JELE | Journal of English Language and Education

Register Realization in the Writing of 8th Grade Students of SMP Kesatrian Semarang
(A Comparative Study between Dialogue and Recount Text)

Azizah Ezard Maulina
State University of Semarang
Email : azizahezardmaulina@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research aimed at comparing the contextual description of the field, tenor, and mode between written dialogue and recount text in the writing of the 8th grade students of SMP Kesatrian 1 Semarang. The next was to find which text was the student's major and find the reason why register realization in dialogue and recount text is the same or different. This was a qualitative research by employing descriptive comparative method. The corpus of the data of this research were written dialogue and recount text in the writing of the 8th grade students of SMP Kesatrian 1 Semarang. The results showed as follows: (1) the production of 'experiential domain found', 'short term goal', and 'long term goal' in the written dialogue texts were more various than in the recount texts; (2) The production of agentive or societal roles, status, and social distance in dialogue texts were also more various than in recount texts; (3) The role of language, type of interaction, and the rhetorical trust in the written dialogues were different from the recount texts (Meanwhile the medium and the channel of both texts were the same); (4) The students produced more various features in terms of contextual description of the field, tenor, and mode in written dialogues than in recount texts; (5) The similarities between written dialogues and recount texts found in the terms of medium and channel. Meanwhile the differences between them were found in the other terms (experiential domain etc.). In conclusion, the students were more major in making written dialogue than recount text.

Keywords: Mood, Register, Theme, Transitivity, Recount Text

INTRODUCTION

In daily interaction, people always talk to each other no matter what they do. They need a means to show their ideas, feelings, and thoughts. The means is language. So, language is a means of communication which aims at showing ideas, feelings, and thoughts. By using language, people can interact to each other and express their ideas and thoughts. People may have difficulties to make an interaction in community without the existence of language.

Language can be divided into two types, spoken and written languages. Spoken language does not only refer to language which is said aloud, it is typically more dependent on its context than written language. The spoken language concerns about

the diction, grammar, pronunciation, fluency in speaking, vocabulary, et cetera that support communication. In contrast, written language does not only refer to language which is written down, but also tends to be more independent of its immediate context. In written language, grammar, text, paragraphs, sentences, phrases, words, et cetera, commonly associated with the written language. Gerot and Wignell (1994: 161) state that "spoken and written languages are both complex, but in different ways. Spoken language tends to be complex grammatically and written language tends to be complex lexically". Moreover, this study focused on written language because it was taken from written text.

I was interested to analyze register found on students' writings. So far I found that students disliked to write. This was due to the difficulties they found in its process. That's why I wanted to analyze students' writing using register variables. I wanted to know the students' ability in their writing competences by exploring the contextual description of 'field', 'mode', and 'tenor'. The data in this research were taken from the 8th grade

students' dialogue and recount text of SMP Kesatrian 1 Semarang. In this data, there were many elements of Systemic Functional Grammar, for example register variables. The data was in the form of students' written texts. There were two forms of data compared in this research. They were written dialogue and recount text. The dialogue chosen was interpersonal dialogue.

The studies of 'register realization' had been previously conducted by other researchers. Cahyono (2008) conducted a study of 'register realization' in casual talks. The conversations were gathered from first semester students of Faculty of Languages and Letters Dian Nuswantoro University. Since it was casual talks, the data were in the spoken forms. Other similar case was conducted by Gestania (2009). She conducted this study about register on advertisements found in English magazine, named "Campus Asia Magazine" Volume 2 Number 8, February, 2009 edition. The data in her study was in the form of written text.

I used register theory to analyze the students' writing namely,

'Systemic Functional Grammar' to investigate the register variables in writing. The term 'register' here described the language of groups of people with common interests or jobs, or the language used in situation associated with such group. This was interesting to compare whether there were much different or not about the register variables found in dialogue and recount text of the 8ᵗʰ grade students writing tasks.

Systemic Functional Grammar

According to Martin *et al* (1997: 1), "Systemic Functional Grammar is a way of looking at grammar in terms of how language is used". As what the researcher said in the beginning of this research, the researcher will use Systemic Functional Grammar to analyze the data. Mood and speech functions are closely related to Systemic Functional Grammar. In addition, Gerot and Wignell (1994: 6) explain, "Systemic Functional Grammar views language as a resource for making meaning". This grammar attempts to describe language in actual use and so focus on text and their contexts. It is concerned not only with the structures but also

with how those structures construct meaning.

Context of Situation

Context of situation can be specified through the use of the register variables: 'field', 'tenor', and 'mode'. Halliday and Hassan (1985: 44) argue that they have analyzed the context of situation into three components, corresponding to the three metafunctions. The relationship between text and context of situation implies in term of the notions of the field (what is going on), the tenor (the social relationship between those talking part), and the mode (how language is being used). Those three variables refer to certain aspects of our social situation that always influence the language as it is being used. We also need contextual configuration for talking about the text structure. A contextual configuration is a specific set of values that realizes field, tenor, and mode. They are usually used in our social activity. Metalanguage can explore the relation between text and context. Butt et. al (2000: 123) says that context of situations motivates the meaning of text in three main areas.

Those areas can be seen in the following description.

1) 'Field of discourse' means the field of human experience encompassed by the text and its purpose in encompassing it.

2) 'Tenor of discourse' means the social relationship between the speaker or writer and the addressee.

3) 'Mode of discourse' means the nature of the text itself and the role that language plays in it.

The field, tenor, and mode of discourse summarize the 'motivational relevancies' which drive the text and make up the context of situation. The context of situation, as defined in these terms, is the immediate environment in which a text is actually functioning. These following things is the contextual description of field, mode, and tenor proposed by Butt (2000: 192-193).

The contextual description of field of discourse in the text can be realized by identifying experiential domain, short term goal, and long term goal.

1. Experiential domain is what the text is all about the processes, participants and circumstances.

2. Short term goal refers to the immediate purpose of the text's production.

3. Long term goal refers to the text's placein the larger scheme of things.

The contextual descriptions of tenor of discourse in the text can be realized by identifying agentive or societal roles, status, and social distance.

1. Agentive or societal roles.

   They are roles between the speaker/writer and the addressees/reader. For example: mother/child, doctor/patient, teacher/pupil, vendor/customer.

2. Status

   The form of status can be equal or hierarchic.

3. Social distance

   It measures how well the participants know each other, whether they speak familiarly or distantly. The two end-points of which may be referred to as *maximal* (for speaker who have never met before) and *minimal* (for those who interact on a familiar and frequent basis).

   Meanwhile, the contextual description of mode of discourse in the

text can be realized by identifying role of language, type of interaction, medium, channel, rhetorical mode:

1. Role of language

    a. It can be either constitutive or ancillary. If language is ancillary to the text, it helps some other activities.

2. Type of interaction refers to whether the text is all spoken by one person (monologic) or by other participant (dialogic).

3.' is whether the text was originally spoken, written or even signed.

1. 'Channel' is how the text was originally received, either phonic or graphic or, in the case of signed text, visual.

2. 'Rhetorical mode' refers to the overall feeling of the text.

Register

Register is defined by Halliday and Hasan (1985: 41) as 'variation according to use'. Alongside genre, the main construct used by functional linguist to model context is known as 'register'. In 'Systematic Functional Linguistics', 'register' analysis is organized by metafunction into 'field', 'tenor', and 'mode'. The dimension concerned with relationships between interactions is known as 'tenor'; that concerned with their social activity is known as 'field'; and that concerned with the role of language is known as 'mode' (Martin and Rose, 2003: 242-243). Halliday and Hasan (1985: 12) have characterized these three dimensions of a situation as follows:

1. 'Field' refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action taking place: what it is that the participants are engaged in, in which language figures as some essential components.

2. 'Tenor' refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statues and roles : what kinds of role relationship obtain, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech roles they are taking on the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationships in which they are involved.

3. 'Mode' refers to what part language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting language to do for them in the situation: the symbolic organization of the text, the status

that it has, and its function in the context.

As language realizes its social contexts, so each dimension of a social context is realized by a particular metafunction of language, as in the table.

Table 1. Register and Metafunction

Metafunction	Context
Interpersonal	Tenor 'kinds of role relationship'
Ideational	Field 'the social action that is taking place'
Textual	Mode 'what part language is playing'

Source: Martin and Rose (2003: 243)

METHODS

This research is qualitative using a descriptive comparative method. According to Nunan (1993: 4-6), "descriptive qualitative research is a research in which the method of data collection is non-experimental or real-time recording that generates naturally occurring data". In qualitative research, the data are not numbers or charts but in the form of word, picture, etc. In this research, the data were not numbers or charts but in the form of clauses consisted of words. So this was descriptive qualitative research.

The data in this research were in the form of written language taken from the 8th grade students' writing in SMP Kesatrian 1 Semarang. There were two kinds of students' writing that were taken. They are written dialogue and recount text. There are two techniques of data collection; testing the students' ability in writing dialogue and recount and collecting the students' writing. There are also some steps in analyzing the data as shown below: (1) Segmenting the texts into clauses; (2) Reading the clauses carefully; (3) Analyzing the clauses in term of transitivity system; (4) Analyzing the clauses in term of mood system; (5) Analyzing the clauses in term of theme-rheme; (6) After analyzing the clauses in term of lexicogrammatical, then analyzing them in term of contextual description using Butt *et al* theory; (7) Comparing the two writings to find out the similarities or differences; (8) Drawing conclusion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Similarities and Differences between Written Dialogue and Recount Text of Students' Writing in Realizing Register

There were some similarities and differences between dialogue and recount texts of realizing register in the writing of 8th grade students of SMP Kesatrian 1 Semarang. The similarities and the differences between both of them are explained as follows.

1. The Similarities

The similarities between dialogue and recount texts of realizing register can be seen in the contextual description of mode. The description of mode of discourse is realized by role of language, type of interaction, medium, channel, and rhetorical mode. Both dialogue and recount text have similarities in medium and channel. The detail similarities can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Contextual Descriptionof Mode of Discourse between Dialogue and Recount Texts

Contextual Description of Mode of Discourse	Dialogue Texts	Recount Texts
Role of language	Constitutive and ancillary	Ancillary
Type of interaction	Dialogic	Monologic
Medium	Written	Written
Channel	Graphic	Graphic
Rhetorical mode	Describe something (description)	Telling past event (recount)

1) The Differences

The differences between dialogue and recount texts of realizing register can be seen in the contextual description of 'field', 'tenor' and 'mode'. The description of field of discourse was realized by experiential domain, short term goal, and long term goal. The description of tenor of discourse was realized by agentive or societal role, status, and social distance. Meanwhile, the description of mode of discourse was realized by role of language, type of interaction,

medium, channel, and rhetorical mode. The differences between dialogue and recount texts can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Contextual Description of Field of Discourse between Dialogue and Recount Texts

Contextual Description of Tenor of Discourse	Dialogue Texts	Recount Texts
Agentive/Societal Role	Friends, mother and daughter, father and son, teacher and student, brother and sister, neighbors	Writer and readers
Status	Equal and unequal	Unequal
Societal Distance	Minimal and maximal	Maximal

Table 4. Contextual Description of Tenor of Discourse between Dialogue and Recount Texts

Contextual Description of Field of Discourse	Dialogue Texts	Recount Texts
Experiential domain	Personal identity, greeting, school, cooking, concert, going fishing, going to bookstore, party, cleaning the house, someone's condition, news, etc.	Holiday, playing monopoly, going to the beach, shopping, cycling, etc.
Short term goal	Asking something, offering help, informing something, telling something, etc.	Informing the readers about the writer's activity
Long term goal	Identifying someone's identity, offering someone to go somewhere, asking for information, offering help, discussing about something, giving information, etc.	Telling the readers about the writer's experience

Table 3 shows that in contextual description of field of discourse, there are more experiential domain, short term goal, and long term goal in dialogue text than in recount text. There are many various experiential domain, short term goal, and long term goal in dialogue text. Meanwhile, there is only 1 experiential domain, 1 short term goal, and 1 long term goal found in recount text.

It also happened in the contextual description of tenor of discourse. Table 4 shows that the agentive/societal role in dialogue text is more than the agentive in recount text. There are 6 types of agentive in dialogue text and 1 type of agentive in recount text. There are also 2 types of status found in dialogue text; equal and unequal. The social distance in dialogue text is also 2 types; minimal and maximal. There is only 1 type of status and social distance found in recount text.

From table 2, it can be stated that there are similarities and differences found in contextual description of mode of discourse between dialogue texts and recount texts. The differences are only in the part of role of language, type of interaction, and rhetorical mode. The role of language in dialogue text consists of constitutive and ancillary. The role of language in recount text is only ancillary. Type of interaction in dialogue text is dialogic while in recount text is monologic. The rhetorical mode in recount text is only telling past event while in dialogue text, the rhetorical mode is description

because all of those dialogues describe about something.

From the similarities and differences as explained above, it can be summarized that the similarity between dialogue and recount texts of realizing register in the writing of 8th grade students of SMP Kesatrian 1 Semarang was in contextual description of mode of discourse. Both of the texts were the same in terms of medium and channel.

Meanwhile, the differences were also found in contextual description of field of discourse, contextual description of tenor of discourse, and contextual description of mode of discourse. Both of the texts have the differences in terms of experiential domain, short term goal, long term goal; agentive/societal roles, status, social distance; role of language, type of interaction, and rhetorical mode.

The Different Effectiveness between Written Dialogue and Recount Text of Students' Writing

Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the results of register analysis between dialogue and recount texts in the writing of 8th grade students of SMP

Kesatrian 1 Semarang. Based on that analysis, it can be seen which one is more effective between dialogue and recount text in showing the students' writing skill. To find which one is more effective, it can be seen from the quantity of contextual description of field, tenor, and mode of discourse produced by students.

From those tables above, it can be stated that the students produced more various features in terms contextual description of field of discourse (experiential domain, short term goal, long term goal); contextual description of tenor of discourse (agentive/societal role, status, social distance); and contextual description of mode of discourse (role of language and rhetorical mode) in dialogue text than recount text. In conclusion, the students' ability in writing dialogue texts are better than in recount texts.

The Reasons of Similarities and Differences between Dialogue and Recount Texts of Students' Writing in Realizing Register

Based on the discussion written above, it can be stated that although there were similarities in the texts, they tended to be different in realizing register. The reasons of similarities and differences between dialogue and recount texts are discussed below.

The similarities were found in the contextual description of mode of discourse in terms of medium and channel. The medium of both texts are written. The channel intervening of both texts is called 'graphic'. Both of the texts are written because the data in this research is written. It was taken from the writing of 8th grade students of SMP Kesatrian 1 Semarang. Because the data is in the written form, the channel of both texts is graphic not phonic.

Meanwhile the differences appeared in the contextual description of field of discourse in terms of experiential domain, short term goal, and long term goal. In those three aspects, the students produced more various features in the dialogue text than in the recount text. They are able to make various topics in writing dialogue better than in writing recount. The students tend to create various topics in writing dialogue than recount because they aren't bound with any rules, for example tenses, temporal conjunction, etc. It is just based on their imagination and creativity. They

can use any kind of tenses, word choice, conjunction, et cetera, freely. Whereas in writing recount texts, the students have to obey some rules, for example: using simple past tense, action verbs, temporal conjunction and so on. In their mindset, the purpose of recount is telling past events closely related to holiday. That's why they tended to write topics about holiday than the other topics.

Furthermore, the differences were also found in the contextual description of tenor of discourse in terms of societal role, status, and social distance. The societal role found in the dialogue text is more various than in the recount text. The societal role in the recount text is only between writer and readers. Because the type of interaction in recount text is monologic, the societal role which is found is limited. It is only between writer and readers. Meanwhile the type of interaction in dialogue text is dialogic. There is a direct interaction between the speakers. So, it can be found various societal roles. They are friends, mother and daughter, father and son, teacher and student, brother and sister, and neighbors. For the status, there was only one status found

in recount text. That is unequal because the writer is the dominant speaker who provided information to readers. Whereas there were two kinds of status found in the dialogue text. Those are equal and unequal. In the dialogue text, sometimes the speakers produced the same and balance mood types. So their status will be said equal. The social distance in the recount text is only maximal while in the dialogue text is minimal and maximal. The societal distance in the recount is maximal because the text does not seem very close. The writer and the reader did not know each other and never met before. In the dialogue text, sometimes the societal distance is minimal because the speakers have a close relationship.

The last differences were found in the contextual description of mode of discourse in terms of role of language, type of interaction, and rhetorical mode. The role of language in the dialogue text is constitutive and ancillary. Whereas ancillary is the only role of language found in the recount text. In the recount text, the role of language is ancillary because it helps the writer to convey his purpose telling about his/her past activity.

While the role of language in the dialogue text is sometimes constitutive because since it is an interpersonal dialogue, so the language here functions to sustain the conversation and keep it long. The type of interaction in recount text is monologic because the writer is the only speaker who provided information to readers. Whereas the type of interaction found in the dialogue text is dialogic because there is an interaction directly between one to another speakers. The rhetorical mode found in the dialogue text is description because all of those dialogues described about something. Meanwhile the rhetorical mode in the recount text is recount because the purpose of the text is telling the past events.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

From the findings and discussions above, it can be concluded as follows; (1) The production of experiential domain found, short term goal, and long term goal in written dialogue text were more various than in recount text; (2) The production of agentive or societal roles, status, and social distance in dialogue text is also more various than in recount text; (3) The role of language, type of interaction, and the rhetorical trust in the written dialogue were different from recount text - Meanwhile the medium and the channel of both texts were the same; (4) The students produced more various features in terms of contextual description of the field, tenor, and mode in written dialogue than in recount text (It means the students were more major in making written dialogue than recount text); (5) The similarities between written dialogue and recount text found in the terms of medium and channel - Meanwhile the differences between them were found in the other terms (experiential domain etc.).

Considering the results of this study, pedagogical implications can be given especially for researchers, English learners, and teachers. English teachers especially for Junior High Schools may find it as a beneficial input to have better understanding and raise their awareness of the importance of writing skills. Such awareness is important since it will eventually drive English teachers to

influence their students in the way they write or expressing their ideas in written way. Even if they were good in writing dialogue texts but they still found difficulties in writing recount texts. The teacher should provide them good model texts, which enable them to produce texts to realize meanings in English so that they can produce their own texts by themselves well. They have to maintain their ability in making dialogue text and improve their ability in writing recount texts. By the time, they will be able to make another text types as well as dialogue and 'recount texts'.

REFERENCES

Brown, G & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butt, D *et al*. (2001). *Using Functional Grammar: An explorer's Guide Second Edition*. Sidney National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Maguire University

Cahyono, Setyo Prasiyanto. (2008). Register Realization in Casual Talk Among the First Semester Students of Faculty of Languages and Letters, Dian Nuswantoro University. Thesis. Department of English Education, Graduate Program, State University of Semarang.

Celce-Murcia, M and E. Olshtain. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. (2001). *Discourse*. Hongkong: Oxford University Press.

Coulthard, M. (ed). (1999). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Printer Publisher.

Ellis, Rod. (1994). *The study of Second Language Acquisition*.

Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change.* Paperback: Polity Press.

Figueiredo, Debora. (2010). Context, register and genre: Implications for language education Vol. 43, pp. 119-141. Universidade do Soul de Santa Catarina, Brasil. (Retrieved on February, 5th 2012)

Fromkin, Victoria. et al. (1985). *An Introduction to General Linguistics (4th eds 1988).* Sydney: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Gerot, L and Wignell, P. (1992). *Making Sense of Funtional Grammar*. Australia: Gerd Stabler.

Halliday, M.A.K. and C.M.I.M. Matthiessen. (1999). *Construing Experience Through Meaning: A Language-based Approach to Cognition.* London: Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K, Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context, and Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Introduction to Functional Grammar First Edition.* London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar Second Edition*. London: Edward Arnold.

Jonston, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jorgensen, Marianne and Phillips, Louise.(2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Great Britain:Sage.

Lee, David YW. (2001). Genres, Registers, Text Types, Domains, and Styles: Clarifying the Concepts and Navigating A Path Through The BNC Jungle Vol. 5, Num.

3, pp. 37-72. Lancaster University, UK. (Retrieved on February, 6th 2012)

Martin, J.R., C.M.I.M. Matthiessen, C. Painter. (1997). *Working with Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Martin, J.R., Rose, D. (2003). *Working with Discourse*. New York: Brown and Company.

Martin, J.R. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (1995). *Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English System*. Tokyo: International Language Science Series.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Navarro, Diego. (2011). A Systemic Analysis of Two Different Media Texts' Positioning of Social Actors and the Effects of Experiential, Interpersonal, and Textual Meaning in Their Evaluation and Presentation of Bespoke Actors. *The Journal of Canada University of International Studies* Vol. 23. (Retrieved on February, 5th 2012)

Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: The Pinguin Group.

Odebunmi, Akin. (2007). Meaning Expressions of Some English Registers. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture* Vol. 21. University of Ibadan, Nigeria. (Retrieved on February, 5th 2012)

Richard, Jack C. (1996). *Functional English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge Language Education.

Schriffin, D. (1995). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stubbs, Michael. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.