav/index.aspx?nid=3911&dok_id=SFS1985:1100&rm

Aidinlou, Nader Assadi. 2011. A Discourse-based Teaching of Writing for Iranian EFL Students: A Systemic Perspective. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning No,8.* No. 8, pp.53-70.

Agbedo, Chris Uchenna. 2012. Placards as a Language of Civil Protest in Nigeria: A Systemic- Functional Analysis of the Fuel Subsidy Crisis. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science.* Volume 6, Issue 2 (Nov. - Dec. 2012), PP 17-26.

Almarri, Saqer Abdulla. 2012. Ideology in the Translation of Legal Treaties. Published thesis. Sharjah, American University of Sharjah. Downloaded on June 26, 2013 at http://saqeram.com/wp-

content/uploads/2013/01/Almarri20 12.pdf.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne & Olshtain, Elite. 2000. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coffin, Caroline & Donohue, James P. 2012. Academic Literacies and systemic functional linguistics: How do they relate? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes.* Pp 64-75.

Darong, Hieronimus Canggung. 2012. *Discourse Sematics Analysis on the USA presidents' Victory Speeches.* Unpublished Thesis: Ganesha University of Education.

Eggins, Suzanne. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London: Biddles Ltd.

Ferguson, Elizabeth. 2010. *Language, Meaning, Context, and Functional Communication.* Perth: Edith Cowan University.

Gall, Meredith D.,Gall, Joice P & Bobg, Walter R. 2003. *Educational Research: An Introduction.* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Edward Arnold Ltd.

Jakobson, Britt & Axelsson, Monica. 2012. 'Beating about the bush' on the how and why in elementary school science. *Education Inquiry.* Vol. 3, No. 4, December 2012, pp. 495–511.

Kebudayaan, Kementerian Pendidikan.2014. *Bahasa Inggris SMA/MA/SMK/MAK Kelas XI.* Jakarta:Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Balitbang, Kemdikbud.

Krippendorff, Klaus. 2004. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lock, Graham. 1996. *Functional English Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, Michael. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McMillan, James H & Schumacher, Sally. 2010. *Research in Education.* New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Mehrgan, Kamran. 2012. On the Plausibility of Functionalist Approach to Second Language Acquisition. *Advances in English Linguistics (AEL) 37.* Vol. 1, No. 2, 2012, pp.37-42.

Ning, Guo. 2008. Systemic Functional Grammar and its pedagogical implications. *Sino-US English Teaching.* Volume 5, No.10 (Serial No.58), pp.45-50.

O'Donnel, Mick. 2011. *Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics for Discourse Analysis.* Downloaded on April 19, 2013 at http://web.uam.es/departamentos/filo yletras/filoinglesa/Courses/LFC11/LF C-2011-Week1.pdf

Rollins, Anna Jones. 2012. *Systemic Functional Linguistics Discourse Features in the Personal Essay.* Published thesis:Marshall University. Downloaded on June 26, 2013 at http: //mds.marshall.edu/cgi/viewcontent.c gi?article=1216&context=etd//

Simpson, James. 2011. *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* New York: Routledge.

Suarnajaya, I Wayan. 2001. *A Discourse Semantics Analysis of Particular Types of Newspaper Texts Taken From A Number of Indonesian Local Newspapers, Using Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory as A Basis of the Analysis.* Unpublished thesis: La Trobe University.

Tompkins, Gail E. 1995. *Language Arts: Content and Teaching Strategies.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Winch, Gordon, Johnston, Rosemary Ross, March, Paul & Holliday, Marcelle. 2006. *Literacy (Reading, Writing and Children's Literature).* New York: Oxford.