
A Comprehensive Review of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG): Reliability, Advantages/Disadvantages and Pedagogical Application

By

Muhammad Asif

Abstract

The present study aims to examine the dependability or reliability of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in textual examination, finding its advantages and disadvantages in textual examination, and finding its pedagogical application in language instruction, research, and lesson design or planning. This study reviews eleven studies concentrating on Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) discipline. Findings of this study are ambiguous because basic ideas like "complement" are not used reliably. Most studies focus on how Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is used only in English-language settings. In spite of these irregularities, in this review it is concluded that Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) reliably exhibits advantages in text-based examination, instructive uses, and language learning. This review recommends further research which should deal with conceptual inconsistencies, carry out strong evidence-based research employing corpus linguistics, and investigate assorted pedagogical contexts to comprehend Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) influence on language instruction and its consequences. Incorporating Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) with other language paradigms could also improve its critical range and uses in recent linguistic research, adding insights to an explicit comprehension of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) advantages and disadvantages.

Keywords: Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG), SFG reliability, pedagogical applications, syntax, semantics and textual analysis.

Introduction

The perspective for language as being a framework, or associated sets of recourse for deriving meaning is basically called "systemic." In this instance, the discipline of grammar is an endeavour to comprehend how the assets of grammar and word preference utilized in language construction basically

construct meanings (Abdel-Malek, 2017; Bloor & Bloor, 2013). According to Matthiessen & Halliday (1997) and Webster (2009), grammar is a tool for conveying meaning through the use of words. For Cahyono (2018) and Cordeiro (2018), therefore, a language is deciphered as a semiotic framework and a procedure for importance potential, joined by structures through which the implications can be understood. Furthermore, systemic theory is a theory of meaning presented as recourse in which a language or a semiotic framework is elucidated as system of interconnected resources (Halliday, 2014). According to Figueiredo (2010), then again, the expression "functional" brings up that the methodology is more related to understanding or meaning, instead of traditional syntax, which focuses on word categories like nouns and verbs, commonly devoid of literature past the singular condition in this way, language is functional. For Dalamu (2017), written or spoken discourse is a means of conveying meaning. It implies how a writer or speaker utilizes language to derive meaning and articulate information (Cahyono, 2018). According to Bruce (2018) and Halliday & Matthiessen (2014), because of its unique connection with social language use, the functional facet of language has an important place in Systemic functional linguistics; and to the selection of language to meet a situation's fundamental requirements (Cusworth & Ewing, 1994). For Clarence-Fincham (2001), to summarize, functional linguistics views language decisions and handles constructions as resultant from the decisions made by means of realization guidelines: the semantics-language connection is a realization connection.

The ability of grammar to present writers and speakers with options is the main role of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). These language options (what learners propose to write or say and how they propose to do it—link the purpose of learners to a language's definite manifestations. According to Abdel-Malek (2017), Cordeiro (2018), Eggins (2004), Halliday (2009), and Matthiessen and Halliday (1997), discourse-semantics (essence of the text), context, lexicogrammar (construction and lexicon in the text), and phonology/graphology (orthography in addition to tones and punctuation) are the main four levels of language that these choices emphasize. For Matthiessen & Halliday (1997), as a result, it helps English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners understand and evaluate the significance of their language decisions. As such, it provides an effective asset for dissecting the text top to bottom.

As indicated by Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), functional underpinnings of syntactic peculiarities are categorised into three expansive regions, (1) metafunctions (ideational), (2) relational and (3) text based. Composed and spoken discourse might be broke down as far as these metafunctions in register examinations. A text's field facet, or topic and framework, are the focus of the ideational metafunction. According to Figueiredo (2010), it has to do with how words mirrors a speaker's or writer's understanding of the concrete, mental, and communal worlds. The interpersonal metafunction is connected to the tenor or reciprocity of a text. According to Bloor & Bloor (2004), Cordeiro (2018), Fernandez (2018), Martin & Rose (2007) and Taboada (2004), it designs societal relationships and symbolizes association among speakers and listeners. As a result, it is the medium via which meaning or conceptual metafunction is created (Knain, 2015; Meehan, 2006, as cited in Hassan et al., 2021). For Figueiredo (2010), the textual metafunction, on the other hand, is more focused on the construction of the text in connection to its setting. According to Bloor & Bloor (2004), Cordeiro (2018), Lim (2018) and Taboada (2004), as per the requirements of a particular mode, it makes use of language to design the conceptual and communicative functions into a integrated discourse.

Review of the Literature

Kusmanto (2016) conducted a study on improving the dependability of social and cultural understanding of text analysis by reviewing the usage of "Complement" in the Mood system of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). Taking care of these problems can also improve syntactic analysis and make language instruction for English and other languages better. **Xiao (2017)** analyzed the incorporation of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) and Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) to improve linguistic comprehension. It implies that utilizing these frameworks' merits together offers a broader view on language. The study talks about uses in second language learning and instruction, featuring cooperative energies between the two methodologies. **Opoku (2024)**, offers an outline of syntactic and semantic problems, concentrating on problems with the Mood system and "Complement." He found Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) problems that have not been addressed, accentuating the requirement for additional research to deal with the framework's conceptual and grammatical problems. Language stratas,

metafunctions, and discourse paradigms are all examined by (Li, 2019) as he defined Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) and its uses to discourse examination. With Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), he looks at the person system, mood and modality, and cohesion in four discourses. He emphasizes the significance of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in discourse comprehension and offers its application in improving comprehension of English song lyrics.

Rita (2004) utilizes Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) to look at the TRANSITIVITY frameworks of English and Spanish in "La Romeria" and its English interpretation. He looks at how experiential assets diverge, specifically how "ser" and "estar" are used. He concentrates on Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) place in offering a comprehensive comparison between languages and demonstrates how these differences are designed by textual and ideational elements. Contrasting Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) with Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) in the analysis of English syntax designs, (Zhang, 2022) examines the teaching of English sentence structure to Chinese learners. He reveals likely connections between these hypotheses to improve instructing techniques. **Banegas (2021)** looked into how Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) affected the professional development of student teachers in an Argentine program for pre-service instructors of second languages. He zeroed in on a required Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) paradigm stressing Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and metalinguistic information. Across the academic year, information from analysis, group discussions, coursework specimens, and class discussions featured Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) favourable influence on subject matter and educational information.

AlHamdany (2012) examines grammar's function in the instruction of English as a Second Language (ESL), specifically in the way that instructors create activities. Analysis and instructor interviews from English as a Second Language (ESL) Cookery lessons demonstrate that certain instructive methodologies impactfully interact learners in bidirectional and circumstantial classes. **Hamilton (2015)** uses Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) for the first time to categorize English writing errors committed by French university learners. He contrasts Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)-error analysis and conventional strategies, discovering that Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) metafunctions supplement customary methodologies by giving a more profound comprehension of errors inside both primary and

text based settings. At Benha University's Faculty of Education, (Hassan et al., 2021) examines the impact of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) methodology on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) written grammar skills and writing issues among learners and instructors. The experimental group had substantially better grammar abilities and less issues than the control group. **Ali et al. (2021)** examines idealization metafunctions in Nelson Mandela's political rhetoric using Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). Researchers demonstrate, via qualitative and quantitative analysis of four speeches, Mandela's effective application of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) doctrines, specifically transitivity analysis. The results demonstrate how Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) sheds light on the connection between concept and linguistics in political rhetoric.

Significance and Objectives of the paper

This study undertakes a **systematic review** of existing research to evaluate the reliability and analytical effectiveness of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in text analysis. Rather than providing a descriptive summary of the literature, the review critically synthesizes studies that focus on: the treatment of *complements* within SFG, integrative approaches combining SFG with Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG), applications of SFG in speech analysis and its pedagogical use in language instruction. The primary purpose of this review is to **assess the strengths and limitations of SFG as an analytical and instructional framework**, with the aim of informing educators, researchers, and curriculum developers about its practical value and theoretical constraints. Guided by this purpose, the study formulates specific review objectives outlined below:

- Investigating the dependability or reliability of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in textual examination.
- Finding the advantages and disadvantages of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in textual examination.
- Finding the pedagogical application of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in language instruction, research, and lesson design or planning.

Limitations

The researcher observed some limitations in this review paper, which are as follows:

- This study incorporates a limited number of studies, possibly neglecting nascent phenomena in Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) discipline.
- Findings of this study are ambiguous because basic ideas like "complement" are not described or used reliably across studies.
- The majority of studies focuses on how Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is used in English-language settings, which makes it hard to learn about how it can be used in other languages and cultures.
- This paper is insufficient in its examination of how Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) connects with various language theories, like Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG), which could improve its cross-disciplinary model.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employs a systematic qualitative review design to evaluate the reliability, advantages, limitations, and pedagogical applications of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). The review is analytical and synthetic in nature, aiming to assess SFG's effectiveness as both a linguistic theory and an instructional framework rather than offering a descriptive overview of prior research.

Sample and Corpus of the Study

The sample comprises eleven selected studies that explicitly adopt or critically examine Systemic Functional Grammar. These sources were selected because they directly address:

1. The theoretical reliability of SFG in text and discourse analysis,
2. Grammatical functions within SFG (with particular attention to *complements*),
3. Comparative or integrative approaches involving SFG and Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG)
4. Pedagogical applications of SFG in language teaching and curriculum development.

Data Sources

The literature was retrieved from major academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, ERIC, and Google Scholar, as well as publisher platforms such as Routledge, Springer, and Elsevier. Reference lists of key publications were also manually searched to identify additional relevant studies.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria

1. Explicit theoretical or analytical grounding in SFG
2. Empirical, theoretical, or review-based focus
3. Relevance to text analysis, discourse analysis, or pedagogy
4. Publication in English.

Exclusion criteria

It included non-scholarly sources, studies with only incidental reference to SFG, conference abstracts without full papers, and duplicated publications.

Data Analysis Procedures

The selected studies were analyzed using thematic content analysis. Each text was coded according to five analytical categories:

1. Reliability and validity of SFG
2. Analytical strengths
3. Theoretical and practical limitations
4. Comparative insights with other grammatical frameworks
5. Pedagogical implications.

Themes were then synthesized across studies to generate an integrated evaluation of SFG's analytical and instructional value.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability was ensured through transparent selection criteria and consistent coding across the corpus. Validity was strengthened through cross-study comparison and close alignment with established Hallidayan theory.

Discussion

In this section of the study, the researcher has analyzed the chosen eleven studies concentrating on the dependability or reliability of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) in textual examination, its advantages and disadvantages in textual examination, and its pedagogical application in language instruction, research, and lesson design or planning. The analysis of this review incorporates juxtaposition, themes, patterns, inconsistencies, and its relation to the present study's objectives.

The researcher compared and contrasted the results across several studies related to Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) to find out its reliability or dependability in textual examination. Following are some similarities and deviations observed in the eleven papers reviewed by the researcher:

- **Evaluation of "Complement" in Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG):** Kusmantu (2016) and Opoku (2024) feature hypothetical uncertainties and recommends for more explicit meanings of "Complement." Syntactic versus semantic meanings are the subject matter of (Kusmantu, 2016), while corpus linguistics is utilized in (Opoku, 2024) to provide empirical knowledge.
- **Incorporating of Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) and Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG):** By both (Xiao, 2017) and (Zhang, 2022), Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) and **Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)** are discussed as supplementary approaches to language learning and instruction, with Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) concentrating on formation uncertainty and **Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)** on operational disparity.
- **Conversational Analysis and Text- based or Scriptural Analysis utilizing Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG):** Li (2019) purposes **Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)** for text examination, zeroing in on mood frameworks, individual frameworks, and stylistic elements.

- Ali et al. (2021) uses **Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)** to examine Nelson Mandela's addresses, featuring transitivity and ideational capabilities.
- **Academic uses and Second Language Acquisition (SLA):** The benefits of **Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)** and Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) are examined by (Xiao, 2017) and (Hassan et al., 2021), with an emphasis on their rational classroom learning uses and the depletion of English as a foreign language (EFL) writing issues.
- **Influence on Language instruction and education:** With the use of classroom assessments and engagement, (Banegas, 2021) and (AlHamdany, 2012) investigate the role that **Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)** plays in improving material and academic insights as well as developing interactive abilities in English as a second language (ESL) settings.

Themes

- **Syntactic Capabilities vs. Semantic Capabilities:**

Kusmanto (2016) and Opoku (2024) feature the steady disarray in recognizing syntactic capabilities i.e. formal functions such as Subject, Predicate and Object, and semantic capabilities i.e. meaning-based functions such as Agent, Patient and Theme. The understanding of language examination is reliable upon this differentiation. While Opoku (2024) scrutinizes the absence of explicit conceptual outlines between these contributions in Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG), (Kusmanto, 2016) focuses on the conceptual issues associated with articulating "Complement" because of different syntactic and semantic paradigms.

- **Complementary viewpoints of Linguistic Concepts:**

Xiao (2017) and Zhang (2022) both basically focus on incorporating Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) and Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) to advance the comprehension of linguistic paradigm. Xiao (2017) features how Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG's) attention on natural language guidelines supplements Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) accentuation on language's practical angles in communal settings. Zhang (2022) looks at how both concepts can be used to show

syntax structure and make language instruction and acquisition far more better.

- **Educational Ramifications and uses:**

Xiao (2017), Zhang (2022), Banegas (2021), AlHamdany (2012) and Hassan et al. (2021) examine the pedagogical advantages related to Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG). Xiao (2017) recommends utilizing bits of knowledge from Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) and Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) to illuminate linguistic instruction. Zhang (2022) underscores that comprehending the two concepts or speculations, Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) and Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG), makes syntactic instruction far more effective. Banegas (2021) examines the effect of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) upon learner and instructors' subject information and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), upgrading their instructive methodologies. AlHamdany (2012) demonstrates how Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) enhances learners' interactive abilities in English as a Second Language (ESL) settings. Hassan et al. (2021) discusses how Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) improves learner and instructors' written syntax abilities and mitigates English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing issues.

- **Discourse and Content Examination:**

Li (2019), Rita (2004), and Ali et al. (2021) feature the utilization of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) in dissecting different discourse. Li (2019) breaks down song verses, uncovering how syntax frameworks such as mood and modality facilitate written and spoken narratives. Rita (2004) focuses on how well-suited Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) is for in-depth cross-linguistic discourse examination, specifically when comparing English and Spanish languages. The analysis of Nelson Mandela's spoken discourse in (Ali et al., 2021) employs transitivity examination to feature the various process approaches that deliver his ideas.

- **Transitivity and Methodology Approaches:**

Rita (2004) and Ali et al. (2021) probe into transitivity investigation. In order to gain understanding into how actions and states are expressed in each language, (Rita, 2004) compares and contrasts different methodology approaches in English and Spanish languages. Ali et al. (2021) looks at Mandela's spoken discourse and shows how content, relational, and psychological methodologies are utilized to make or

create conceptual understanding and get people to act.

- **Cohesion and Texture in Content:**

Li (2019) and Banegas (2021) both concentrates on cohesion and texture. Improving content coherence, (Li, 2019) examines song verses' syntactic-based and lexical-based cohesion. Banegas (2021) demonstrates how Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) facilitate learners and instructors' comprehension of content formation past the syntax dimension through featuring their acknowledgment for cohesion and texture examination in content.

- **Evidence-based knowledge and Corpus Linguistics:**

Opoku (2024) and Hamilton (2015) underline evidence-based techniques and corpus linguistics in examining Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG). Corpus linguistics is utilized in (Opoku, 2024) to aid conceptual paradigms through uncovering complement distributional regularity throughout genres and registers. For error analysis, Hamilton (2015) makes use of the UAM CorpusTool, which offers in-depth information regarding linguistic variations and error reduction in learners' written discourse.

- **Learner-Instructor Communication and Classroom Trends:**

The significance of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) in classroom context is investigated by (Banegas, 2021) and (AlHamdany, 2012). The techniques of learner-instructor are analyzed in (Banegas, 2021), with the goal of fostering capable curriculum development and content progress. AlHamdany, (2012) features learner-instructor cooperation in English as Second Language (ESL) settings, demonstrating how Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) cultivates a majority rule of classroom environment and empowers interactive abilities.

- **Error Analysis and Enhancement:**

The utilization of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) in error analysis is discussed in (Hamilton, 2015), and its usefulness in diminishing mistakes related to language in students' written discourse is shown. The review demonstrates critical error mitigation in more than two semesters, featuring the pragmatic advantages of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) in the instruction of language.

- **Metafunctional Examination:**

Language application is examined through the understanding of metafunctional examination by (Rita, 2004) and (Ali et al., 2021). The complicated combination of conceptual, relational, and content significations is the focus of (Rita's, 2004) investigation of metafunctional understanding of Spanish and English language. Ali's et al., (2021) transitivity examination of Nelson Mandela's discourses highlights the conceptual capability, representing how semantic decisions deliver his idea and activate his crowd.

- **Language Learning and Skills:**

The effects of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) are discussed in (Xiao, 2017) and (Zhang, 2022). Xiao, (2017) features Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG's) standards and changes supporting Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) emphasis on interactive methodologies. The advantages of combining Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) and Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) for instructing sentence formations, which improves students' comprehension and abilities, are concentrated on by (Zhang, 2022).

Findings and Results

The present study has observed repetitive patterns across the papers selected for this study focusing on the reliability of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG). Kusmanto (2016) and Zhang (2022) coordinate Transformational-Generative Grammar (TGG) with Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) to upgrade language examination and language instruction comprehensively. Opoku (2024), Zhang (2022), Banegas (2021), AlHamdany (2012), and Hassan et al. (2021) feature Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) advantages in instruction of sentence structure, mitigating written discourse issues, and further developing English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL) interactive capability. According to Li (2019), Rita (2004), and Ali et al. (2021) Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) can be utilized to examine content comprehensively, involving song verses and political rhetoric. Li (2019) and Banegas (2021) examine the text's uniformity, focusing on how syntactic and semantic choices affect text's logical flow. Rita (2004) and Ali et al. (2021) investigate procedure styles (content, social, psychological) in order

to deliver conceptual importance, especially in cross-linguistic and political rhetoric. Opoku (2024) and Hamilton (2015) analyze language trends and errors using evidence-based techniques and corpus linguistics to back up conceptual assertions with empirical methods. Banegas (2021) and AlHamdany (2012) center around learner and instructor collaboration elements, featuring Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) part in advancing successful interaction and improvement to classrooms environment. Hamilton (2015) applies Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) to analyze errors and develop a learner's written discourse, showing how it can be used to improve language efficiency. Rita (2004) and Ali et al. (2021) utilize metafunctional examination to investigate linguistic capabilities (conceptual, relational, content-based), displaying Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) complete methodology. Xiao (2017) and Zhang (2022) concentrates on Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) suggestions for second language learning and skill, utilizing contributions from both Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) and Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG).

The present study has observed irregularities across the papers selected for this study focusing on the reliability of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG). Kusmanto (2016) and Opoku (2024) feature hypothetical irregularities in characterizing "Complement" inside Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG), creating inconsistencies between grammar capabilities and lexical roles. Banegas (2021) and AlHamdany (2012) uncover differing impression of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) among teachers and learners, with errors in its apparent uses and functions in pedagogical context. Opoku (2024) facilitates conceptual paradigms with corpus linguistics, as opposed to Hamilton's (2015) evidence-based techniques, demonstrating irregular use of data-driven studies. While AlHamdany (2012) concentrates only on Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG), (Zhang, 2022; Hassan et al., 2021) vouches for incorporating Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) with other instruction paradigms, demonstrating irregularities in academic techniques. Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) is applied in thorough content examination by (Li, 2019; Ali et al., 2021; Banegas, 2021) provides a wider perspective on how Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) affects instructors' education, implying different degrees of systematic complexity. Xiao (2017) and Zhang (2022) are different in their focus on Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG's) role in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), indicating differences in how Systematic

Functional Grammar (SFG) is used and interpreted in environments of language acquisition. AlHamdany (2012) places an importance on learning environment, whereas (Banegas, 2021) places a greater emphasis on syntax instruction, featuring gaps on research aim. Rita (2004) and Ali et al. (2021) use transitivity examination in different ways, with one concentrating on cross-linguistic juxtaposition and the other on rhetorical examination, demonstrating irregular uses. Hamilton (2015) applies an in-depth error analysis, demonstrating methodological irregularities in contrast to other research that concentrate less on this element of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) uses. Banegas (2021) and Hassan et al. (2021) note different effects of Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG) on learners and instructors, with varying consequences calculated and methods employed, uncovering irregular impacts.

This study features investigating the dependability or reliability of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in textual examination by means of its solid conceptual foundation and evidence-based verification through the application of corpus linguistics techniques (Opoku, 2024; Hamilton, 2015). The continuous utilization of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in content examination (Li, 2019; Ali et al., 2021) and its cross-linguistic flexibility (Rita, 2004) additionally cement its adaptability and hypothetical uniformity. Studies that incorporate both conceptual and evidence-based methodologies (Opoku, 2024; Hamilton, 2015) show that Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is more consistent than studies that only apply conceptual approaches. On the other hand, (Li, 2019; Banegas, 2021; AlHamdany, 2012; Ali et al., 2021) show that the intensity of examination is different, and (Kusmanto, 2016; Opoku, 2024) demonstrate that the meaning of concepts such as "Complement" fluctuate, implying that various papers could have an effect on Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) consistency.

Secondly, this review also investigates the advantages in syntactic and textual examination (Li, 2019; Ali et al., 2021), as well as the disadvantages of functional uses specifically in pedagogical contexts (Banegas, 2021; AlHamdany, 2012). Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is productive in discourse and rhetorical examination (Li, 2019; Rita, 2004; Ali et al., 2021), but it is difficult to apply in pedagogical settings due to its various complications. Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) interpretive merit is demonstrated in the comprehensiveness of text-based examination (Li, 2019; Ali et al., 2021), whereas inconsistencies in rational application are featured in the wider pedagogical viewpoints (Banegas, 2021;

AlHamdany, 2012). Weaknesses in documented effects on language acquisition and instruction impact (Xiao, 2017; Zhang, 2022; Banegas, 2021; AlHamdany, 2012) implies setting based efficiency, and differences in critical range (Rita, 2004; Ali et al., 2021) in contrast to (Banegas, 2021; AlHamdany, 2012) feature different advantages and disadvantages.

Lastly, this review also analyzes the pedagogical application of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in language instruction, research, and lesson design or planning. It uncovers Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) capability to improve academic procedures (Zhang, 2022; Banegas, 2021; AlHamdany, 2012) and its significance in assorted study settings (Opoku, 2024; Hamilton, 2015). Designs demonstrate useful effects on educator information and abilities (Banegas, 2021; Hassan et al., 2021), but issues continue in pragmatic classroom execution (Banegas, 2021; AlHamdany, 2012), facilitating enhanced incorporating techniques. Disparities in concentrated regions (AlHamdany, 2012; Hassan et al., 2021) feature a number of academic uses, while analysis between incorporated Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) methodologies and sole uses (Xiao, 2017; Zhang, 2022; AlHamdany, 2012) feature different degrees of efficacy. Discrepancies in the reported effects on instructors and learners (Banegas, 2021; Hassan et al., 2021) highlight the setting variation in the advantages of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) throughout academic contexts.

To conclude, these critical analyses show how the dependability or reliability of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) in textual examination, its advantages and disadvantages in textual examination, and its pedagogical application in language instruction, research and lesson design or planning are mitigated by pragmatic issues, diverse levels of utility, and discrepancies throughout various pedagogical conditions and research settings.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In view of the exhaustive audit of research on Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), a few prime points arise in regards to its dependability and uses. In spite of varieties in the treatment of ideas like "complement" and the combination with other language theories like Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG), Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) reliably exhibits advantages in speech and text based examination, instructive uses, and language learning. But, its conceptual constructs, observational verification, and educational effectiveness remain unreliable across various academic settings. To further comprehend Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) influence on language instruction and its consequences, further studies should concentrate on solving conceptual uncertainties, carrying out more sound experimental research with corpus linguistics, and examining a variety of academic contexts. Furthermore, Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) analytical range and uses in recent linguistics research could be explored by incorporating it with evolving language concepts. Dealing with these ideas will add to a more explicit comprehension of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG's) true capacity and impediments in both conceptual area and functional academic contexts.

References

Abdel-Malek, M. (2017). *http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/31510/1/Abdel-Malek_Myriam-Dissertation.pdf* [University of Pittsburgh]. http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/31510/1/Abdel-Malek_Myriam-Dissertation.pdf

AlHamdany, H. (2012). THE USEFULNESS OF SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR AND ITS IMPACT ON STUDENTS' COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS IN ESL CONTEXT. *European Scientific Journal, 8(11).* https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=THE+USEFULNESS+OF+SYSTEMIC+FUNCTIONAL+GRAMMAR+AND+ITS+IMPACT+ON+STUDENTS+E2%80%99+COMMUNICATIVE+SKILLS+IN+ESL+CONTEXT&btnG=#d=gs_qabs&t=1718906240480&u=%23p%3Dj8HVj2YQ4EYJ

Ali, I., Mukhtar, A., Mansoor, A., & Butt, M. (2021). A STUDY OF THE IDEATIONAL FUNCTION IN SYSTEMATIC FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR: TRANSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF NELSON MANDELA'S SPEECHES. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*.

https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=A+STUDY+OF+THE+IDEATIONAL+FUNCTION+IN+SYSTEMATIC+FUNCTIONAL+GRAMMAR%3A+TRANSITIVITY+ANALYSIS+OF+NELSON+MANDELA%28%80%99S+SPEECHES&tnG=#d=gs_qabs&t=1718906789969&u=%23p%3D3oNa62zI4nIJ

Banegas, D. L. (2021). Understanding the impact of teaching systemic functional grammar in initial English language teacher Education. *School of Education, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/ijal.12346>

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2013). *The Functional Analysis of English A Hallidayan Approach* (3rd ed.). Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203538098>

Bruce, L. (2008). Academic Writing and Genre: A Systematic Analysis. London: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-publication data.

Cahyono, S. P. (2018). Teaching L2 Writing through the use of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(1), 53-72. Retrieved from: <https://www.academia.edu>.

Clarence-Fincham, J. (2001). Using systemic functional grammar in the media classroom: increasing students' ability to produce and analyze media texts. *Per Linguam*, 17(2), 23-36. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5785/17-2-3>.

Cordeiro, C. M. (2018). Using systemic functional linguistics as method in Identifying semogenic strategies in intercultural Communication: A study of the collocation of “time” and “different” by Swedish managers with international management experiences. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* (Online), 47(3), 207- 225. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rjic20>.

Cusworth, R., & Ewing, R. (1994). *What is a functional model of language?* Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.

Dalamu, T. (2017). Systemic Functional Theory: A Pickax of Textual Investigation. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(3), 187-198.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd Ed.). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Fernandez, L. (2018). Qualitative interview analysis: The use of systemic functional linguistics to reveal functional meanings. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 19(2), 1-22. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-19.2.2663>.

Figueiredo, D. (2010). Context, register and genre: Implications for language education. *Revista Signos*, 43(1), 119-141. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718>.

Halliday M. A. K. (2009). Preface to Continuum Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics. In M. A. K. Halliday & J. J. Webster (Eds), *Continuum companion to systemic functional linguistics* (PP. 8-9). York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th Ed.). USA: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.books.google.com>.

Hamilton, C. E. (2015). The Contribution of Systemic Functional Grammar to the Error Analysis Framework. *TESOL International Journal*. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=The+Contribution+of+Systemic+Functional+Grammar+to+the+Error+Analysis+Framework&btnG=#d=gs_qabs&t=1718906407424&u=%23p%3DbLHXIUJLppUJ

Hassan, N. M. H., Mohamed, Dr. F. S., Abdel-Hack, Dr. E. M., & Safyeddin, Dr. R. M. (2021). Using Systemic Functional Grammar Approach for Developing EFL Written Grammar Skills and Reducing EFL Writing Anxiety among Student Teachers at the Faculty of Education. *Journal of Faculty of Education*. https://journals.ekb.eg/article_240908_1fc62d678c9aeaaafff8fb5c572bc18b.pdf

Kusmanto, J. (2016). THE TERM “COMPLEMENT” IN THE SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR THEORY: A CRITICAL REVIEW. *Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities (CAPEU)*. <http://eeic.usk.ac.id/proceedings/index.php/eeic/article/download/64/63>

Li, X. (2019). Analysis of Discourse from Perspective of Systemic Functional Grammar. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(8). <http://www.academypublication.com/issues2/tpls/vol09/08/25.pdf>

Lim, V. F. (2018). *Developing a systemic functional approach to teach multimodal literacy*. United States: Springer. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0066-8>.

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). Interacting with text: The role of dialogue in learning to read and write. *Foreign Studies Journal*, 20, 1-20.

Opoku, K. (2024). The Term “Complement” in Systemic Functional Grammar: A Review of Its Theoretical Problems and Implications. *Open Journal of*

Modern

Linguistics.

<https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=131015>

Matthiessen, C., & Halliday, M. A. K. (1997). *Systemic functional grammar: A first step into the theory*. China: Higher Education Publishing House.

Rita, J. A. (2004). Understanding “how we mean” through discourse analysis; a contrastive example using Systemic-Functional Grammar. *Universidad Complutense De Madrid*.

https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Understanding%22how+we+mean%22+through+discourse+analysis%3B+a+contrastive+example+using+Systemic-Functional+Grammar+.%2C+JORGE+ARUS+RITA&btnG=#d=gs_qabs&t=1718905843709&u=%23p%3DF2GXe9smxSYJ

Taboada, M. T. (2004). *Building coherence and cohesion: Task-oriented dialogue in English and Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Webster, J. J. (2009). An introduction to continuum companion to systemic functional linguistics. In M. A. K. Halliday & J. J. Webster (Eds), *Continuum companion to systemic functional linguistics* (PP.1-11). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Xiao, R. (2017). Combining transformative generative grammar and systemic functional grammar: Linguistic competence, syntax and second language acquisition. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND LITERATURE*.
<https://academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL/article-full-text/72EE98164411>

Zhang, Y. (2022). Revelations on Grammar Teaching Based on an Analysis on Syntactic Structure of Transformational Generative Grammar and Metafunctions of Systemic Functional Grammar. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*. <https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt/article/download/4076/3511>

Sampling References (Books, Journal Articles and Doctoral Dissertations)

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

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Eggins, S. (2004). An introduction to systemic functional linguistics. In *Continuum Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp. 1–30). London: Continuum.

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2007). Functional analysis of English. In *The Functional Analysis of English* (pp. 1–18). London: Hodder Arnold.

Butler, C. S. (2003). Structure and function: A guide to three major structural-functional theories. *Journal of Linguistics*, 39(2), 361–364.

O'Donnell, M. (2012). Analyzing discourse with Systemic Functional Grammar. *Discourse Studies*, 14(2), 189–203.

Fontaine, L. (2013). Analysing English grammar: A systemic functional introduction. *Functions of Language*, 20(2), 298–302.

Thompson, G. (2008). Systemic Functional Grammar: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Linguistics*, 44(3), 641–650.

Fawcett, R. (1980). *Cognitive Linguistics and Social Interaction: Towards an Integrated Model*. University of London.

Hasan, R. (1985). *Linguistics, Language and Verbal Art*. University of