

# THE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH NATIVE SPEAKER AND ESL TEXTS USING FARS APPROACH

Mulyani  
STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena  
Email: mulyanianwar07@gmail.com

## Abstract

This research was a comparison of ESL's and native speaker (NS)'s texts in achieving a coherent text. This study aims at investigating the frequency or the number of occurrence of relations, hierarchical structures, and functional relations; paratactic and hypotactic and also to find out the recursiveness occurrences within schema constructed as well as the explicitness of signalling from the two texts analyzed. Both texts were scrutinized based on FARS approach. Each of the texts was segmented into several segments, categorized based on FARS relations and determined in terms of functional relations. The findings indicate that the ESL learner's text was the hypotactic relation which tends to dominantly use cohesive devices or conjunctions within the text in order to elicit a coherent text. On the other hand, there is an equal number of paratactic and hypotactic relation in NS's text as it shows the dominant use of elaborative relation in the text. Referring to recursiveness occurrence, text 1 (NS) has three highest occurrences of recursiveness; Elaboration Amplification, Framing and Elaboration Extension, while text 2 (ESL) has two occurrences; Elaboration Amplification and Framing. Then, in text 1, it is implicitly comprehended that the writers apply implicit signalling beyond the clauses indicated by the low occurrence of conjunctions which shows higher English proficiency of the writers. However, text 2 does not employ any implicit signalling identified by higher number of conjunctions employment beyond the clauses. All of these features found in the texts are possibly linked to the linguistic, type of texts and cultural backgrounds of the writers.

**Keywords:** *ESL, NS, Paratactic, Hypotactic, FARS Approach, Recursiveness.*

## INTRODUCTION

In the academic writing, some ESL learners especially advanced learners tend to excessively use cohesive signals such as *while, whereas, apart from, rather than, this*, etc. This exaggeration may be caused by their incapability in achieving a coherent text precisely. A text is considered as coherent if the utterances used refer to the similar entities like people, events, or things (Kintsch and van Dijk, cited in Golebiowski, 2012). Similarly, Dressler and Givon (cited in Golebiowski, 2012) argue that a coherent text or discourse occurs when there is reference to the same objects or entities. Halliday and Hasan (cited in Golebiowski, 2012) propose a

taxonomy of relations which is called as 'conjunction' such as additive (e.g. and), adversative (e.g. but), causal (e.g. so), and temporal (e.g. then). They believe that conjunctive relations play important role in achieving a coherent text. However, Beekman (cited in Golebiowski, 2012) asserts that the proposition of sentences in the coherent text is not entirely determined by the existing of cohesive signals.

Similar to Beekman's view, Framework for the Analysis of the Relational Structure of Texts (FARS) approach proposed by Golebiowski (2002, 2004, 2009) gives an essential account for the writer in structuring the text using discourse relations in order to achieve his

communicative purposes. Meanwhile, in Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST) theory as proposed by Mann and Thompson and Matthiessen and Thompson (cited in Golebiowski, 2012) that the basis of this theory is the writer's purposes and readers' needs which are determined by the form of text applied. Fundamentally, RST has a list of relations: *Circumstance, Solutionhood, Elaboration, Background, Enablement and Motivation, Evidence and Justify, Cause relations, Antithesis and Concession, Condition and Otherwise, Interpretation and Evaluation, Restatement and Summary, Sequence, Contrast, and Means.*

Actually, both FARS and RST have similarity in terms of that all parts of a text cooperate and complement each other in eliciting the general message of the text. In addition, both describe the meaning of text based on the writer's purposes, either generally or specifically (Golebiowski, 2012). Meanwhile, what the main difference between FARS and RST is FARS claims that nuclearity is not always in discourse, while RST claims it is. Besides, FARS depends more on the co-text and context. The co-text and context is required to be understood by a writer or a reader in comprehending the main meaning message in the text. In determining whether the text is coherent or not, FARS does not rely on the cohesive devices appeared within the discursal text, while RST does. On the other hand, Create A Research Space (CARS) model proposed by John Swales (1990), which has been applied and tested in various scientific articles, focuses more on analyzing the organizational structure of text especially in the introduction section. Basically, CARS model proposes three-move type; establishing centrality, establishing a niche, and occupying the niche with its

steps to investigate organizational structure of scientific articles written by writers coming from various cultural backgrounds and speech community in order to find out whether the text is sequent or not, linear or cyclical, and implicit or explicit.

## LITERATURE OF REVIEWS

Within the text, there is proposition which is a conceptual unit represented by a sentence. Principally, texts are considered as a nucleus-satellite pattern where nucleus is the prominent text which conveys the main meaning message of the text while satellite is the supporting information for the nucleus text. Macroproposition is the global meaning within the text which can be comprehended through employment of clauses - a minimal analytical unit within a text. There are two types of clauses divided: restrictive relative and non-restrictive relative clauses. Restrictive relative clause is not set off by commas which is part of its host clause, while non-restrictive one is set off by commas which constitutes separate analytical unit (Golebiowski, 2012).

Before conducting analysis of text, it is important to do segmentation of text in order to find out the FARS relations. In segmenting the texts, the hierarchical structures of the text are required to be categorized. There are three levels of them; macro level, mezzo-level, and micro-level (Golebiowski, 2002, 2009). Macro level is the top level of the text segmented which forms a global representation message of discourse. Mezzo-level can be found in the middle of text between second and third level, while micro-level can be found at the bottom level of text segmented.

Furthermore, FARS classifies two types of relational functioning: paratactic, whereby all parts of a text are equally

significant in their discursual functions, and hypotactic, whereby only one part of a text is more significant than the other part(s) (Golebiowski, 2004, 2009). In paratactic function, there are two nuclei of the propositional texts which are equally prominent. Meanwhile, in hypotactic function, the prominent text is regarded as nucleus and the one which is not significant is considered as satellite. Moreover, recursiveness sometimes occurs within the same schema categorized. It is a similar relation repeatedly in the next relational level(s). For example, in the first level is found *Framing* then in the next level it is repeatedly found the same relation within the same schema. Recursiveness can be found after determining FARS relations in each level.

## METHODOLOGY

In this study, the writer analyzed two texts: text 1 is *The interaction of discipline and culture in academic writing* written by native speakers (NS), Golebiowski and Liddicoat (2002), and text 2 is *Interlanguage* written by an ESL learner, based on FARS approach. Each of the texts was segmented into several segments, categorized based on FARS

relations and was determined in terms of functional relations whether the text is paratactic or hypotactic. This study investigated the frequency or the number of occurrence of relations, hierarchical structures, and functional relations; paratactic and hypotactic and also to find out the recursiveness occurrences within schema constructed as well as the explicitness of signalling from the two texts analyzed.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

### *The hierarchical structure and recursiveness' occurrence*

In order to analyze the two texts from the introduction section selected, the segmentation of a text should be done in order to ease in determining the relational structures within the propositions of text. Text 1 was segmented into fifteen analytical units of clausal dimension, while Text 2 was segmented into twelve. After determining the relations, the explanation of the results from the data collection will be discussed specifically using FARS approach as well as the occurrence of recursiveness. Functionally prominent textual units are indicated in the diagram by bold font.

**Table Relations in Text 1(Native Speaker Text)**

1-10 F 11-15						
1-7 An			8-10			
11-13 F			14-15			
1-2 F	3-7		8-9 E	10	11 E 12-13	14 CM 15
1 EA 2	3-4 E 5-7		8 EA 9		12 EA 13	
	3 ED 4	5-6 EA 7				
		5 EA 6				

(1) All writers use the language of their discourse communities. (2) and communicate in ways deemed appropriate to and their discourse communities. (3) The rhetorical choices made by writers are influenced by cultural norms, values and belief systems prevailing in discourse communities (4) which constitute social contexts of text. (5) Studies in academic rhetoric (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Berkenkotter, 1990) clearly show that epistemologies and ideological assumptions of academic cultures are firmly embedded in the conventions of academic genres, (6) which reveal and signal the academic discourse community's norms, values and social ontology. (7) Research into the development of rhetorical conventions of scientific writing reveals a close connection between the formation of a scientific discourse community and the development of discursive strategies for making claims and the appearance of genre textual features (Bazerman, 1988). (8) At the same time, the cross-cultural studies of academic organization (eg Ahmed, 1997; Clyne, 1981, 1991, 1994; Cmerjrkova, 1994; Duszak, 1994; Golebiowski, 1998, 1999; Gunnarsson, 1993, Mauranen, 1992, 1997; Markkanen & Schroder, 1992; Safanil, 2000) have shown that the rhetorical structure of research prose produced by a non-native English writer, similarly to rhetorical styles of other discourse domains, cannot escape being conditioned by cultural norms, traditions and conventions (9) which underlie the discourse community into which the author has been socialized. (10) Neither can it totally disentangle itself from rules and systematic limitations of the author's mother tongue. (11) In this paper, we will therefore argue that the writers of specialist academic texts are not influenced entirely by their culture or by the speech community in their writing, (12) but rather that each writer is located at an intersection between culture and discourse community. (13) This particular intersection of culture and discourse community has the potential to be resolved differently in different cultures and in different disciplines. (14) This study will review research in contrastive rhetoric (15) to investigate the impact of cultural and disciplinary factors on text construction at a range of levels in range of disciplines and across a range of languages.

The relations are grouped according to their location at macro, mezzo, and micro levels of textual structure. In table 1, macro level is the highest and the second level, mezzo level is the third and fourth level, while micro level is the fifth and the lowest level. The highest level relational schema of text 1 is *Framing*. The content of segment (1-10) frames the content of segment (11-15): the presentation of background information constitutes the foundation for the introduction of propositions which convey the focus of the article.

The second hierarchical level features two relational schemata: *Adversative Concession* and *Framing*, in which part (8-10) constitutes hypotactically structured and functionally significant rather than the segment (1-7). In the segment (1-7) and (8-10), the writers partly agree in which they propose two perspectives and prefer to the perspective in the part (8-10). Both parts of segment (11-13) and (14-15) exhibit paratactically

structured and functionally prominent in which information presented in the segment (11-13) sets up a frame for conveying the goal of the article in the segment (14-15). It is a recursiveness as in the first top level relational schema is also *Framing*.

The third hierarchical level is occupied by *Framing (F)*, two relations of *Elaboration Extension (E)*, and *Causal Means (CM)*. The only hypotactic relation is part (1-2) and (3-7) categorized in *Framing*, while others are paratactically structured and functionally prominent. The content of segment (1-2) frames the content of segment (3-7). The segment (8-9) and the proposition (10) categorized in *E* relation since text 1 employs two angles or perspectives; “discourse community conditioned by cultural norms, traditions, and conventions” and “rules and systemic limitations of the author's mother tongue”.

The proposition (11) and segment (12-13) also categorized in *E* relation since text 1 also employs two perspectives; “the writers' texts are not entirely influenced by

their culture or speech community” and “the writer is in a particular intersection of culture and discourse community”. The proposition (14) and (15) is categorized in *CM relation* because there is a means in the proposition (15) explaining the purpose of the study in the proposition (14).

The fourth level is occupied by three relations of *Elaboration Amplification (EA)* and one relation of *E*. The propositions of (1) and (2), (8) and (9), (12) and (13) are hypotactically structured which are categorized in the cluster of *EA*, while the relational schemata of (3-4) and (5-7) are equally functionally prominent categorized in the cluster of *Elaboration Extension (E)*. The proposition of (2) amplifies with specific information to the proposition (1). The proposition of (9) provides more specific information for the proposition of (8). The proposition of (13) also provides more detailed information to the proposition of (12). The relational schemata of (3-4) and (5-7) is categorized in *E* relation since the writer proposes two

perspectives; “The rhetorical choice made by writers are influenced by cultural norms, values, and belief systems prevailing in discourse community” and a perspective from a study of academic rhetoric that “epistemologies and ideological assumptions of academic cultures are firmly embedded in the conventions of academic genres”.

The fifth level is occupied by *Elaboration Addition (ED)* and *EA* in which the proposition of (3) and (4) is hypotactically developed, while the schema (5-6) and the proposition (7) is paratactically structured and functionally significant. The proposition of (3) and (4) is *ED* as the proposition of (4) can be omitted because it is unimportant information. Table 1 again shows another occurrence of recursiveness, namely *Elaboration Amplification* relation which is occurred in the fifth level and then it is repeatedly in the sixth level. The lowest level relational schema which employs *EA* is also equally functionally significant.

**Table Relations in Text 2 (ESL Learner’s Text)**

1-7 F 8 - 12					
1-4 F 5 - 7			8-9 AN 10 - 12		
1 EA	2-4		5 CI	6 - 7	
	2-3 ER	4		6 EA	7
	2 DE	3			10 EE 11

(1) Interlanguage has been recognized as a new language system. (2) It is being formed when a person acquires an additional language other than mother tongue, (3) because the language acquired is somewhat a system in between mother tongue (L1) and target language (L2). (4) Selinker as cited in Larsen-Freeman (1998, p. 552) proposes the term interlanguage as a created combination system from two different aspects: L1 and L2. (5) As it is a product between two linguistics systems, (6) a popular perspective has arisen, (7) that L1 interferes L2. (8) A study Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) has been assumed as the field in which Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers can predict common errors (9) that occur in Learner’s language due to L1 interferences. (10) However, this perspective has been disapproved by error analysis in learner’s language, (11) that errors which are predicted by CAH did not occur, (12) but other errors did occur.

The relations are grouped according to their location at macro, mezzo, and micro levels of textual structure. Based on table 2, macro level is the highest and the second level, mezzo level is the third and fourth level, while micro level is the lowest level. The highest level relational schema of text 2 is *Framing*. The content of segment (1-7) frames the content of segment (8-12): the presentation of background information constitutes the basis for the introduction of propositions conveying the topic of the academic writing studied. The second hierarchical level shows two relational schemata: *Framing (F)* and *Adversative Concession (An)* which is hypotactically structured.

Table 1 shows an occurrence of recursiveness, namely *Framing* relation which is occurred in the top level then repeatedly in the second level in the same schema. In the *F* schema, the content of (1-4) frames the background information to the content of (5-7). In the segment of (8-9) and (10-12), the writer reveals two perspectives; common errors in Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) and error analysis, whereby she prefers to the second perspective. The third hierarchical level, occupied by four relations: 2 times *Explanation Amplification (EA)*, *Causal Circumstance (CI)*, *Adversative Contrast (A)* is also hypotactically structured.

It is *Elaboration Amplification* relation since the schema (2-4) provides more specific information for the proposition (1). The proposition (5) and segment (6-7) is judged as *Causal Circumstance* relation as the main meaning message "L1 interferes L2" in the schema (6-7) is regarded as the circumstance set up by the proposition (5). The proposition of (8) and (9) is categorized in *Elaboration Amplification* relation as the proposition of

(9) gives more detailed information to the proposition (8). The segment (10-11) and proposition (12) is categorized in *Adversative Contrast* relation since it develops contrast idea each other. The fourth hierarchical level, occupied by *Elaboration Reformulation (ER)*, *Elaboration Amplification (EA)*, and *Elaboration Explanation (EE)* is again hypotactically developed. The segment (2-3) and (4) is categorized in *ER* relation because the propositional content of (3) is a paraphrasing sentence to the propositional content of (2).

The propositional content of (6) and (7) is considered as *EA* relation since the propositional content of (7) provides more specific information to the propositional content of (6). The propositional content of (10) and (11) is categorized in *EE* relation because the proposition (11) explains the reason of *why the perspective of CAH has been disapproved*. The lowest level relational schema of introduction *interlanguage* is also hypotactically developed in the cluster of *Digression Explanation (DE)*. It is *DE* since the proposition (3) is unnecessary as the additional information to the proposition (2) because the proposition (2) is already understood with the absence of proposition (3).

Furthermore, from the two texts analyzed, it is found that text 1 merely employs one non-restrictive relative clause in the segment (8) *similarly to rhetorical styles of other discourses domains...* in which the subject "it is" is ellypted and its clause can be omitted from the host clause. In text 2 it is found that the ESL learner has lack ability in using both restrictive relative and non-restrictive relative clauses as it is shown in her text in the proposition 10, 11, and 12, she uses commas whereas the

commas are not needed since the proposition (11) and (12) are parts of the host clause (proposition 10).

***The frequency of occurrence***

The frequency of relations occurrence is counted using percentage in order to find out the rank of the frequency of relations occurrence beyond the text. The results will be compared between text 1 and text 2.

**Table The Ratio Of Frequency Of Relations (%)**

Relation	Text 1	Relation	Text 2
Framing	50	Framing	28.5
Adversative Concession	16.6	Adversative Concession	14.2
Elaboration Extension	50	Elaboration Amplification	<b>42.8</b>
Elaboration Amplification	<b>83.3</b>	Elaboration Explanation	14.2
Elaboration Addition	16.6	Elaboration Reformulation	14.2
Causal Means	16.6	Digression Explanation	14.2
Total	233.1	Causal Circumstance	14.2
		Total	142.3

Table 3 illustrates that the most frequent occurrence of relations in text 1 is *Elaboration Amplification* reaching 83.3% compared to the rests, followed by Framing and Elaboration Extension – 50% in the second rank. The remaining relations are equally occurred in the text with the percentage of 16.6. Similarly, text 2 exhibits *Elaboration Amplification* – 42.8% as a higher frequent occurrence of relations but it is followed by only *Framing* relation – 28.5% in the second rank. The rest of relations are equally occurred in the text with the percentage of 14.2. From the two

text written by different individual backgrounds, text 1 employs *Elaboration Amplification (EA)* higher than text 2 as from table 1 it is shown that 5 times of *EA* is occurred (2 times in between).

***The ratio of paratactic and hypotactic relations***

Intertextual variation in the ratio of paratactic and hypotactic functional relations was observed. There were fourteen functional relations found within text 1, while text 2 was only eleven functional relations.

**Table The Ratio Of Paratactic And Hypotactic Relations (%)**

Type of Relation	Text 1	Text 2
Paratactic	50	0
Hypotactic	50	<b>100</b>

Table 4 illustrates that text 1 features the equal number of paratactic and hypotactic structures. On the other hand, text 2 employs an extreme different number between paratactic and hypotactic structures – 0:100 in the percentage. It means that text 1 which is written by ESL

learner is not able to show balance in terms of the propositions development in the text, while text 2 written by the expert writers is able to show a balanced and coherent propositions within the text. Thus, the propositions of ESL learner’s text is entirely hypotactically developed and the

propositions of text 1 written by Golebiowski and Liddicoat (2002) are equally employed; paratactically and hypotactically structured.

### ***The explicitness of signaling***

Signalling within text is recognized by the use of cohesive devices such as conjunctions, conjunctive expressions, prepositions, etc., by grammatical features, and by anaphoric and cataphoric referencing (Golebiowski, 2009). For explicit signalling, such as in text 1, it is found the use of cohesive devices such as *therefore, similarly, and, but rather, this, in this paper, at the same time*. Likewise, in text 2, it is also found explicitly the use of cohesive signals *because, however, as, and but*. Meanwhile, the implicit signalling is recognized by the absence employment of cohesive devices within the text but the meaning of message exists such as in adversative relation. In text 1, it is implicitly comprehended that the writers use implicit signalling beyond the clauses proposed such as in the schema (5-7) showing similar view. However, text 2 written by an ESL learner does not employ any implicit signalling.

### **CONCLUSION**

The analysis of both texts written by Golebiowski and Liddicoat (2002) and an ESL learner carried out in this study has shown a big difference between the text written by the linguistic expert and the one written by the ESL learner. It can be seen from the relations employed by each of both writers that the difference between the writers appears in terms of the development of textual coherence. The ESL learner tends to highly use cohesive devices within her text in order to elicit a coherent text, whereas the fact that her text does not show appropriate coherence by the presence of

cohesive signals. Another text analyzed does not rely much on the usage of cohesive signals in order to produce a coherent text but rather on the meaning message through the propositions of using elaborative relation. In addition, in fact that the ESL writer does not structure her text properly, while the NS writers do it appropriately so that the readers might find easiness in comprehending the text. In terms of functional relations employment, the ESL learner entirely employs hypotactic structure, while the NS writers employ both paratactic and hypotactic relations equally in the text. Generally, ESL learners' texts are usually found difficult to analyze because of their failure in developing clauses especially the use of restrictive and non-restrictive clauses. Referring to recursiveness occurrence, text 1 has three occurrences of recursiveness; *Framing, Elaboration Amplification* and *Elaboration Extension*, while text 2 has two occurrences; *Framing and Elaboration Amplification*. In text 1, it is implicitly comprehended that the writers apply implicit signalling and low explicitness beyond the clauses. However, text 2 written by the ESL learner employs high explicitness rather implicitness indicated by using several conjunctions in meeting the coherent text.

This study reveals that in analyzing text by approaching the FARS concept is highly essential and effective rather than using RST and CARS analysis, particularly for ESL learners and native and non-native writers. In analyzing and determining whether the text is coherent or not, RST tends to rely on the presence of cohesive devices like conjunctive signals as well as CARS solely focuses on how the organizational text is developed using three-move with its steps in order to find



out the sequence of text, while FARS is very specific and accurate using relational clusters and it does not solely depend on the presence or absence of cohesive signals within the text. Hence, ESL learners are strongly encouraged to apply FARS approach since they may take the usefulness of this employment in their writing. As it is realized that many ESL learners overuse the cohesive devices in their academic writing. It is occurred perhaps because of the lack of ability in applying the coherence within the text. Therefore, in enhancing ESL learners' writing skill, FARS approach may assist them in recognizing the coherent text and ultimately they are able to elicit a coherent text.

## REFERENCES

- Golebiowski, Z. (2012). Textual coherence and coherence relations. In Z. Golebiowski. *ECL 756 study guide and readings: Discourse analysis for language teaching* (Topic. 6) (pp. 1-25). Melbourne: Deakin University.
- Golebiowski, Z. (2009). The use of contrastive strategies in a sociology research paper: A across-cultural study. In E. Suomela-Salmi, E &F. Dervin. (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspectives on academic discourse* (pp. 165-185). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Golebiowski, Z. (2006). The distribution of discursal salience in research papers: Relational hypotaxis and parataxis. *Discourse Studies*, (8(2), 259-78, retrieved 12 June 2009, Sage Premiere database.
- Golebiowski, Z. (2004). *Description of FARS relational clusters and definitions of relations*. Deakin University.
- Golebiowski, Z., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2002). The interaction of discipline and culture in academic writing. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 59–71.
- Sabarniati, S. (2012). *Interlanguage* (course assignment submission). Melbourne: Deakin University.
- Swales, J. (1990). Research articles in English. *Genre analysis* (pp. 110-176). Cambridge University Press.