FARS ANALYSIS ON NATIVE WRITER'S AND ESL WRITER'S ACADEMIC ARTICLE

Nuraini
IAIN Lhokseumawe
Email: *marsnuraini@gmail.com*

Keywords: *FARS analysis, Communicative Structure, Academic Writing Analysis, RST*	**Abstract** This Paper applies the FARS (Framework for Analysis of the Relational Structure) model of discourse analysis. In this paper, the writer tries to analyse the text in order to recognize the relation between segments and find the plausibility of the application of FARS relation to the writer's message which is attempted to communicate in the global level of the text and how it is developed in lower level or in micro level of the text. This analysis attempts to show the prominence of paratactic and hypostatic relation may relate to writer message which is delivered within the text. It is also used to present the comparison of applicability of CARS and FARS analysis in language pedagogy. FARS analysis focuses on studying discourse structure, textual coherence and functional of textual relation. FARS analysis is developed based on the RST (Rhetorical Structure Theory) model of discourse analysis. The three main claims found in RST are about the predominance of nucleus/satellite structural pattern, the functional basis of hierarchy, and the communicative role of structure (Mann & Thompson, 1988). However, in FARS these three main points are presented a little bit different in the number of relation, the taxis principles of each relations and the name of the relation.
Kata Kunci: *Analisa FARS, Susunan Komunikatif, Analisa Tulisan Akademik, RST*	**Abstrak** Pada tulisan analisa diskursus FARS digunakan untuk menganalisa teks guna mengetahui hubungan antar segment pada tulisan ESL dan Native Writer . Selain itu analisa in juga untuk menemukan tingkat kelogisan dari aplikasi FARS terhadap pesan yang ingin dikomunikasikan oleh penulis pada tingkat global dari teks yang dianalisa dan tingkat kelogisan ini dibangun pada level yang lebih rendah atau pada level mikro. Artikel ini mencoba menunjukkan relasi parataksis dan hipotaksis yang menonjol yang berhubungan dengan pesan penulis yang disampaikannya melalui teks. Artikel ini juga untuk menunjukkan perbandingan pengaplikasian analisa CARS dan FARS pada pengajaran bahasa. Analisa FARS adalah studi stuktur diskursus, tekstual koherensi, dan fungsi relasi tekstual. Analisa ini dikembangkan berdasarkan model analisa RST (Rhetoriticl Structure Theory). Tiga klaim pada RST adalah

tentang keunggulan inti/ pola strukstural satelit, tingkatan dari dasar fungsi, dan peran komunikatif dari struktur tulisan. Namun demikian, pada analisa FARS, tiga poin inti ini disajikan sedikit berbeda pada jumlah relasi, prinsip taksis pada tiap- tiap relasi dan penamaan relasinya.

INTRODUCTION

This Paper is used to apply the FARS (Framework for Analysis of the Relational Structure) model of discourse analysis. In this paper, the writer tries to analyse the in the text in order to recognize the relation between segment and find the plausibility of the application of FARS relation to the writer's message which is attempted to communicate in the global level of the text and how it is developed in lower level or in micro level of the text. This analysis is attempted to show the prominence of paratactic and hypostatic relation may relates to writer massage which is delivered within the text. It is also used to present the comparison of applicability of CARS and FARS analysis in language pedagogy. FARS analysis is focused on the study of discourse structure, textual coherence and functional of textual relation. FARS analysis is developed based on the RST (Rhetoriticl Structure Theory) model of discourse analysis. The three main claims found in RST are about the predominance of nucleus/ Satellite structural pattern, the functional basis of hierarchy, and the communicative role of structure (Mann & Thompson, 1988). However, in FARS these three main points are presented a little bit different in the number of relation, the taxis principles of each relations and the name of the relation.

The main objective of an introduction is to justify the reasons for writing about the issue. The objective of this part is to introduce the issue to the readers, hand over an overview of related findings researches of the issue, and identify your own hypothesis, research, or study. If you introduce and define key words in your abstract, you need to introduce and define them in this section.

FARS Relation Framework

In general, FARS Taxonomy is divided into 7 relations; those are Adversative, Assessing, Causal, Digression, Elaboration, Facilitating and list. Adversative is as relation showing two different meanings of and between segments. In Assessing cluster,

the tendency of the relation of the segment is to show how one part of segment of evaluates, concludes and interprets another segment. Causal shows theorization between segment in the form of argument of antecedent and consequent. Digression is a kind of relation that adds more information which is good for the reader knowledge to a segment of the text; however the additional is not directly related to what is in the focus. Elaboration occurs as a relation where one part of the segment is the thesis and the other one is the part that elaborates this thesis. In a facilitating cluster one of the segments is used as a frame of the following segment and present the subject matter that shich is regarded important to be presented in order to order to make the reader familiar with the topic of the text. Meanwhile, in a list cluster two, proposition are related to each other through the share of the same topic or aspect of the topic (Golebiowski, n.d) These relations are divided into some more delicate categories as it is tabulated in table 1 below.

Table 1: FARS Relation Taxonomy

GENERAL CATEGORIES	DELICATE CATEGORIES	ABBREVIATION
Adversative	Contrast	A
	Collateral	AC
	Comparison	AM
	Concession	An
Assessing	Conclusion	Cn
	Interpretation	In
	Evaluation	Ev
Causal	Cause	Cn
	Circumstance	CI
	Condition	CD
	Evidence	CE
	Means	CM
Digression	Addition	D
	Explanation	DE
	Reference	DR
	Instantiation	DI
Elaboration	Amplification	EA
	Extension	E
	Explanation	EE
	Reformulation	ER
	Instantiatiation	EI
	Addition	ED
Facilitating	Framing	F
	Advance Organising	FA
	Enumeration	FE
	Introduction	FI
List	Collection	L
	Disjunction	LD
	Sequence	LS

METHOD

The text functional in FARS is divided into two paratactic and hypotactic. In paratactic, all the segment of the textual scheme has the equal prominence in the term of their discourse function, meanwhile in the hypotactic in one of the segment of textual scheme is more prominent than other. This functional relation can be based on the purpose which is communicated by the writer (Grime, 1975 in Golebiowski, 2009). Some of these relation can have both hypotactic relation and pratactic relation in this discourse functional such as it is in causal-cause, Adversative contras and List – Framing.

One of Characteristics found in FARS is the hierarchical analysis which means that analysis can be done is different level of analysis unit. Golebiowski (2009: 167) states that "the entire text represents a relational schema at the top hierarchical level". The top of this scheme is called as the global level of discourse which is constructed by macro-proposition linking to each other.

The macro proposition levels entail the lower level called the mezzo proposition which is also constructed by another linking of lower level which is called micro proposition (Golebiowski, 2010)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Analysis Result

In this paper the write uses two texts: one of the native English writers and other one is from the ESL students. The first text is device into 27 basic analytical units and the second one is divided into 28 basic analytical units. The basic analytical unit used in the analysis are the chunk of objects, and adverbials) and the restrictive and non-restrictive clauses (Golebiowski, 2010)

In this analysis, the writer decides the hierarchical segments based on Golebiowski (2009) level of relation analysis; mazzo level, and micro level. The first level of the analysis table is labelled as macro level and the second level as the mezzo level, meanwhile the rest levels of the are regarded as the micro level of the analysis.

The are 24 segmentation for the first text 26 segmentation for the second text. From the analysis, the relations of the segmentation are shown in Table 2. From the

114

Table 2 it can be seen that the global aims of the write of the ESL text is to provide evidences as many as possible for the readers in order to make them understand and accept the writer's idea which disagree to the program of introduction the National ID card in Australia. Here, the writer tries to collect as many as negative aspect of the National ID card introduction to be presented to the reader.

In this text it can also be seen that the most dominant relation is list-collection with 8 appearances in micro level. Gelobiowski (n.d) states that List– Collection has very weak relation or has no relation at all between the constitutive propositions. This phenomenon can be seen in the whole List- Collection relation which appear in the text where the relation between the segments cannot be seen clearly. However, it still can be understood that the segment have cohesiveness signal by sharing the same topic or aspect of the topic such as shown in segment 8-13 and 14-18.

(8) up to five precent of cards are lost, stolen or damaged each year

(9) and the result can be denial of service ad benefits, and lost of identity.

(10) The replacement of a high securty, high intergrity card involves significant administrative involvement.

(11) Documents must be presented in preson to an official.

(12) Card must be processed centrally.

(13) This process can take some weeks.

(14) The existance of a person's life story in hundred unrelated database in one important condition that protects privacy.

(15) The bringing together of these separate information center created a major privacy vulnerability.

(16) Any multi-purpose national ID card has this effect.

(17) The concentration of such data on all Australia in single location could prove disastrous

(18) If it was attacked by hackers.

Another dominant relation found in this text is causal conditional as the first segment is the antecedent and the other is the consequent and first segment is a condition for an outcome presented in the second segment such as in segment 5 and 6-7 below

(5) ID card can easily be lost

(6) and found by people who will abuse it

(7) and violate other people pripavacy.

Here is only one digression – Addition found in this text which is in segment 26 and 27. In this segment 27 is additional information for segment 27. The additional of this information, however, does not have any further explanation space whether before or after it is mentioned and it make the existence of this clause seems less important and less coherent.

Table 2:   Tabulation of Relation found in Native write's text

Symbol	Relation – Delicate Categories	Macro level (1 relation)	Mezzo level (2 relation)	Micro Level (21 relation)
CM	Causal - Mean	1		
F	Facilitating - Framing		2	
L	List - Collection			1
Cn	Assessing - Conclusion			2
FI	Facilitating – Introduction			2
CD	Causal - Condition			2
ED	Elaboration - Addition			3
EA	Elaboration - Amplification			5
CE	Causal - Evidence			3
E	Elaboration - Extension			1
C	Causal - Cause			1
AN	Adversative - Concession			1
		1	2	21

Form the Table 2 it can be sees that in Native write text, the most relation used is elaboration implication. All of the elaboration amplifications appear in the level of macro level. The least on the casual means and it take position in the level.

In the macro level, the relation of segment 1-10 and 11-27 is closer to the causal mean because the whole text represents the write goal of the research, the way which is used by the writer in order to achieve the goal and result. It seem that the relation of these two segments can be labelled as Framing in the way that segment 1 -10 provides a frame segments 11- 27. However, in the segments the write does not necessarily to make the reader familiar with the topic which is presented in the because the subject matter is not related to the new theoretical or technical term which is hard to e understood. Rather, it is the writer explanation about her finding through interviewing

the teacher student in finding out their opinion about the session of the lecture given by the write and her colleague.

The main purpose-of this text is to make the reader accept why this research is important to be done that the writer has done and chosen the right methodology in doing this research. Thus, causal mean is the most suitable relation for the segments is the macro level.

Meanwhile, the facilitative framing relation is more applicable in the lower level of the segments is divided into 1-2 and 3–10 and 11–20 and 21– 27

(1)   This paper is an attempt to apply cenversation analysis to feedback sessions between a teaher studying on a postgraduate diploma course specialising in English as a second language (ESL)

(2)   and a university supervisor who has just observed her lesson.

(3)   My interest inthis arose

(4)   becaus this is an aspect of teacher education which has been writen about

(5)   and discussed in the trems of what actually goes on in these feedback sessions as far as the talk itself is concerned.

(6)   but rarely in terms of what actually goes on in these feed back sessions as far as the talk itself is concerned.

(7)   As a supervisor involved in this aspect of teacher education,

(8)   I am devoting a large part of my job the something which often informally discussed betwee colleagues

(9)   but not analysed in detail or compared across students, supervisors or intituitions.

(10) It seemed appropriate to look at this.

Here, the writer tries to give frame to the readers in order to understand the background of this research and how the procedure of this research and what kind of data to be analysed in the research.

The following table show the tabulation of the relation found in the ESL Text.

Table 3: ESL Text relation tabulation

Symbol	Relation - Delicate categories	Macro level (1 relation)	Mezzo level (2 relation)	Micro Level (21 relation)
CE	Causal - Evidence	1		2
E	Elaboration – Extension		1	2
Cn	Assessing – Conclusion		1	3
CD	Causal - Condition			7
L	List - Collection			8
ED	Elaboration – Addition			1
D	Digression - Addition			1
		1	2	24

Rhetorical Choice and Recursiveness

The following is the tabulation of the use of paratactic and hypotactic in both ESL and native text.

Table 4: Rhetorical Choice Tabulation

No.	Rhetorical choice	Paratactic	Hypotactic
1	Native Text	15 (62,5%)	9 (37,5%)
2	ESL text	25 (92,6%)	2 (7,4%)

From the table above it can be seen that the ESL write uses more paratactic relation function that native writer. The paratactic rhethoric used by the ESL writer is about 92, 6% and the native write only chooses paratactic. It is about 62,5% of the whole functional relation.

In ELS text it seems that the paratactic rhetorical choice shows that the writer does not have any intention to mitigate the sentences for the reason of face threatening act. It can be said that the use of paratactic in this text shows the writer intention to express negative side of introducing the national ID card explicititely.

In both text, however, the hypo tactical choice seem used to mitigate the imposition of the writer's intention to make the readers accept the idea they proposed. In the native writer's text two of nine hypotactic relation function are also used to diminish the speech act which can threat the face of the information whose the dispreferred session, in this case is her own colleague. In this segment, the clause which shows the negative point of the sessions is put aside in the form of insertion or appositional clause.

From the analysis, it is also found some Recursiveness of the relation found in both texts. In the native writer text it is is found that the higher level in the micro level which has Assessing – Conclusion relation will tends to be dominated by the relation of elaboration cluster as in the lower level of segment 3-9 adan 10; and the lower level of segment 21-25. Meanwhile, the higher level in micro level in micro level which has Casual – Evidence relation will be dominated by the causal ckuste in the lower level such in the lower level of segment 14-16 and 17-20.

In the ESL text, there tendencies the higher level in micro level of the text which has Assessing – Conclusion will have dominant List cluster relation in the lower level such as in segment 8-12 and 13; and the higher level which is related in the Casual – Evidence is dominated by the Causal – Condition in its lower level such as in segment 19–20 and 21–23 and its lower level

Signalling

In analysing the text coherence, it is generally an easy way to rely on the linguistics signal such as cohesive and coherence device. However, in analysing the discourse this linguistics device is not merely the sign of a text to be coherence. From the analysis it is revealed that the coherence of the text is more depend on the relation found between segments. In this analysis, only some relation of segments are explicitly realized by the linguistics coherence signals such as found in the ESL text whereas the linguistics signal shows the relation between the segment explicitly as it is shown in the relation of segment 1 and 2, and 21 and 22 below

(1)   If a national ID card were to be introduced in Austalia

(2)   not only will it invade our privacy

(21)   Australians could be forced to pay about \$100 each for a new ID

(22)   If they are introduced.

The use of adversative but in native text analysed in this paper, for example, does not only show the function as contrastive device but it is used to introduce another part of segment to show that the writer's intention in this text is to make the research focus on one aspect of teacher education. Also in this text, before is not used to show

the sequence of events, rather it is used to signal the condition of the interview done with the supervisor.

Thus, it can be said that both the native writer and ESL write text are not use a high level of explicitness in their text regarding the use of the linguistics signals. Rather the explicitness can be realized by the choice of the relational function between segments found in the text.

Comparison between Analytical Procedure of FARS and CARS

Both FARS and CARS depends on the plausibility of analysis. The similarity of both of the analysis is that they are analysed based on the purpose which is communicated by the writers. Their similarity can realize by focus of analysing the coherence of the text.

There are big chances to have the cyclicity in moves and step in CARS model but not in FARS model of analysis. CARS analysis plays important role in deciding which move chosen in managing or building a text. Meanwhile, the FARS is looking at the discourse to more deep relation between segments. In CARS analysis there are no analysis done to find out the functional relation in the term of prominence of each segment of the move and there are no basic unit of analysis for CARS model. CARS are used to study how the pattern of certain genre of writing is generally built. On the other hand FARS is focused on the approaches apply in those different kinds of genres by investigating the relationship between the segments the text (Golebiowski, 2009).

Based on the scope where both of this model can be applied it can be said that CARS model is more focused on the research article, meanwhile the FARS model can be used in more kind of articles.

CONCLUSION

One of the factors that can support the success of delivering meaning in a text produced by the writers is mostly realised on the coherence between the propositions of the text. The coherence of the text does not have be realized by the linguistics signal. It can be identify by learning the relation of segment of the text. CARS and FARS are two ways which can be used to analysis the approach used in the text in order to deliver the

meaning and the purpose of their writing effectively base on the move and steps and the relational coherence, so the readers can understand and accept it.

In language pedagogy it can be seen that CARS and FARS model of analysis has a very useful implication. Both of the models of analysis can be used to manage the syllabus in the teaching language especially in productive skill such as writing and speaking. The students need to know and use the right rhetoric in order to produce appropriate text. By learning or being aware of move found in CARD model the student can follow this move and step to decide their position and genre especially in the form of academic writing style. In other word it can be said that CARS is more applicable in the process of deciding syllabus of ESP. Meanwhile FARS can be used to teach the students to be more aware that in every genre of text the most important thing is how to present the text by using the right approach, choosing of right key feature for the each genre by considering the coherence presentation and emphasizing on the prominent massages which the writers want deliver to the reader thus their idea can be conveyed effectively and can be accepted by the reader.

REFERENCES

Golebiowski, z. (2009). The use of contrastive in a sociology research Paper: A cross-cultural study. In E. Suomela- Salmi, E& F. Devin. (Eds.) Cross- lingualistic and cross- cultural perspestives on a academics discourse (pp.165-186). Amsterdan: John Benjamins Publishing.

Golebiowski, Z. (n.d). Description of FARS relation Clusters and Definitions of Relations. Deakin Univesity. Retrieved from DSO for ECL 756 Discourse Analysis for Language Teaching

Golebiowski, Z. (2010) Part 2: Framework for the analysis of the relation structure of Texts (FARS), ECL 756 Discourse Analysis for Language Teaching.Topic 6. Geelong: Deakin University

Mann, W.C.& Thompson, S.A. (1988). Rhrtorical Stucture Theory: Toword a functional Theory of text organization. Organization. Text, 8(3), 243-281