Research Paper

A Genre and Appraisal Analysis of Critical Review Texts in Academic Writing From a Systemic Functional Linguistic Perspective

Merina Devira[1] & Elise Westin[2]

[1]Corresponding Author; English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Samudra University, Aceh, Indonesia; *merinadevira.fkip@unsam.ac.id*

[2]Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia; *elise.westin@adelaide.edu.au*

Abstract

A critical review is one of the text types (i.e., genres) assigned for academic writing in Australian universities; yet, the study of this genre remains underexamined in academic discourse. This qualitative study was designed to analyse the schematic structures and lexical choices in evaluative meanings within critical review texts to provide a description of the critical analysis genre that could help to familiarise students with the characteristics of the genre. Texts used for the analysis were a tutor's model text, provided to the students in the Introductory Academic Program (IAP) at the University of Adelaide, and the critical review writing of 2 Indonesian students in the IAP class. Using both genre analysis (Martin & Rose, 2003) and the appreciation framework (Martin & White, 2005) from systemic functional linguistics (SFL), the study applied "a genre-analytic approach" (Nodoushan & Khakbaz, 2011, p.112) to analysing and describing the structure and language use of the critical review texts. Analysis of the schematic structure identified 5 stages: Introduction, Summary of the Article, Analysis of the Article: Positive Critique, Analysis of the Article: Negative Critique, and Conclusion. The values of appreciation that contributed to the evaluative purpose of the critical review genre were categorised as valuation, composition, and reaction. Based on the analysis, this report provides suggestions for structural and lexical resources for the realisation of the purpose of a critical review text and for the expression of evaluative meanings.

Keywords: Genre Analysis; Appraisal; Critical Review Texts; Academic Writing; Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

1. Introduction

Critical reviews have become an increasingly common form of assignment writing in tertiary education, requiring students to read a text and to critically analyse its content. Critical reviews, also known as 'Evaluative Accounts' in academic literacy research (Woodward-Kron, 2003), are assigned with the aim to develop students' critical thinking skills (Teramoto & Mickan, 2008; Woodward-Kron, 2003). However, there remains a lack of consensus among experts about the precise definition of a 'critical' analysis (Teramoto & Mickan, 2008; Thompson, 2003; Woodward-Kron, 2003). Consequently, students are often left confused by the lack of consistent instruction from lecturers and teaching support. International students who are accustomed to exam-based education systems face further difficulties, due to a lack of experience in demonstrating critical thinking in academic writing, along with differences in rhetorical patterns (Teramoto & Mickan, 2008; AUTC, 2002; The Claremont Colleges Writing Centres, 1999). Despite these concerns, the critical review genre has received insufficient attention from academic literacy researchers (Woodward-Kron, 2003). Existing studies have investigated specific elements of academic writing, particularly the expression of students' opinions and argumentation. Approaches to such studies include analyses of the appropriateness of linguistic components that make a text argumentative (Mickan, 2003; Woodward-Kron, 2003; Wu & Desmond, 2003), moves identification in an argumentative text assignment for an Engineering Communication course (Devira, 2017), instruction on aspects of the

expression of opinion (Barkhuizen, 2002) and the use of self-reflection to understand the process of critical review writing as a social practice (Teramoto & Mickan, 2008).

There is increasing recognition among tertiary literacy practitioners of the need to build greater transparency towards the social and rhetorical dimensions of academic writing for both English-speaking background (ESB) students and non-English-speaking background (NESB) students at all stages of their degrees (Hyland & Hamps-Lyons, 2002; Khany, 2017; Pashapour et al., 2018). However, there remains insufficient support for students to become acquainted with the textual practices of their discipline (Ali et al., 2012; Baldauf, 1997; Woodward-Kron, 2003). A deeper analysis and a more comprehensive presentation of varied critical review models, in terms of their textual organisation (generic structure) and language features are required to fill the gaps in previous studies. This study reports on a study which aims to address this anomaly to better facilitate the learning process for writing a critical review. The study is also intended to generate useful knowledge for identifying the generic structure and lexical choices in evaluative meanings that are required to fulfill the purpose of a critical review text. Once these are identified, they can be brought to the attention of students using model texts. Woodward-Kron (2003) notes that using model texts to linguistically unpack "the concept of 'critically analyse' and how this is realised in writing" provides a "concrete support" for students to better understand the Evaluative Account genre (p. 34). Understanding both the structure and lexical choices in evaluative meanings are crucial to achieving the social purpose of the genre, which is "to pass judgment on new contributions to disciplinary knowledge, and to make the new knowledge and the judgment available to the discourse community" (Woodward-Kron, 2003, p. 23).

2. Literature Review

Despite a lack of consensus as to the requirements of a critical review, the genre is generally considered to have two main components: a summary of a chosen text and a critical evaluation of this text ('Introductory Academic Program: Semester 2, 2012,' 2012; University of New South Wales, 2008). The summary addresses the main ideas covered in the text, while the critical evaluation presents students' analyses of these ideas (ibid). In evaluating the text, students should provide "judgment about the value" of the text, referring to both its positive and negative aspects (University of New South Wales, 2008, p. 2).

Woodward-Kron (2003) stresses that in Western societies' higher education institutions, critical analysis is widely considered to be one of the most important skills in students' writing (p. 121). In light of the importance of critical thinking skills at the tertiary level, critical reviews have become a common form of assessment, assigned to students in order to develop these skills (Nodoushan & Montazeran, 2012; Teramoto & Mickan, 2008; Woodward-Kron, 2003). Tsui (1999, 2002) states that "case studies and student self-reports also suggest that writing is among the strategies students find most helpful to develop critical thinking skills" (cited in Cavdar & Doe, 2012, p. 299). Also, Belcher (1995) argues that critical writing assignments are useful for students, as the tasks force them to think critically about a subject. However, Belcher (1995) found that her students did not feel completely comfortable reviewing the specific content of the disciplinary texts critically until they were confident in their discipline. It is important to note that Belcher's study is just one of a number of studies that note the difficulties faced by students encountering critical review assignments.

Another difficulty faced by students in constructing a critical review text is the role of reading. When students are assigned a critical review text, they are instructed to read a selected article on a particular topic that is either assigned by a lecturer or chosen by the student to be reviewed. To construct a critical review text, students must read about the topic of the article they are required to review independently, in order to demonstrate their ability to read, understand and interpret the text from a critical perspective (Barkhuizen, 2002; Teramoto & Mickan, 2008; Woodward-Kron, 2003). Gaining an understanding of the topic of the article and its content must be completed before the content of the text can be connected with relevant theories and practices from other articles, in line with the purpose of a critical analysis (Barkhuizen, 2002; Teramoto & Mickan, 2008; Woodward-Kron, 2003). However, selecting which articles to read and determining the scope of the topic can be challenging for students who are not acquainted to the Evaluative Account genre. A study of students' experiences of researching and writing academic texts in Nursing, conducted by Nisa (2010), reveals the difficulty that a particular student faced in selecting journal articles to critically evaluate. This may indicate that there is significant 'socialisation into the discipline' needed before students can become comfortable with critical review writing as a social practice within their discipline. A similar issue was found in a study on writing a critical review, conducted by Teramoto and Mickan (2008). In this study, a student's experience of writing a critical review assignment was investigated from a social semiotic perspective, which was used to document and analyse her socialisation into new

academic practices. This investigation shows that, in the process of preparing a critical review, the student encountered difficulty with making sense of the topic, defining the scope of her review and finding additional sources of information through a web-based search. According to Mansourian (2008, p. 209), it would be a challenge for someone with limited knowledge of the topic to select the appropriate search terms. The student also experienced difficulties in the writing phase of preparing her critical review, as she struggled to organise her writing into a critical review structure (Teramoto & Mickan, 2008).

From another perspective, Woodward-Kron's (2003) research into the generic structure of a critical analysis, as a form of Evaluative Account, provides insights for both educators and students, as it aimed to provide a linguistic description of "what is valued as analysis in education students' writing" (p. 30). The generic structure of the Evaluative Account genre was identified as "orientation, summary of article, analysis of article, and implications" (Woodward-Kron, 2003, p. 24). Further, an appreciation analysis from the appraisal framework in systemic functional linguistics (SFL) was used to provide a description of the evaluative lexical resources that students incorporated into their critique into writing a critical review. As part of the attitude system within the appraisal framework, appreciation deals with the evaluation of 'things' (Martin and White, 2005, 56). Therefore, the system of appreciation and its lexical instantiations play an important part in the construction of critical analysis texts as a form of Evaluative Account. The findings of Woodward-Kron's study noted that students found it difficult to find a balance in the word length of their assignments between the summary and the analysis sections. He also found that students had difficulty identifying the themes of the text that they were evaluating (Woodward-Kron, 2003). Through these findings, it can be assumed that the students' main difficulty in writing a critical review is in structuring their critical analysis according to the evaluative purpose of this genre. To address this issue, research into the development of a more detailed explanation of the critical review schematic structure and evaluative lexis, conducted over a number of varied critical review texts, would provide further support to students in writing this genre.

In light of Woodward-Kron's (2003) recommendation and the importance of critical review texts to students' academic writing development, this study aims to develop a clearer understanding of the schematic structure of a critical review text and to demonstrate how lexical expressions of evaluation described within a sample of critical review texts could be used to inform a more comprehensive description of how to write in this genre.

3. Methodology

To analyse the schematic structure of critical review texts and to identify the key lexical features that relate to the evaluative purpose of its genre, a qualitative methodology, in the form of a content analysis, was deemed appropriate. Using the content of the tutor's model text, which was provided to students, and the writing of two of her students, this study employs a SFL approach to analysing genre (Martin & Rose, 2003), and an analysis of the values of appreciation (Martin & White, 2005) in the texts, in order to compare their structural and lexical elements.

Genre theory, which views genre as "a staged, goal-oriented social process" (Martin & Rose, 2003, p. 7) is used to provide a description of the schematic stages that participants used to organise their writing into a critical review. Identifying the stages of a critical review as a genre provides a description of its generic organisation (Martin & Rose, 2003, p. 8) and the communicative purpose of each stage (Swales, 1990, p. 47).

In addition to genre theory, the appraisal framework, which is used to analyse the interpersonal meta-function (tenor) in SFL (Hood, 2010; Lee, 2007; Martin & White, 2005), was adopted in this study to identify the participants' lexical choices for critiquing texts in their critical reviews. In particular, the study will draw on appreciation, a category of the attitude system, which relates to the ways in which feelings are seen as a system of meanings (Martin & White, 2005; McQueen, 2013). Appreciation involves the positive or negative evaluation of semiotic and natural phenomena (Martin, 2000; Martin & Rose, 2003; Martin & White, 2005; Tajvidi & Arjani, 2017) and is adopted in this study to identify the lexical expressions of evaluation as they have been used by the study's participants in writing their critical reviews.

The critical review texts collected for the present study include a model of a critical review text, provided by the tutor of the Introductory Academic Program at the University of Adelaide, and final versions of critical review texts provided by two students from the course, named N1 and N2 for the purpose of this study. The tutor's model text was provided to students as an intervention to "scaffold" (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001) the construction of a critical review

text. Classroom observations accompanied the textual analyses, in order to gain an understanding of the experiences of students as they undertook the process of constructing their texts. In the Introductory Academic Program, each student is expected to submit a critical review assignment as a major task. The focus of the assignment is on writing in the genre of a critical review and, accordingly, tutors are instructed "to look at how well the students are writing in the genre of a critical review and to help improve it instead of marking their writing" (Teacher, quoted from an observation on 13 June 2012). In addition to the model critical review text and the two students' writing, the feedback sheets from the participant students' drafts and final critical reviews were also collected. Although the small-group tutorials in the programme were intended to prepare the students to write a particular text, it was found that the major practices that the students took part in were constructed socially, such as working in a group with the other students and interacting with the tutor. During tutorials, there was a high degree of social interaction mediated by the use of texts and the tutor's "scaffolding" (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001) of information in addition to the provision of the model text.

Interviews were conducted with the two students throughout the process, in order to better understand their experiences while undertaking the assignment. These were, then, used in combination with the text analyses to understand the students' perspectives on writing a critical review, for example, to identify cases where students understood the strengths and weaknesses of their writing in the critical review genre.

The first analysis conducted was the genre analysis (Martin & Rose, 2003), in order to identify the schematic structures of the critical review texts and the moves used by the tutor and her students in organising their writing into the genre of a critical review. This drew mainly from Woodward-Kron's (2003, p. 24) provisional description of the schematic stages of the critical review and additionally, from the framework of the argumentative text moves presented by Hyland (1990) to aid in identifying and naming the different stages and substages (moves). Table 1 shows the Woodward-Kron (2003) framework for a move analysis in the critical review (evaluative account) genre.

Table 1. *Schematic Stages of Evaluative Account Provisionally Described by Woodward-Kron (2003, p. 24)*

Schematic Stages	Substages (Moves)
[Orientation]^	Rationale, Preview, Definition
Summary of Article^	Summary of the article
Analysis of Article^	Point, Elaboration, [Implications]
Implications	Point, Elaboration, Recommendation

Note: The symbol square brackets [ ] indicate an optional stage; ^ means followed by the moves

After identifying the schematic stages of the critical review, an appreciation analysis was conducted at the level of lexicogrammar. The purpose of this analysis was to identify values of appreciation used by the tutor and her students to evaluate their chosen texts. In the process of exploring the appreciation resources used in the texts, it was first necessary to identify the appraiser (who is appraising). Secondly, the identification of appreciation items (evaluative words) was conducted. The lexical expressions of appreciation functioned as either epithets in a nominal group or in conjunction with relational attributive processes (Hood, 2010, p. 26). These expressions were categorised into reaction (impact/quality), composition (balance/complexity), and valuation (Martin & White, 2005, p. 56). They were, then, further categorised as having either a positive or negative value (+/-) of expression. Finally, the appreciated (what is being appreciated) participant was identified to complete the appreciation analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

To identify the schematic stages for the genre of critical review, the tutor's model text and the critical review writing of two of her students were analysed through a genre analysis by adopting the frameworks presented by Woodward-Kron (2003, p. 24) and Hyland (1990). Table 2 provides the schematic stages and substages (moves) of structural units in the three critical review texts.

Table 2. *Schematic Stages for Critical Review Texts*

Schematic Stages, Substages, & Moves	Description		
	The Tutor's Model	N1	N2
Stage 1	**INTRODUCTION**	**INTRODUCTION**	**INTRODUCTION**
Move 1	Bibliographic details of the review article	Bibliographic details of the review article	Bibliographic details of the review article

Move 2	Gambit	Gambit	Gambit
Move 3	Information	Information	Information
Move 4	Introducing the article	Introducing the article	Introducing the article
Move 5	Critique	-	Outlining of the text
Stage 2	**SUMMARY**	**SUMMARY**	**SUMMARY**
Move 1	Topic of article	Topic of article	Topic of article
Move 2	Information	Information	Information
Move 3	The author's rationale	-	-
Move 4	The author's solution	-	-
Move 5	The author's suggestion for future research	The author's suggestion for future research	-
Stage 3	**ANALYSIS OF THE ARTICLE:**	**ANALYSIS OF THE ARTICLE:**	**ANALYSIS OF THE ARTICLE:**
Substage 1	**Positive Critique**	**Positive Critique**	**Positive Critique**
Move 1	Point	Point	Point
Step 1	Explanation	Critique	Explanation
Step 2	Critique	Explanation	Critique
Step 3	Suggestion	Citations	Citations
Substage 2	**Negative Critique**	**Negative Critique**	**Negative Critique**
Move 2	Point	Point	Point
Step 1	Explanation	Critiques	Citation
Step 2	Critique	Citations	Critique
Step 3	Citation	Explanation	Explanation
Stage 4	**Conclusion**	**Conclusion**	**Conclusion**
Move 1	Critique	Critique	Consolidation
Move 2	Suggestion	Suggestion	Critique
			Suggestion

The critical review model text, provided by the tutor in the Introductory Academic Program, was characterised by five stages: *Introduction, Summary of the Article, Analysis of the Article: Positive Critique, Analysis of the Article: Negative Critique,* and *Conclusion*. Each of these stages consisted of substages, defined as 'moves' (Hyland, 1990, p. 69). The *Introduction* stage encompassed five moves: the *bibliographic details of the review article* ('Introductory Academic Program: Semester 2, 2012,' 2012, p. 48), *gambit*, which served to "grab" readers' attention (Hyland, 1990, p. 70), *information*, *introducing the article*, and *critique.* These moves were constructed by the writer in order to refer to the review article, to direct readers' attention to the main issue, to present background information about the main issue, to introduce the topic of the reviewed text, and finally, to give the writer's critique of the text. In the *Summary* stage, the main points of the reviewed text were summarised. The moves in this stage, which consisted of *The Topic of the Article, Information*, *The Author's Rationale*, *The Author's Solution,* And *The Author's Suggestion for Future Research,* were used by the tutor to present a comprehensive summary of the article. The next stage, the *Analysis of the Article,* was divided into two parts: *Positive Critique* and *Negative Critique*. The students commented that the division of the *Analysis of the Article* stage into two parts made the model text easier to understand in terms of the organisation of information. During this interview, the students said that its clear structure made the model text helpful as a template for writing their critical reviews (Interview, 29 June 2012).

The tutor's stance toward the reviewed text was made explicit from the beginning of the *Analysis of the Article* stage due to the initial *Point* move (Woodward-Kron, 2003, p. 24). This was followed by the *Explanation*, *Critique*, and *Citation* moves, which supported an elaboration of the tutor's stance (Woodward-Kron, 2003, p. 24). The *Negative Critique* section also included the *Point* move and the other elaborating (Woodward-Kron, 2003, p. 24) moves of *Explanation*, *Critique*, and *Citation* of external evidence. The *Explanation, Critique,* and *Citation* moves were again used by the tutor to support her main point. A greater number of critiques were included in the *Negative Critique* part than in the *Positive Critique* part. This is because a key aspect of critical review texts involves making recommendations, which stem from negative evaluations of the reviewed text (Teacher, cited from an observation on 16 June 2012). During one of

the interviews, N1 noted that the clear distinction between positive and negative critiques in the tutor's model text enriched her understanding of the critique definition. Previously, she had understood critiques to be only related to negative evaluations, but through the model text, she realised that the critiques covered both positive and negative evaluations.

The model text ended with a *Conclusion* stage, which consisted of the tutor's critiques of the reviewed text and suggestions for future research. The analysis of the schematic structure of the tutor's model revealed a clear structure with specific moves for each stage of the text. Consequently, the model enabled the students to recognise the function of each stage and to apply this to the organisation of their own critical review texts. N2 commented: "Yes, it's useful and making more sense. It makes me think on how to organise a critical review…" (Interview, 21 June 2012), while N1 explained:

"… she gave us three examples and I choose one example that I think I would like to use it as my model. I'd like to use it as a model for my writing later. And I'd like to comment the good points because of this and, then, find the supports. And then, I also like to critique the bad points. (Interview, 21 June 2012)."

In addition to the usefulness of the model in building the students' understanding of its schematic structure, the results of an appreciation analysis also showed the model's practicality in modeling a lexicon for the expression of evaluation in a critical review text (Interview, 21 June 2012 & 04 July 2012). Table 3 summarises the model's lexical expressions of evaluation using the appreciation system:

Table 3. *Appreciation in the Tutor's Model Critical Review Text*

Cl#	Appraiser	Appreciated	Appreciation Resources	Appreciation Categories
Introduction				
8	The writer	The approach	refreshing	+reaction: impact
10	The writer	The evidence	anecdotal	-valuation
Summary				
21	McGowan	Approaches in previous research	neither … successful	neg +valuation
26	McGowan	Writing an argument	hard	-composition: complexity
31	McGowan	Support for EAL students	essential	+valuation
34	McGowan	Language skills	appropriate	+valuation
39	McGowan	Language	appropriate	+valuation
Analysis of the Article:				
Positive Critique				
59	McGowan	language skills	sophisticated	+valuation
Negative Critique				
74	The writer	Problem found in the article	main	-valuation
75	The writer	The evidence presented in the article	anecdotal	-valuation
75	The writer	McGowan's workshop as evidence	limited	-composition: balance
76	The writer	The group presented as the evidence in the article	no focus	neg +composition: balance
76	The writer	The material as evidence presented in the article	no quantifiable	neg +valuation
78	The writer	Interviews on another research	in-depth	+composition: complexity
78	The writer	McGowan's research findings	more robust	-valuation
79	The writer	Problem found in the article	major	-valuation
80	The writer	McGowan's research findings	unclear	-composition: complexity
83	The writer	The link between another research and McGowan's suggestion	tenuous	-valuation
84	The writer	McGowan's suggestion	true	+valuation
Conclusion				
94	The writer	The article	thought-provoking	+reaction: impact
95	The writer	The paper article	refreshing	+reaction: impact
95	The writer	Another approach	punitive	-valuation
95	The writer	Another approach	lenient	-valuation

| 96 | The writer | Genre analysis (the approach suggested by the author) | more refined | -composition: complexity |
| 96 | The writer | Outcomes resulted from a suggested approach | improved | +valuation |

Note: The word 'neg' means 'grammatical negation' — Morphological negation 'un-...'

The results of the appreciation analysis of the model text, presented in Table 3, identify the use of values of appreciation to evaluate the content of the reviewed text. Table 3 shows the distribution of the texts' lexical expressions of evaluation across the stages of the critical review text. There is a higher concentration of evaluative words in the *Negative Critique* part of the *Analysis of the Article* stage. This can be attributed to the author's negative stance towards the reviewed text in this section. It is also supported by the schematic structure analysis, which showed a greater number of *critique* moves in this part when compared with the *Positive Critique* part and other stages.

The results of the appreciation analysis also show that the use of these appreciation resources strengthened the communicative purpose of the stages and the moves in the critical review text. This can be seen firstly from the *Introduction* stage. The appraisal resources refreshing and anecdotal, used by the tutor in giving her critiques of "the approach and evidence suggested by the [reviewed text's] author," strengthened the construction of the *critique* move in the *Introduction* stage.

Appreciation resources were also found in the *Summary* stage of the text. However, as the stage was intended to summarise the reviewed text ('Introductory Academic Program: Semester 2, 2012,' 2012, p. 49), the evaluative meanings of these resources were not being expressed by the tutor, but rather from the perspective of the author of the reviewed text. Values of appreciation, such as *successful*, *hard*, *essential*, and *appropriate,* were used by the tutor to construct her evaluations.

In the *Positive Critique* part of the *Analysis of the Article* stage, the appreciation resources did not correspond to the tutor's critiques. This is because his critiques were expressed through graduation, a separate part of the attitude subsystem of the appraisal framework (Martin & White, 2005, p. 140), rather than appreciation. Martin (2000, p. 143) acknowledges that writers or speakers could use different appraisal resources, such as those in the graduation system, to express their evaluations. Examples of evaluative words in the graduation system that were found in the tutor's text can be seen from the following clauses:

60. Thirdly, and *very importantly*, she explains ||
68. *Most importantly*, McGowan stresses ||

In the *Negative Critique* stage, the writer used appreciation resources on 11 occasions to construct his negative evaluations of the selected themes in the article. For example, the tutor constructed his critical evaluation of "the evidence presented by the author" using lexical expressions of negative evaluation, such as *anecdotal*, *limited*, *no focus*, and *quantifiable*. She, then, stressed "the problem found in the article," using *main* and *major,* which correspond to negative evaluations in this context. Graduation was used when the tutor added *more* to the evaluation *robust*, along with the appreciation resources *unclear* and *tenuous*, to construct the negative criticisms of "the author's research findings and suggestions." The use of these resources, which correspond to negative meanings on these occasions, contribute to the tutor's negative critiques of the reviewed text and the communicative purpose of the *Negative Critique* part of the *Analysis of the Article* stage.

Appreciation resources were also used by the tutor in the *Critique* move of the *Conclusion* stage. The tutor expressed a positive assessment of the reviewed text using the words *thought provoking* and *refreshing*. Meanwhile, the values of *punitive* and *lenient* were selected to strengthen his criticism of "another approach offered in the article."

Generally, in the model critical review text, the appreciation resources used by the tutor corresponded with more negative than positive evaluations. Therefore, the expression of negative evaluation dominates this text, in line with the tutor's stance. Furthermore, the appreciation resources in the text were able to be classified into the three variables of the appreciation system, namely reaction, composition, and valuation, proposed by Martin and White (2005, p. 56).

The usefulness of the model text for the students' writing development was evident in their responses during the interviews. In the final stages of the students' progress, they commented on feedback from the tutor that indicated both students were able to understand the purpose of the text, to organise their writing into the schematic structure of a critical

review text, and to critique the selected themes against the reviewed text using evaluative words. N1 mentioned that positive features of her text included the way in which her writing was distributed in an equal proportion among the stages of *Introduction*, *Summary*, and *Critique*, and also that her critiques were concise and supported by evidence (Interview, 10 July 2012). This response was consistent with the results of the schematic structure analysis and appreciation analysis of N1's text.

4.1. Analysis of N1's Critical Review Text

The results of the schematic structure analysis of N1's critical review text (see Table 2) showed that the stages of her text followed the schematic stages of the model text. The five *moves* in the *Introduction* stage in N1's text were identical to those in the model. The phrase *bibliographic details of the review article* is labeled as the first move in N1's *Introduction,* which was a compulsory part of *Introduction* in a critical review text, according to the program's instructions ('Introductory Academic Program: Semester 2, 2012,' 2012, p. 48). The *Gambit* move was the next move in this stage. The following excerpts show the similarities between N1's *Gambit* move and the model text's *Gambit* move (M) in the *Introduction* stage:

N1   The issue over teaching and learning in tertiary education level has been a concern of …
M   The issue of plagiarism is one of growing concern for both students and educators alike …

These examples indicate that in introducing the "the discourse topic" to readers, N1 followed the *Gambit* move in the model text to capture her readers' attention (Hyland, 1990, p. 70). The third move of N1's *Introduction* stage was *Information*. Although the move labelled here was similar to the one presented in the model, the communicative purpose realised in each of their moves was different. The *Information* moves presented in each text were as follows:

N1   This term mainly refers to the process of making teaching a scholarly activity …
M   Many factors arise in relation to the growth of plagiarism, and foremost among these are   …

The first example shows that the purpose of the move constructed by N1 was to inform readers of a particular definition of the topic in the article, whereas the move in the model text was intended to inform a description of the factors that act as the main issues of the article (Hyland, 1990, p. 170). The fourth move presented by N1 was *Introducing the Article*, which was followed by a fifth move, that is, *Critique*. A clear presentation constructed in N1's *Introduction* stage supported her comment regarding the usefulness of the model in building her understanding, in terms of the functions of the sentences in the *Introduction* (Interviews, 21 June 2012 & 4 July 2012).

The *Summary of the Article* stage followed the *Introduction* stage in N1's text, which reflected the order of stages in the model text. For the most part, the moves constructed in N1's *Summary*, such as *The Topic of the Article*, *Information*, and *The Author's Suggestion for Future Research,* followed the moves presented in the model text, except for two moves omitted by N1, namely *The Author's Rationale* and *Solution*. This is because the content of the journal article reviewed by N1 did not indicate *The Authors' Rationale* or *Solution*. However, this omission did not influence the clarity of the Summary stage written by N1, as there was sufficient information for the student to be able to provide a comprehensive summary of the article (Tutor's Feedback on N1's Critical Review Text).

The next stage that N1 followed from the model was *Analysis of the Article*, consisting of the *Positive Critique* and *Negative Critique* parts. The *Positive Critique* section in N1's text began with the *Point* move and its presentation was quite similar to the model text, as follows:

N1   There are several strengths posed by this paper.
M   There are many strengths in McGowan's article.

After the *point*, there were four sentences to illustrate N1's *Critiques, Explanations,* and *Citations* moves. Across these moves, three positive evaluations were identified and each critique was supported by citations from external sources. Consequently, the presentation of the *Critique*, *Explanation*, and *Citation* moves in these four sentences can be viewed as an elaboration for supporting N1's main statement in the *point*.

The *Negative Critique* part of the *Analysis of the Article* stage also began with the *Point* move. N1's *Point* in this section was similar to the *Point* in the model text, evident in the following examples:

N1   Despite the strengths, several weaknesses can also be identified in this paper.
M   Despite these strengths, there are, however, several weaknesses in McGowan's article, …

After the *Point*, three *Critiques* were provided by N1, followed by *Citations* of external evidence and explanations, in the form of an *Elaboration* move. During the follow-up interview, she mentioned that positive feedback from the tutor highlighted the fact that her critiques were always supported by evidence (Interview, 10 July 2012). Furthermore, her previous comment that she had been successful in organising information appropriately among the stages of *Introduction*, *Summary* and *Analysis of the Article* corresponded to the analysis results for these stages (Interview, 10 July 2012). Finally, N1's *Critiques* and *Suggestions for Future Research* were included in the *Conclusion* stage.

The results of the schematic structure analysis of N1's text were consistent with her comment during the interview at the end of the programme (Interview, 7 October 2012), in which she said she had learnt ". . . about the format … ." The results demonstrated that her writing had been successfully organised into the schematic structure suggested by the model text, and the communicative purpose of each stage had been realised in the moves that N1 used to construct her text. Overall, the results of the analysis supported her comment in the earlier interview about the usefulness of the model in the process of structuring her critical review text (Interview, 29 June 2012).

In addition, to observe N1's literacy progress in structuring a critical review text, the results of the appreciation analysis correspond to the student's comments about her development in identifying the themes of the reviewed text and in using lexical expressions of evaluation for her critique (Interviews, 29 June 2012 & 10 July 2012). The results of the appreciation analysis of N1's critical review text are shown in Table 4:

Table 4. *Appreciation Choices in N1's Critical Review Text*

Cl#	Appraiser	Appreciated	Appreciation Resources	Appreciation Categories
Introduction				
55	The writer	The paper (article)	interesting	+reaction: impact
6	The writer	The paper (article)	systematic	+composition: complexity
Summary				
111	The author	The model	essential	+valuation
111	The author	The application resulted from the model	successful	+valuation
Analysis of the Article:				
Positive critique				
117	The author of other article (Boyer)	Points in teaching and written reports	key	+valuation
118	The writer	The assessment resulted from the model	systematic	+composition: complexity
220	The writer	The level of faithfulness shown in the model	high	+reaction: quality
Negative critique				
222	The writer	The difference of scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching	subtle	+reaction: quality
227	The author of the article (Trigwell et. al)	The goal of the model	ultimate	+valuation
330	The writer	The elements of the model	essential	+valuation
331	The author of other article (Huber)	The concept of suggested model	well	+reaction: quality
Conclusion				
332	The writer	The thought presented in the article	well	+reaction: quality
332	The writer	The model	systematic	+composition: balance
333	The writer	The article	remarkable	+reaction: impact
335	The writer	The model	clear	+composition: complexity

Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz

The results of the appreciation analysis demonstrate that the major themes of the text evaluated by N1 were "the article" and "the author's theoretical model." Furthermore, the use of appreciation resources presented in each of the stages of her critical review text was consistent with N1's comment on her understanding of the identification and use of evaluative words in giving a critique of the text (Interview, 10 July 2012). For example, in the *Critique* move of the *Introduction* stage, N1 expressed her personal impression of the text using the word *interesting* and showed her perception of the "theoretical model" presented in the reviewed text with the word *systematic*. Meanwhile, the words *systematic* and *high* were used by N1 in the *Positive Critique* part of the *Analysis of the Article* stage to express her critique, and the meanings of these selected appreciation resources corresponded with her positive evaluations.

In the *Negative Critique* section, the appreciation resources *subtle*, *ultimate*, *essential,* and *well* were used (see Table 4). However, the use of these appreciation resources did not correspond to negative evaluations of the text. As in the analysis of the previous text, this is because N1's negative evaluations were expressed using other systems of attitude, namely judgement and graduation (Martin & White, 2005). The values of judgement and graduation are shown in the following clauses:

22. Initially, Trigwell et al. *fail* [-judgement] to notice *the subtle* [+ *reaction: quality*] difference between scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching ||

30. Finally, this paper *obviously* [graduation] ignores several *essential* [+ *valuation*] elements [[that support ||and maintain the scholarship of teaching]].

The use of the process *fail* in the first clause evokes negative judgment towards the ability of the reviewed text's authors. In the second clause, N1 construed her assessment of the article by using graduation in combination with the process *ignore*.

The appreciation resources *well*, *systematic*, *remarkable*, and *clear* were also presented in the *Conclusion* stage. As shown in Table 4, most appreciation resources used by N1 in her text correspond to positive meanings. Therefore, there were more positive critiques than negative critiques in her critical review text, which revealed a different stance to that of the tutor in her critical review text. The results of the appreciation analysis show that N1's development in identifying the themes of the article and using evaluative words to critique these themes (Interview, 10 July 2012) were realised in her writing. This finding was also in line with Barkhuizen's (2002) research finding, revealing that most students felt more comfortable providing positive opinions, rather than negative ones, as they were not confident in their limited knowledge to question the content and methods of articles written by established scholars. Furthermore, it is important to consider N1's cultural background. Research has shown that it is customary among Indonesian students to show respect towards those in positions of higher status, such as teachers (Exley, 2005). Critiquing a more experienced scholar could be considered an act of disrespect in the student's cultural context, which could explain the tendency towards a positive bias in their critiques. However, the presence of even a small amount of negative critique suggests that the tutor's scaffolding in the form of a model text helped to support N1 in recognising the concept of critical analysis and how this concept is realised in critical review writing (Barkhuizen, 2002; Teramoto & Mickan, 2008; & Woodward-Kron, 2003).

4.2. Analysis of N2's Critical Review Text

The development of N2's writing in the critical review genre was also illustrated in her interview responses and through an analysis of the schematic structure and evaluative choices in her writing. In one of the interviews, N2 believed that her writing had been successfully organised into the appropriate structure for a critical review text. She had received positive feedback from the tutor for her draft, which was organised into the stages of *Introduction*, *Summary*, and *Conclusion*. The feedback also noted that her critique of the reviewed text was clear. However, the *Negative Critique* part of the *Analysis of the Article* stage needed refinement with the addition of more evidence to the *Elaboration* move (Interview, 10 July 2012).

The results of the schematic structure analysis of N2's critical review text showed consistency with the model text's *Introduction*, *Summary of the Article*, *Analysis of the Article*, and *Conclusion* stages. The moves offered in N2's *Introduction* stage were also similar to the ones presented in the model, with the exception of the *Outlining the Text* move, which was provided in addition to the moves of the model text.

In the first paragraph of the introduction, N2's manner of presenting the topic was similar to that of the tutor in her model text, specifically in the use of the *gambit* move, shown in the following excerpts:

N2 : … the term communicative competence…has aroused controversy in the language world.

M : The issue of plagiarism is one of growing concern for both students and educators alike…

The *Gambit* move was followed by the *Informing*, *Introducing the Article* and *Giving Critical Comment* moves, which were, in turn, followed by the *Outlining the Text* move. The last move, *Outlining the Text,* presents N2's own writing choice for developing her *Introduction* stage because that move was not included in the model. This result shows that her progress in identifying the moves from the model had enabled her to construct a well-organised *Introduction*. This analysis result was supported by her comment regarding the teacher's feedback, saying that the *Introduction* stage in her critical review text was "perfect" (Interview, 10 July 2012).

Furthermore, the two moves constructed in the second paragraph were used to provide a *Summary* of the article. Although the moves constructed in N2's text were mostly different from the model, the tutor's feedback for her *Summary,* according to an interview with N2, described the paragraph as "excellent" (Interview, 10 July 2012). These differences can be summarised as follows:

Table 5. *Move Comparison in 'Summary' Stage of the Tutor's Model Text and N2's Text*

The Model (an Example of a Critical Review)	N2's Critical Review
1. Introduce the topic of the article	1. Introducing the topic of the article
2. Informing the background to the topic	2. Informing a historical overview of the theoretical model
3. The author's rationale	
4. The author's solution	
5. The author's suggestion for future research	

In the next two paragraphs, the *Analysis of the Article* stage was divided into *Positive Critique* and *Negative Critique* parts. In the *Positive Critique* part, the paragraph began with the *Point* move. The *Point* move in this part was almost identical to the one presented in the model text:

N2 There are some strength in Celce-Murcia's article.
M There are many strengths in McGowan's article.

The examples above show that the central statement expressed in the tutor's model seems to have been reproduced by the student (N2). This is supported by N2's comment that she copied the tutor's argument (Interview, 04 July 2012). To elaborate on these "strengths," this *Point* move was followed by an *Explanation* move, and a third move, which combined *Critique* and *Citations*. This was followed by another positive *Critique* move, a *Citations* move, and an *Explanation* move. Each of N2's critiques presented in the *Positive Critique* part were supported by citations of external evidence and an explanation, which elaborated on the *point.*

At the beginning of the *Negative Critique* part of the *Analysis of the Article* stage, the *Point* was also expressed by N2 before introducing the *Citations*, *Critique*, and *Explanation* moves. The second move found in this section presented the citations of the external evidence, before moving onto the critique. These citations were intended to support her first negative critique of the reviewed text. However, the three *Critique* moves, which were constructed over four sentences, were not followed by the *Citations* move. A lack of the use of external evidence in this part results in a loss of marks, as the student's argument lacks support ('Introductory Academic Program: Semester 2, 2012,' 2012, p. 108). This finding was supported by a discussion with N2, in which she said that her writing in the *Positive Critique* section was "good," but the *Negative Critique* section still needed refinement because of a lack of evidence (Interview, 10 July 2012).

Finally, the *Consolidation* move (Hyland, 1990, p. 74), which refers back to the overall content discussed in the article, was composed in the *Conclusion* stage. The three other sentences in the *Conclusion* stage formed the *Critique* move, which summarises an evaluation of the reviewed text. The moves constructed here were different from the ones presented in the model text, which consisted of the critique*,* but concluded the stage with a *Suggestion for Future Research* move.

This schematic structure analysis shows a correlation with N2's comment in an early interview, in which she described her use of the model text in composing her own critical review text (Interview, 29 June 2012). Each of the stages and moves presented in N2's text also existed in the model. The results of this analysis demonstrate that N2's critical review writing had been organised into the structure of a critical review text, although the *Negative Critique* part lacked a well-supported argument. This part would have benefited from cited evidence to support her *Negative Critique* of the reviewed text (Interview, 10 July 2012).

Table 6. *Appreciation Choices in N2's Critical Review Text*

Cl#	Appraiser	Appraised	Appreciation Resources	Appreciation Categories
Introduction				
6	The writer	The models offered in previous studies	insufficient	-valuation
112	The writer	The principles of the model offered by the author	detailed	+composition: complexity
Summary				
117	The author	Chomsky's view	main	+valuation
222	The author	Hymes's model	strategic	+valuation
Analysis of the Article:				
Positive critique				
332	The writer	The author's perspective	positive	+reaction: quality
335	The writer	The model	complete	+valuation
335	The writer	The model	ideal	+valuation
440	The author	Elements of Celce-Murcia's model	essential	+valuation
443	The writer	The article	clearer	+composition: complexity
Negative critique				
555	The writer	Description of Celce-Murcia's model	in-depth	+composition: complexity
557	The writer	Celce-Murcia's model	demanding	-valuation
559	Priyono (the author of another article)	The issue of language input provision	important	+valuation
660	Tsui Bik-may (the author of another article)	The issue of language input provision	fundamental	+valuation
663	The writer	The element in the model	important	+valuation
Conclusion				
669	The writer	Celce-Murcia's model	potential	+valuation
770	The writer	Language courses through an application of Celce-Murcia's model	effective	+valuation
771	The writer	Celce-Murcia's model	interesting	+reaction: impact
772	The writer	Description of element presented in Celce-Murcia's model	detailed	+composition: complexity

The results of the appreciation analysis (see Table 6) show the appreciation resources that contributed to the construction of N2's critical review text. As in the two previous texts, the lexical expressions of evaluation were spread out across the different stages. In the *Introduction* stage, there were two appreciation resources, *insufficient* and *detailed*, which evaluated "the model in previous study" and "the model offered by the author." In the *Summary* stage, the appreciation resources used by N2 were *main* and *strategic* to positively evaluate theoretical perspectives.

Further, in the *Analysis of the Article* stage, N2 constructed her *Positive Critique* part using the following lexical expressions of evaluation: *positive*, *complete*, *ideal*, and *clearer*. These appreciation resources corresponded with positive evaluations and supported the construction of her argument in this part. In the *Negative Critique* part, N2 described the strength of the theoretical model in the reviewed text using the appreciation resource *in-depth* and, then, attempted a

negative assessment, using the lexeme *demanding*. However, after her brief negative evaluation of the text, she returned to her positive assessment of "the model" in the *Conclusion* stage with the words *potential*, *effective*, *interesting*, and *detailed*. This shows that N2's critical review text was similar to N1's text in terms of the greater use of positive rather than negative evaluations. The unequal distribution of positive and negative evaluations, in favour of the positive values of appreciation, may indicate a lack of confidence among students to criticise the work of established scholars in a field into which they are only just becoming initiated.

Lastly, the results of the appreciation analysis in critical review texts revealed that the use of evaluative words (appraisal items) made a significant contribution to constructing a critical analysis of *the critique* move in the *Analysis of the Article* stage (*Positive Critique* and *Negative Critique*). These results also provided a concrete concept to the students about how the evaluation is constructed in critical review texts (Tajvidi & Arjani, 2017). The realisation of appraisal items has an important function writing a critical review; that is, to organise and achieve the social purpose of the text (Martin, 2004 cited in McQueen, 2013; Woodward-Kron, 2003).

5. Conclusion

This study involved exploring a genre that has been relatively unexplored in genre studies of academic writing. The findings of the genre analysis showed that a critical review text is constructed through several stages and each of the stages consists of substages, known as moves. Even though each of the texts had different flows of organisation, the nature of this text type was characterised by *Introduction, Summary of the Article, Analysis of the Article,* and *Conclusion.* Further, the results of the appreciation analyses revealed the use of lexical expressions of evaluation to provide critiques of the reviewed texts, particularly in the moves of *Positive Critique* and *Negative Critique* within the *Analysis of the Article* stage. These parts were the key to fulfilling the social purpose of the critical review genre. The findings of this study will be useful for educators to make explicit the structure and lexical options that are relevant to writing a critical review text (Nodoushan & Montazeran, 2012). The findings also indicate that guidance on the use of both positive and negative values of appreciation could improve confidence among NESB students, in this case Indonesian, in critically evaluating the work of others in their field of research. Although both Indonesian postgraduate student participants possessed strong English proficiency, N2 demonstrated a greater lack of confidence and experience in academic writing than N1, which may indicate that some students require a higher level of scaffolding than others. However, through its analysis of the schematic structure of critical review texts and their lexical expressions of appreciation, this study may inform a more explicit intervention for students to support the development of both their writing in the critical analysis genre, as well as their transition to postgraduate study in Australia. The study is limited by the short duration of the data collection period, its small sample size, and the similarities in student participants' cultural backgrounds. However, it provides a foundation for further studies of longer durations and with larger participant groups. In particular, a longitudinal study, using students from varied cultural backgrounds, is recommended to thoroughly investigate how students experience writing a critical review in an Australian higher education context. A study of this size and duration could more thoroughly reveal the ways in which scaffolding can reassure and assist students in writing critical analysis texts in a broader range of academic disciplines. Given there were appraisal resources found outside of the appreciation system in this study, namely values of graduation, a functional linguistic investigation into how other appraisal resources can be used to construct critical review texts, along with the ways in which these resources interact with field-related resources, would expand the repertoire of modelling materials to enable a stronger scaffolding approach.

Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Australian Universities Teaching Committee (AUTC). (2002). *Assessing students unfamiliar with assessment practices in Australian higher education.* Retrieved January 7, 2021, from the World Wide Web: http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/assessinglearning/03/intstaff.html

Barkhuizen, G. (2002). The QUEST for an approach to guided critical reading and writing. *Prospect, 17*(3), 19-28.

Baldauf, R. (1997). Tertiary language, literacy and communication policies: Needs and practice. In Z. Golebiowski (Ed.), *Policy and practice of tertiary literacy. Selected Proceedings of the First National Conference on Tertiary Literacy: Research and practice* (Vol. 1). Melbourne: Victoria University of Technology.

Belcher, D. (1995). Writing critically across the curriculum. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language* (pp. 135-154). US: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Cavdar, G., & Doe, S. (2012). Learning through writing: Teaching critical thinking skills in writing assignments. *The Teacher*, *45*(298-306).

Cohen, L., Manion L., & Morrison K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.) London: Routledge.

Devira, M. (2017). Acquisition of academic literacy in an engineering communication course: Integration of English for specific purposes (ESP) and systemic gunctional linguistics (SFL). *Studies in English Language and Education*, *4*(1), 38-53.

Exley, B. (2005). *Learner characteristics of "Asian" EFL students: Exceptions to the "norm."* Proceedings of Pleasure Passion Provocation Joint National Conference AATE & ALEA, 1-16.

Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2001). What is scaffolding? In *Scaffolding: Teaching and learning in language and literacy education* (pp. 1-14). Newton, NSW: PETA.

Hood, S. (2010). *Appraising research: Evaluation in academic writing.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hyland, K., & Hamp-Lyons L. (2002). EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*, 1-12.

Hyland, K. (1990). A genre description of the argumentative essay. *RELC Journal*, *21*(1), 66-78.

Introductory academic program: Semester 2. (2012). The University of Adelaide.

Lee, S. H. (2007). An application of multiple coding for the analysis of ATTITUDE in an academic argument. *Linguistics and Human Science*, *3*(2), 165-190.

Martin, J. R. (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 142-175). Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London & New York: Continuum.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York Palgrave Macmillan.

McQueen, H. J. (2013). Exploring the intonation of appraised items in Obama's speech: The case of prominence. *International Journal of Language Studies*, *7*(2), 79-102.

Mickan, P. (2003). What's your score? An investigation into language descriptors for rating written performance. In L. Hyam (Ed.), *International English Language Testing System Research Reports,* 5 (pp.125-157). Canberra: IELTS Australia Pty.

Nisa, K. (2010). *Academic literacy in the discipline of nursing: An integrated approach using ethnographics and systemic functional linguistics (SFL) analysis to postgraduate international students' writing practice.* Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Adelaide.

Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz

Nodoushan, M. A. S., & Montazeran, H. (2012). The book review genre: A structural move analysis. *International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS), 6*(1), 1-30.

Nodoushan, M. A. S., & Khakbaz, N. (2011). Theses "Discussion" sections: A structural move analysis. *International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS), 5*(3), 111-132.

Pashapour, A., Ghaemi, F., & Hashamdar, M. (2018). A structural move analysis of research article introduction subgenre: A comparative study of native and Iranian writers in applied linguistics. *International Journal of Language Studies, 12*(1), 79-106.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Tajvidi, G. R., & Arjani, S. H. (2017). Appraisal theory in translation studies: An introduction and review of studies of evaluation in translation. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 8*(2), 3-30. https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2017.13089

Teramoto, H., & Mickan, P. (2008). Writing a critical review: Reflections on literacy practices. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 44-56. https://doi.org/10.2167/la433.0

The Claremont Colleges Writing Centres. (1999). *Working with international students.* Retrieved January 7, 2021, from the World Wide Web: http://www2.hmc.edu/www common/writing/centweb/intstu.html

Thompson, C. (2003). *Constructing critical discourse and university student writing.* Paper presented at Australian and New Zealand Communication Association (ANZCA) Conference, Brisbane, Australia.

University of New South Wales. (2008). *Writing a critical review.* Retrieved July 22, 2020, from the World Wide Web: http://wwwdocs.fce.unsw.edu.au/fce/EDU/eduwritingcritreview.pdf

Woodward-Kron, R. (2003). Critical analysis and the journal article review assignment. *Prospect, 18*(2), 20-36.