



Investigating PhD Students' Awareness and Application of Systemic Functional Linguistics in Academic Writing: A Study at the Language Faculty, University of Benghazi

*Nagat Shagluf Abdallaha¹

¹AL-Kufra University

Abstract

The current study investigated PhD students' major challenges in academic writing, in addition to their awareness of Systemic Functional Linguistics. It also aimed to determine whether Systemic Functional Linguistics can serve as a useful pedagogical framework to support PhD students in overcoming academic writing challenges. This study was conducted at the Language Faculty of the University of Benghazi. A Google Form was designed to collect data related to the research questions. The researcher adopted a mixed quantitative and qualitative approach as the method of the study. The questionnaire was administered to 20 PhD students who participated in the study. The data analyzed reveal that PhD students face various challenges in academic writing, such as organizing ideas logically, achieving coherence and cohesion, and presenting arguments effectively. This is related to the lack of awareness of how language functions in context. The researcher hopes that the findings of this study will greatly assist PhD students in addressing their writing difficulties.

Keywords: Systemic Function Linguistics (SFL), Academic writing challenges, PhD students

Introduction

Academic writing is challenging for students in various disciplines. As Bailly (2018) states, many students struggle because academic writing introduces a completely unfamiliar style filled with strict rules and expectations. Oshima and Hogue (2006) emphasize the complexity of learning to write with clarity, cohesion, and formal tone which are not needed in everyday communication. Wilson (2023) introduced the role of critical linking and structural clarity in producing effective academic texts, further contributing to this difficulty. Moreover, students writing in a second language and mastering the correct phrases can find it particularly daunting to continue (University of Manchester, n.d.).

Academic writing is a skill that proposal and dissertation students, as well as doctoral students, need to possess. However, many PhD students lack control in academic writing, such as organizing ideas sensibly, achieving coherence, and making arguments effectively. There are numerous reasons for this, one of which is ignorance of how language works in context. This study investigates the effectiveness and role of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in academic writing. Systemic Functional Grammar, developed by M.A.K. Halliday (2014) provides a powerful theoretical framework for understanding how language constructs meaning.

Based on the above, it can be inferred that an effective systemic functional approach in academic writing is crucial for every PhD student.

Statement of The Study

Based on the difficulty of academic writing faced by PhD students, the current study was conducted to investigate these challenges and explore PhD students' awareness of Functional Systemic Approaches to consider a solution to these problems.

Aim of the Study

This study aimed to investigate the challenges faced by PhD students in academic writing and explore their awareness and application of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in academic writing.

Questions of the Study

1. What are the main academic writing challenges that PhD students face?
2. Are PhD students aware of Systemic Functional Linguistics?
3. Can Systemic Functional Linguistics serve as a framework for addressing PhD students' challenges in academic writing?

Significance of the Study

It is expected that the findings of this study will provide great benefits to PhD students of the English language and syllabus designers in addressing the academic writing challenges encountered by PhD students. The current study is significant in addressing these challenges through the application of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). In addition, gains further significance by exploring PhD students' awareness and application of SFL. To provide ideas on how a Systemic Functional Approach can be applied systematically in academic writing contexts. Furthermore, the findings are expected to benefit curriculum designers, teachers and researchers by offering practical implications for improving academic literacy and integrating SFL in educational context

Literature Review

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

Developed by M.A.K. Halliday (2014) states that language as a resource for meaning focuses on context and function. There are three metafunctions of language: ideational metafunctions, expressing ideas and experiences; interpersonal metafunctions, expressing social relationships; and textual metafunctions, organizing information into text.

Theme and rheme concepts of SFL are essential in academic writing. They refer to the organization of information in the text. Theme refers to the important point, whereas rheme refers to new information. Knowing how to organize information results in effective academic writing with clarity and coherence. Cohesion and coherence refer to tools used to analyze how texts achieve cohesion (grammatical and lexical linking within a text) and coherence (logical flow of ideas), which are crucial for effective academic writing.

Nguyen (2021) states that the SFL approach has positively affected Vietnamese university students' English. Nguyen used action research methods and quantitative and qualitative approaches. This study aimed to investigate the role of theme and rheme structures in writing. The results indicated that the SFL approach enhanced students' ability to organize texts and increased their motivation in writing classes.

Similarly, Pramono (2018) conducted a study to analyze students' difficulties in writing using the SFL framework in text exposition. This study aimed to investigate the frequent problems with interpersonal features and textual

metafunctions, and in particular, how to manage theme progress and logical conjunctions. The findings revealed the challenges students face in effectively using SFL concepts in academic writing.

Similarly, Echeverri (2016) explored the use of the SFL genre-based approach in the Colombian teacher education programme. The findings of this study emphasize that prospective teachers developed a better understanding of context, audience, and purpose in academic writing. In addition, they face difficulties in moving beyond traditional methods. Another study by Nagao, A. (2020) At Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan, the teaching-learning cycle from the SFL approach was used to teach analytical exposition essays to first-year university students with varying proficiency levels. The findings showed that students' performance improved through using lexical-grammatical choices and metafunctions compared to their initial performance.

Finally, Shaumiwatay et al. (2024) conducted a qualitative study that used observation and student interviews to investigate the effectiveness of the SFL approach in enhancing writing for EFL learners. The results showed that students taught using SFL strategies produced more coherent and effective writing. The researcher noticed that the feedback incorporating SFL metafunctions had a more positive impact than traditional grammar-focused feedback and increased students' engagement and grammatical awareness.

The Systemic functional approach supported the use of the SFL approach to enhance writing skills for EFL students and improve their writing performance and abilities to develop their contextual awareness and linguistic competence. Based on the above findings, studies support the need to spotlight doctoral writing research on how SFL can be explicitly taught and applied to support PhD students navigating problems of academic writing. The use of systemic linguistics in academic writing instruction can improve writing skills.

Despite increasing research on the difficulties of academic writing, the studies mentioned above focused on undergraduate populations, without looking at the part of PhD students aiming to understand how they engage with academic writing challenges and their awareness of SFL concepts (how they can apply them to address their writing problems). This remains an important gap to be explored.

Methodology

The current study utilized a mixed approach of quantitative and qualitative research, suitable for investigating participants' perceptions, awareness, and experiences in depth. In addition, it describes the specific academic writing challenges faced by PhD students.

The Sample of the Study

The study sample comprised 20 PhD students from the English Department, Faculty of Languages, University of Benghazi. The 20 participants of the study were PhD students in applied linguistics and translation theory departments, most of whom were in their final semester.

Instrument

Data were collected using a questionnaire created on Google Forms. The questionnaire was designed as a research instrument to collect data from 20 PhD students. The questionnaire was distributed online and was completed electronically. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: background information, difficulties in academic writing and understanding of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) among PhD students."

Findings

A Google Forms questionnaire was analyzed by interpreting the responses to identify themes related to challenges in academic writing and awareness of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). The data analysis was divided into three types: quantitative analysis using percentages, qualitative analysis, and correlation analysis through thematic coding. The findings indicate that PhD students demonstrated a strong interest in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

Quantitative Findings

Challenges of Academic Writing

The most commonly cited issue in academic writing was effectively explaining arguments (38%) and organizing thoughts (24%). Relatively few participants mentioned holding coherence and cohesion (14%), referring and citation (14%), and grammar and sentence structure (10%) as their principal problems.

Table 1: Main Challenges in Academic Writing

| Challenge | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Expressing argument clearly | 8 | 38% |
| Organizing ideas | 5 | 24% |
| Maintaining coherence and cohesion | 3 | 14% |
| Grammar and sentence structure | 2 | 10% |
| Referencing and citation | 3 | 14% |
| Total | 20 | 100% |

Writing Strategies

Second, regarding writing strategies, most participants (65%) reported not using specific techniques to structure their work, while only (35%) indicated that they did. The lack of structured planning likely contributes to difficulties in organizing ideas and maintaining their coherence. Introducing learners to practical strategies such as outlining, mind mapping and drafting can help improve the logical flow of their writing

Table 2: Writing Strategies

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 7 | 35% |
| No | 13 | 65% |
| Total | 20 | 100% |

Familiarity with EFL Concepts

Familiarity with SFL concepts varied among the participants. Forty percent reported being very familiar with principles such as theme-rheme, cohesion, modality, and mood, while (30%) were somewhat familiar. A smaller portion (20%) reported being not at all familiar, and (10%) were neutral. These findings emphasize that while some learners possess a solid theoretical understanding of SFL, a notable minority require targeted instruction to apply these concepts effectively in academic writing.

Table 3: Familiarity with SFL Concepts (Theme-Rheme, Cohesion, Modality, Mood)

| Familiarity Level | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Not at all familiar | 4 | 20% |
| Somewhat familiar | 6 | 30% |
| Very familiar | 8 | 40% |
| Neutral | 2 | 10% |
| Total | 20 | 100% |

Consideration of Text Structure

Awareness of information structuring, such as placing known information before new information, was reported by (55%) of the participants. However, (25%) did not consider this principle, and 20% were unsure, indicating that although many learners are conscious of techniques that enhance textual cohesion, a significant proportion either neglects or lacks clarity about their application. Teaching the importance of information sequencing can further strengthen writing's coherence and reader comprehension.

Table 4: Consideration of Text Structure (e.g. placing known information before new)

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 11 | 55% |
| No | 5 | 25% |
| Not sure | 4 | 20% |
| Total | 20 | 100% |

Perceived Usefulness of SFL

The majority of participants recognized the value of SFL in improving their academic writing. (85%) agreed or strongly agreed that learning about SFL would be beneficial, with no participants expressing disagreement. Similarly, (85%) expressed interest in attending training or workshops on SFL, reflecting their strong motivation to engage with practical instruction that could enhance their writing skills.

Table 5: Perceived Impact of Learning SFL on Academic Writing

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree | 10 | 50% |
| Agree | 7 | 35% |
| Neutral | 3 | 15% |
| Disagree | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 20 | 100% |

Interest in Training or Workshops on SFL

A remarkable (85%) of participants indicated interest in undertaking workshops or professional development in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) while only (5%) declined, and (10%) were indecisive. This shows a strong desire for professional development.

Table 6: Interest in Training or Workshops on SFL

| Response | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 17 | 85% |
| No | 1 | 5% |
| Maybe | 2 | 10% |
| Total | 20 | 100% |

Qualitative Findings

Analysis Based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

As mentioned above, SFL is based on three meta-functions of language, and in this study, we will look at them individually with students' responses. Thematic qualitative analysis of participants' open-ended responses revealed a strong demand for awareness of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). The responses indicated varying levels of awareness of SFL and its potential application in academic writing. The analysis can be categorized according to three SFL metafunctions.

Thematic Qualitative Analysis

Thematic qualitative analysis of responses centers on a strong need for training in academic writing workshops and structured courses, supporting thesis and research article writing, and a need for feedback-based learning and emphasis on practice, critical analysis, and guided learning.

Ideational Metafunctions

In the SFL ideational meta-function, language is used to express experiences and reality; it focuses on expressing ideas, processes, participants, and circumstances, which are all important in writing research. Based on the analysis of participants' responses: "How to analyze, interpret and present data" "I think learning about research methodology is important" and "The one that focuses on writing dissertations and academic articles for future use." Based on systematic functional linguistics, PhD students understand the importance of content-related functions and how language functions to help represent research methods, findings, and arguments.

Interpersonal Metafunctions

In interpersonal metafunctions, language is used to express social relationships and attitudes; it is important in academic writing for expressing a wittier stance, evaluation, and arguments with the reader. We can get these from the participants' responses: "I really need to have a solid knowledge of how to write and publish academic articles related to my major," "critical," and "open." Based on the SFL analysis, the above responses indicate an awareness of the need to evaluate information, a key interpersonal skill in academic writing.

Textual Metafunctions

Its focus on cohesion and coherence in formal writing, in addition to theme and rhyme structures, is necessary for clarity in academic writing. Relevant participants responded "formal writing with main focuses on cohesion and coherence" "by making workshops focusing on academic writing" and "practice a lot and read articles." SFL provides instructions and analysis using the theme-rheme structure to help learners control paragraph development and appropriately use cohesive devices.

Correlation Findings

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) helps students better understand how to structure their writing by focusing on tools such as the theme-rheme structure. This approach allows learners to develop clearer paragraphs and connect their ideas more effectively, using cohesive devices. In the current study, the correlation analysis showed a positive relationship between participants' awareness of SFL and their confidence in academic writing. Many participants reported familiarity with key SFL concepts, suggesting that having a solid understanding of how language works can help students address complex academic texts with greater ease and confidence.

Discussion

Academic writing is a complex skill that requires clear argumentation, logical organization, and precise use of language. The findings of this study reveal several key challenges faced by participants, their familiarity with Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) concepts, and their perceptions of the usefulness of SFL in improving their writing.

Main Challenges in Academic Writing

Academic writing is a higher-level ability that requires clarity of intellect, effective organization, and proper language usage. The analysis of the data collected reveals that the respondents' most common problem is expressing arguments clearly, as pointed out by (38%) of the participants. This finding mirrors a significant lack of ability to express ideas logically and persuasively and to deliver high-quality academic work. The second most frequently reported challenge cited by (24%) of respondents is organizing ideas. This means that there is a considerable number of writers who find it challenging to present their pieces coherently, hence writing pieces that are discontinuous or incoherent. The issue of coherence and cohesion was a secondary issue, with (14%) of the respondents reporting such challenges. This reflects problems with making sentences and paragraphs connect naturally, which is necessary to help there be a continuous development of arguments from one point to another.

The second problem, raised by (14%) of the participants, was problems with referencing and citation. This implies that a significant number of students are likely to perceive the importance of referencing but lack proper knowledge of the style guides of academics or have difficulty managing the technicalities of formatting when citing. Grammar and sentence structure, coming second as the least discussed issue, were discussed by (10%) of the respondents. Although linguistic precision is critical, there is a notion that participants do not prioritize it over the problems of conceptual coherence and writing's organizational structure.

In general, the findings suggest that PhD students' greatest challenges in academic writing tend to be more content-related than linguistic-related. Addressing these challenges might entail specially tailored training in writing arguments, structuring written texts, and correctly employing conventions of referencing. Even though competence in grammar is an area of weakness, enhancing the quality of written texts' coherence and logical organization presents an immediate solution to enhancing academic writing abilities.

These results suggest that participants struggle more with content-related aspects of writing than with language mechanics, emphasizing the need for instructional support focused on developing ideas and effectively structuring academic texts.

Writing Strategies

The information concerning the use of definite strategies by the participants to organize their writing shows that a major portion (65%) indicated never using certain strategies during planning, writing, and organizing academic texts. This finding also means that a greater number of responses might carry out academic writing without a clear-cut framework or system of organizing work, which might give rise to problems such as disordered thoughts and lack of coherence. A lack of a planned structure is also bound to influence, in general, the coherence and logical progression of written texts, correspondingly increasing the difficulty of tracking the intended argument on the reader's part.

In contrast, only (35%) of the participants mentioned undertaking special strategies to organize their writing. Such persons will likely benefit from outlining, drafting, and arranging ideas before writing the eventual text, as these processes are known to fortify coherence and general writing quality.

Generally, research finds a strong need for effective writing strategy training, particularly with regard to planning and material organization. Introducing students to more formalized procedures, such as brainstorming, mind mapping, or creating outlines, could enrich academic writing quality and coherence.

Familiarities with EFL Concepts

The responses disclose differential levels of familiarity among respondents with the fundamental principles of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is: Theme-Rheme, cohesiveness, modality, and mood. The greatest number of informants (40%) replied that they were very familiar with them, hence expressing good theoretical knowledge among a considerable percentage of the group. Another (30%) replied that they were fairly familiar, expressing partial knowledge possibly fortified through the assistance of explanation and practical application.

In comparison (20%) of participants showed no familiarity with SFL concepts at all, revealing a clear knowledge gap. Added to this (10%) chose the neutral option, which could also indicate indecisiveness about their knowledge or the applicability of their knowledge in academic writing.

Although most participants had some knowledge of the SFL guidelines, a small minority had inadequate exposure. This makes it necessary to have targeted pedagogic interventions to ensure that all learners can openly utilize the tools of SFL in the writing of coherent, formatted, and effective academic writing.

Consideration of Text Structure

The data indicate that more than half of the participants (55%) consciously considered structural principles in their writing, such as placing known information before introducing new ideas. This suggests that the majority are aware of and apply strategies that contribute to logical flow and reader comprehension. However, (25%) reported not consider such structural principles, which may lead to weaker cohesion and less reader-friendly texts. Additionally, (20%) indicated that they were not sure, suggesting uncertainty about the concept or its relevance to writing practice.

While a significant portion of respondents demonstrated awareness of information structuring in academic writing, a notable proportion either overlooked or were uncertain about its application. This emphasizes the need for explicit instruction on how information sequencing affects coherence and reader engagement.

Perceived Usefulness of SFL

The results show strong general support for the idea that learning about Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) could enhance academic writing skills. Half of the participants (50%) strongly agreed with this statement, and a further 35% agreed,

indicating that 85% of respondents believe SFL has clear potential benefits for improving their writing. Only 15% selected a neutral response, suggesting they were unsure about the usefulness of SFL, while no participants disagreed. This positive perception reflects a readiness among learners to engage with SFL-based instruction and a recognition of its relevance to developing clarity, coherence, and effective structure in academic texts.

In general, the findings emphasize strong learner motivation to integrate SFL principles into academic writing support programs, with minimal resistance or uncertainty among participants.

Interest in Training or Workshops on SFL

The data indicate a strong interest among participants in receiving training or attending workshops on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). A large majority (85%) expressed a clear willingness to participate in such programs, reflecting high motivation to enhance their academic writing skills through SFL-based instruction.

Only a small proportion (5%) reported no interest, while 10% were uncertain, suggesting minor hesitancy among a few participants. The positive response emphasizes both the perceived value of SFL in improving writing and the readiness of learners to engage in professional development opportunities.

In general, the findings suggest that implementing targeted workshops or training sessions on SFL would likely be well received and could effectively support participants in developing stronger and more coherent academic writing skills.

Overall Interpretation of Findings

In short, the results highlight the value of directed support in developing higher-order academic writing proficiency, the use of structured writing strategies, and greater knowledge of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) principles. The strong interest in professional development emphasizes the likely value of workshops and instructional interventions centered on applying SFL to enhance clarity, coherence, and overall academic writing competence.

To sum up, the study indicates that the main challenges in academic writing are content-related, including clarity of argument and organization of ideas, rather than purely linguistic issues. There is a clear need for interventions that combine theoretical instruction in SFL concepts with practical strategies for structuring and organizing writing. Given the participants' positive perceptions of SFL and their interest in training, implementing targeted workshops or courses could significantly improve their academic writing competence, helping them produce coherent, well-structured, and persuasive texts.

Correlation Analysis

The results reveal several meaningful relationships between the problems identified by participants, their writing strategies, and their knowledge of SFL. For instance, the fact that 65% of respondents reported not having individual strategies for organizing their writing relates to the high number of learners who experience difficulties in expressing arguments clearly (38%) and organizing their ideas (24%). This suggests that a lack of strategic awareness may contribute to problems with achieving organization and clarity.

Similarly, familiarity with SFL concepts appears to be related to participants' interest in training. While only 40% reported being very familiar with SFL, 85% expressed interest in workshops, and 85% agreed or strongly agreed that learning SFL would improve their academic writing. This reflects a positive relationship

between limited familiarity and high motivation to learn, indicating that participants recognize their own gaps and view SFL as a possible solution.

Another relationship can be observed between structural awareness and reported writing challenges. The 55% of participants who already consider structure in their writing (e.g., placing known information before new information) are less likely to cite coherence and cohesion (14%) as major challenges, compared with those who do not consider structure (25%) or are unsure (20%). This suggests that applying structural principles may help reduce difficulties in maintaining cohesion. Overall, the correlations indicate that limited strategy use and insufficient SFL knowledge are linked to key academic writing challenges, while strong interest in SFL training highlights participants' recognition of its value for improving writing performance.

Conclusion

The PhD students' responses demonstrate an awareness of the requirements of academic writing but not necessarily the linguistic resources needed to implement these effectively. Systemic Functional Linguistics provides a practical framework for addressing their academic writing challenges by clarifying how to construct ideational meaning, express academic identity and stance (interpersonal meaning), and organize texts coherently (textual meaning).

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher proposes the following recommendations to support PhD students in overcoming academic writing challenges and improving awareness of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as a tool for academic literacy development.

University authorities should integrate SFL principles into doctoral programs and workshops to enhance PhD students' awareness of SFL, which can help them produce more logically organized and contextually appropriate texts. Curriculum and syllabus designers should tailor academic writing courses to incorporate SFL tools and concepts. In addition, they should consider designing modules or materials explicitly based on SFL theory for use in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programs.

Academic advisors, instructors, and supervisors should receive basic training in SFL to better guide students in their writing development. Finally, PhD students should be encouraged to analyze their own writing using an SFL-based checklist that focuses on textual organization. This practice can promote self-awareness and foster greater autonomy in the writing process

References

Bailey, S. (2018). *Academic writing: A handbook for international students* (5th ed.). Routledge.

Correa, D., & Echeverri, S. (2017). Using a systemic functional genre-based approach to promote a situated view of academic writing among EFL pre-service teachers. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(2), 121–134.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). Halliday's introduction to functional grammar (4th ed.). Routledge.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., Wang, B., Ma, Y., & Mwinlaaru, I. N. (2021). *Systemic functional insights on language and linguistics*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-8713-6>

Nagao, A. (2020). Adopting an SFL approach to teaching L2 writing through the teaching–learning cycle. *English Language Teaching*, 13(6), 144–155. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n6p144>

Nguyen, T. H. (2021). Improving writing skills with a systemic functional linguistic approach: The case of Vietnamese EFL students. *World Journal of English Language*, 11(3), 185–195.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing academic English* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Pramono, S. A. (2019). A systemic functional linguistics-based analysis of students' problems in writing exposition text.

Saito-Abbott, Y., & Oda, M. (2020). Adopting an SFL approach to teaching L2 writing through genre-based pedagogy. *English Language Teaching*, 13(6), 22–30.

Tshotsho, B. (2014). Assessing students' academic writing using systemic functional linguistics at a university in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(3), 425–432.

University of Manchester. (n.d.). *Academic phrasebank*. <http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk>

Wilson, J. R. (2023). *Academic writing*. Harvard University. https://wilson.fas.harvard.edu/files/jeffreywilson/files/jeffrey_r._wilson_academic_writing.pdf

Appendix A

PhD Students' Awareness of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) Questionnaire

Section 1: Demographic Information

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age group?

- 20–29
- 30–39
- 40–49
- 50 and above

3. What is your field of study?

- Linguistics
- Applied Linguistics
- Education
- Other (please specify)

4. What stage are you currently at in your PhD journey?

- Coursework
- Proposal writing
- Data collection
- Thesis writing
- Completed

Section 2: Academic Writing Challenges

5. What are the main challenges you face in academic writing? (check all that apply)

- Expressing arguments clearly
- Organizing ideas logically
- Maintaining coherence and cohesion
- Grammar and sentence structure
- Referencing and citation
- Other (please specify)

6. Do you use specific strategies to structure your academic writing?

- Yes
- No

Section 3: Awareness of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

7. How familiar are you with SFL concepts (e.g., Theme–Rheme, Cohesion, Modality, Mood)?

- Not at all familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Very familiar
- Neutral

8. Do you consider structure when writing (e.g., placing known information before new information)?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

9. Do you think learning about SFL would help improve your academic writing?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree

10. Would you be interested in training or workshops on SFL for academic writing?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

Section 4: Open-ended Questions

11. In what ways do you think SFL could support your academic writing development?

12. What type of support or training would you prefer (e.g., workshops, online modules, one-to-one supervision)?