



## Comparison of Pakistani and Native English Learners' Argumentative Essays: A Functional Genre Approach

Ayesha Asghar Gill\*, Fauzia Janjua\*\*

**ABSTRACT:** *Academic argumentation needs complex interaction between cognitive and linguistic competence to achieve social purpose. This research aims to investigate deficiencies in argumentative writing of English Language Learner and to suggest a pedagogy to overcome their learning gaps. This case study compares two analytical expository essays: one of English Native Learner and other of ELL, drawn from the corpus ICNALE. ELL earned B1 and ENL got C1 descriptors by CEFR system. The researcher used Hyland's model of argumentative genre for minute functional linguistic analysis of register variables within stages by using three meta-functions based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) framework. The results demonstrate that the ENL employed better functional linguistic resources for argumentative genre as compared to the ELL due to familiarity with generic structure. Resultantly, this work recommends genre pedagogy to improve ELLs' argumentation at functional and linguistic level in L2 context as recommended by various SFL researchers (Dreyfus & Macnaught, 2013) for ELLs.*

**Keywords:** Systemic functional linguistics (SFL), genre, genre pedagogy, register variables, argumentative writing

### Introduction

Academic argumentative essay needs linguistic resources functional use according to the target discourse community requirement (Hyland, 2003). At tertiary level, the essential nature of argument in English as L2 gives rise to writing difficulties for the Pakistani English Language Learners (PELLS), due to insufficient knowledge of English language and its discourse community requirement. To overcome these issues, PELLs need exposure to knowledge of language and knowledge about language to develop language skills as rightly pointed out by Halliday (1996). In Pakistani context, most of teachers do not have comprehensive knowledge of language, its structures and functions (Sajid & Ahmed 2015). They mostly depend on outdated teaching methods such as grammar

\* Ph.D. Scholar and Lecturer in English University of Agriculture, Faisalabad (Corresponding author E-mail Address: [Ayesha.augf@yahoo.com](mailto:Ayesha.augf@yahoo.com)).

\*\* Associate Professor at International Islamic University, Islamabad

translation method. Thus, PELLs even at tertiary level are struggling hard to become better academic argumentative writer.

However after trying different theoretical framework at international context, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), proposed by Halliday, has made significant contribution to the development of language skills and its teaching to PELLs.

In SFL framework, effective argumentative essay needs efficient language resources usage at two levels: context of culture (genre) and context of situation (register). This research conducted functional linguistic analysis (FLA), at text and clause level to detect weaknesses in PELL's argumentation structure in comparison to ENL. The analysis found PELL's learning gaps in linguistic resources' functional usage as compared to ENL. It means that PELL is required to focus on raising critical awareness of argumentative genre by learning desired linguistic resources to realize their required functions at clause and text level. Genre pedagogy with reading to learn approach facilitates this growth by elaborating concrete and systematic links between the linguistic features to construct argumentation and to achieve social function by passing through systematic stages: "cycle of deconstruction, joint construction and independent construction", proposed by Martin (1985). This work proposed that genre pedagogy is likely to prove a better pedagogic choice for PELLs because it exclusively focuses on the text construction by considering relationship between language, text and context (Coffin & Donohue, 2012).

## **Literature Review**

Primarily, the argumentation in academic writing needs efficient persuasion skills to convince a reader of a controversial standpoint (Coffin, 2004). The present research investigates the impact of generic schematic structure unawareness on the appropriate deployment of linguistic resources to realize social communicative purpose of sound argumentation at both clause and text level of PELL writing by comparing it with proficient ENL.

Genre approaches within linguistic traditions regardless of differences are commonly utilized to determine the social functions of text. Previously, genre being a classificatory tool was used in the categorization of texts and cultural objects, but genre is recently acknowledged as the medium of "organizing kinds of texts and more as a powerful, ideologically active, and historically changing changer of texts, meanings and social actions". Therefore, genre analysis, according to Bhatia (2002),

intends to understand and account for the realities of world of text on account of complexity and dynamics of real world. Furthermore, Hyland (2002) contend that the study of genre is quite essential to perceive the relation of language use to its culturally recognized context. The various experts such as Bran Paltridge, Chris Tardy and Ken Hyland utilized the conception of genre in the context of second language writing as Swales (1990) said, the fulfilment of communicative purposes of any genre comprises the members of parent discourse community expectation.

With respect to genre theories, the Rhetorical Genre Studies (RGS), English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) are three distinctive approaches in genre analysis (Bhatia, 1993; Hyland, 2002; Hyon, 1996; Paltridge, 2007). The Rhetorical Genre Studies (RGS) or the North American Genre Theory is defined as, "typified rhetorical actions based in recurrent situations". RGS's primary concern is to investigate contexts through the mediation between textual and social ways rather than linguistic resources. Next, Swales (1990) in English for Specific Purposes (ESP), considers genre as, "a class of communicative events characterized both by their communicative purposes" achieved by the structural elements to present lexical and syntactical choices within the genre and does not emphasize functional resources in the text. Similarly, in ESP genre studies, Vijay Bhatia (2002) proposed multi-perspective four-space model of discourse analysis premised upon the textual perspective. However, it only concentrates on the statistical analysis of language which is confined to the surface-level properties of discourse instead of linking the text with its context in broader sense (2014:19). SFL based genre theory proposed by Martin and Rose (2007) is an outline of how all things might be done through language. Genre in SFL is defined as "a stage goal-oriented social process" (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 8). It informs knowledge about the language used in the argumentative essay writing essential to achieve its social purposes in steps by integrating key choices for lexis, grammar and discourse semantics. Similarly, in response to literacy needs, like Schleppegrell (2006), Humphrey et al (2010) suggested a framework that allows the educators to view the text in nine dimensions for explicit teaching. These dimensions include three meta-functions of language (ideational, interpersonal, and textual) combined with other three strata of language (genre, discourse semantics, grammar and expression). It is refereed as "trinocular and tri-stratal perspective of the 3x3" for describing linguistic resources required for argumentative academic domain. It is utilized by this case

study to analytically demonstrate differences at clause and text of argumentative essays written by the ENL and the PELL.

Halliday defines the ideational function in language as “meanings about the world”. It consists of experiential meanings expressed through the transitivity systems, and logical meanings realized by logical structure of the clause complex. Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) proposed that transitivity system constructs world of experience with a manageable set of process types. There are six types of processes: material, mental, relational, behavioral, verbal and existential processes (p.264). Each process is configured with three types of components: process, participants and circumstances. Besides processes there are circumstantial elements construed by adverbial groups and prepositional phrases as an expansion of meaning. In addition to semantic components, logical meanings are formed by paratactic or hypotactic relations consisting of at least two clauses. In clause complex formation, the tactic system defines the type of interdependency relationship.

Interpersonal meta-function build strategies for interaction between reader and writer. It uses Grammatical Metaphor (GM) as a linguistic resource for expanding the potential of an expression by scrambling the realization between the semantic and the syntactic level (Martin, 2008).

Textual meta-function is classified into three types of themes at clausal level (Halliday, 2014). First one is topical theme which can be any one of the experiential element either participant, a process or a circumstance. Topical theme is categorized as unmarked theme, when it is the grammatical subject of clause and termed as marked themes, when it is realized by complements, modal adjuncts or dependent clauses (Wei, 2013). Second one is textual themes, which organizes the information via continuatives, conjunctions and conjunctive adjuncts. The third one is Interpersonal theme, which consists of vocatives, modal adjuncts, interpersonal metaphor and mood-making. These themes were analyzed for developing connection between a preceding and a successive theme and their contribution to the effective flow of information. This study utilized macro themes at text level and thematic progression at clause level to measure cohesion at the clause level.

Review of literature illustrates that genre pedagogy is progressively used by many educational linguists. For instance, Cheng and Chiu (2018) observed a positive effect of genre pedagogy on the descriptive writing at the discourse level of learners taking Chinese as Second Language (CSL) on the two pre-intermediate students in

pre and post experimental design case study. After the pre-test, the researcher introduced linguistic resources to improve description in ideational meta-interpersonal and textual meta-functions in posttest essays after a series of teaching sessions. Nagao's study (2019) corroborated positive effect of genre pedagogy in understanding lexico-grammatical features and generic structures of a discussion genre essay through applying a pre and post-experimental design to the 27 students of different schools. The post-test clearly showed students' enhanced understanding of interpersonal meanings. Promwinai (2010) likewise applied genre pedagogy to the analytical exposition essays of two learners by using the Hyland's model to improve the argumentative writing skills of PELLs.

However, all the aforementioned researches deployed SFL based genre pedagogy on the targeted linguistic resources, apart from Promwinai's research (2010), both of them neither took a holistic view of language system as recommended by SFL grammar nor clearly illustrated the schematic structures of genres to guide the selection of linguistic resources used to realize these generic moves. Though Promwinai's work (2010) explored the improvement in learner's argumentative writing by applying FLA after deployment of genre pedagogy, she had different objectives. Firstly, it utilized FLA to examine linguistic resources used by two learners and to explore how these linguistic resources exposure improved their English language proficiency. Although, this comparative case study used most of the analytical tools used in Promwinai's research (2010); it has additionally, investigated all moves of each stage of essay to find out functional and linguistic resources differences in argumentation between PELL and ENL in contrast to her work. It highlighted PELL's weaknesses as a need analysis to plan out a pedagogy to help PELL to develop his/her argumentative writing skills.

### **Research Methodology**

Martin and Rose (2008) observed that an argumentative genre has distinct "recurrent local patterns" and schematic structures. They further described how does it unfolds in broad stages and more specific phases. This research deployed FLA to compare PELL and ENL learners by using explicit rhetorical terminology for these phases of an argumentative essay suggested by Hyland (1990) Model after conforming them to SFL framework as cited in Promwinai (2010).

Table: 1

*Stages of Argumentative Essay*

Stage	Move
Thesis	Gambit, information, proposition, evaluation and marker
Argument	Marker, Restatement, Claim, support
Conclusion	Signal, consolidation, Affirmation, Close

Table: 1 shows basic rhetorical staging structure of argumentative genre of Hyland model. This study replaced the information move and marker moves in the thesis stage with elaboration and preview phases respectively. Then, marker in the argument stage is labelled as the hyper claim phase to develop compatibility with SFL framework. It is in accordance to Promwinai (2010) work.

*Population Sample*

This work used purposeful sampling comprised of two essays drawn from ICNALE. One of them was written by ENL and the other was written by PELL writer on the topic, "Smoking should be completely banned at all the restaurants in the country." The ENL essay was named as W-ENS-SMK0-001-XX-1 having C1 advanced proficiency level and PELL essay was named as W-EPAK-SMK0-001-B1 having B1 intermediate threshold proficiency level by Common European Reference (CEFR) system in the ICNALE (Halliday 2003). It made a comparison between ENL and PELL essay via using the aforesaid analytical tools to pin point subtle differences at clause and text level. This research used frequencies of linguistic resources used by both writers as quantitative analysis and their interpretation as qualitative analysis in order to find the solutions of the following research questions.

1. What linguistic resources were used by writers to realize generic variables in their argumentative essays?
2. What were the functions of these linguistic resources?
3. Were these linguistic resources appropriate to construct effective argumentation?
4. Which pedagogy could be used to develop generic schematic structure and linguistic resources awareness of PELL?

## Data Analysis

This work conducted comparative Functional Linguistic analysis (FLA) of two argumentative essays. Firstly, it was performed at three stages level; then, it was done at phase level to explore genre and meta-functions construction successively.

### *Analysis of Meaning-Making Linguistic Resources at Stage Level*

#### *Thesis stages*

In the thesis stage, the writer is required to introduce their opinion about prompt by taking a stance and providing overview of arguments to achieve persuasion. Thesis stages of both writers were analyzed to compare their argumentation. The phases within thesis stages of both writers are presented in Table: 2.

Table 2

*Phases of Thesis Stage in the ENL and PELL's Essay*

Thesis stage	ENL	PELL
Gambit	I don't agree at all.	×
Elaboration	×	×
Proposition	I think that it should be left up to the owner's discretion.	Smoking is very bad things which became a bad habit in our society.
Evaluation	If we allow governments to legislate everything, supposedly in the publics' best interests, then where is it going to end?	It became a common fashion in our society and especially Youngers. Young boys try it as a fashion, but it became their habit.
Preview	Next thing you know, they will start legislating how many tissues can be passed out at the train stations. If we give them too much power, then they will start to monitor everything that we do.	

Table No.2 outlines that ENL adopted explicitly propositional attitude about the ban of smoking at the restaurants to reveal his viewpoint. On the contrary, the PELL did not follow gambit and elaboration phases and presented ambiguous thesis statement at the propositional phase. PELL did not develop dialogic interaction with reader to negotiate opinion. S/he used declarative affirmation rather than providing critical insight to propose any alternative against the smoking ban. Then, at the evaluation stage, both writers attempted to evaluate their stances differently. ENL initiated discussion but PELL gave subjective opinion to end the discussion. Next, ENL used preview phase as a backdrop to build arguments discussed in the whole essay and PELL did not use preview phase as an anticipation guide for the reader to understand the development of different arguments.

#### *Argument stage*

The FLA of argument phase of both writers is presented in the following Table 3.

Table 3

Argument Stage in ENL and PELL's essays

	ENL	PELL
Hyper-Claim	I don't believe that it is the government's job ..... then that's fine.	×
Claim	I seriously believe that many .... has a democratic government don't they?	×
Support	I don't think that it is a good idea ..... principles of democracy.	When someone involve ... .. situation became common we could not do for it.
Restatement	The people elect the government .....to do in my view	×

Table 3 shows ENL employed hyper-claim phase to introduce a logic to back up thesis statement. Then, ENL elaborated the purpose behind the hyper-claim by linking it to 'democracy' as a guiding principle for the acceptance of main claim. ENL further strengthened claim with personal voice to perceive shared assumptions. Finally, the ENL restated proposition and conclude the hyper claim as a complete thought. On the other hand, PELL did not construct hyper-claim phase. S/he directly started to support main-claim by enlisting the bad effects of smoking at the



support stage. Then, PELL missed the restatement phase in argument stage. It shows that PELL did not construct argument phase systematically for establishing grounds to justify proposition.

#### *Concluding stage*

ENL and PELL's conclusion stage generic move analysis are depicted in table No.4:

Table 4

#### *Phases of Concluding Stage in ENL and PELL's Essays*

	ENL	PELL
Marker	I am certain that	
Consolidation+ affirmation + close	most people would ... that all the time.	People hate the smoking and smokers. ... God Always keep us in right path. Amen!

Table No.4 shows that ENL used marker to consolidate and reiterate his/her thesis statement by introducing personal voice and skillfully re-affirmed the main stance in first sentence. ENL connected proposition statement with context of situation by shifting smoking ban focus to people's perception at the close phase. However, PELL neither utilized marker, nor deployed close phase. PELL merely used consolidation phase by describing the impacts of smoking on society without any personal voice.

Hence, it is reasonable to assume PELL, lacks awareness regarding the generic structures to build argumentation at all stages of argumentative essay.

#### ***Analysis of Meaning-Making Linguistic Resources at Phase Level***

The linguistic choices of phases were analyzed with reference to register variables: field, tenor and mode. Field construction was analyzed by focusing on transitivity system and tactic system. The following sections, firstly describe the construal of field by providing quantitative analysis of processes types, participants and circumstances to infer how ENL and PELL construe their experience in the phase of thesis, argument and conclusion stages one by one. Then, the clause complexes analysis of both write-ups was executed to explore how both writers form inter-clause link.

### *Experiential meta-function*

At Thesis stage, the subject matter and the writer's stance were analyzed by considering components of transitivity system. ENL used verbal process (V. P.) in gambit phase to reveal disagreement to the smoking ban with a personal voice by using sayers, "I" and V. P. "agree", next used Cognitive Mental process to construct critical judgement on smoking and Circumstantial identifying relational Process to develop a causal link between token "it (smoking ban)" and value "owner's discretion", at proposition phase. It highlighted writer's explicit position about the issue in a logical manner. Moreover, at evaluation stage VP "allow" and MP "going to end" supported writer's proposition in order to analyze the repercussions of smoking ban. Next in preview phase to sustain flow of discussion, ENL utilized Perceptive Mental Process "know" and sensor "you" to inform the readers about the writer's predictions about future action that could happen under the guise of smoking ban. Then, ENL demonstrated government's intrusion in the private lives of public by the usage of Material Processes (MaP) like, "end, give, monitor and passed out" and participants as actors "they (government), we(public)" and participants as goals "many issues, them and everything". Contrarily, PELL, at the proposition phase, characterized smoking as the participants: carriers like "smoking" with attributes "bad things and a bad habit" via Intensive Attributive Relational Processes (IARP) "is and became" to ban the smoking rather than creating causal links among participants. For backing the proposition, the evaluation phase was carried out through Intensive Identifying Relational Process (IIRP) "became" and Material Process "try". Dominant use of IARP in proposition phase shows that PELL has used descriptive style to show the negative impacts of smoking on the society rather than developing authoritative stance based on logics for persuasion.

Moreover, ENL used Location, Manner and Cause Circumstantial element dominantly, out of nine circumstantial element as proposed by ), to draw the attention of readers on the governmental intrusion in public private life. For instance Location (Circ. sub-category: time) "then" appeared as a marked theme to highlight the after effects on lives of people if government would be involved in banning. Then, Manner (Circ. sub-category: quality) "at all, supposedly, and at the train station" assisted ENL to build cause-effect relations between main stance and its consequences. Next ENL "in the publics' best interests" Cause (Circ. sub-category: purpose) was deployed to demonstrate writer's opinion against 'smoking ban'. PELL

used different circumstances like location (Circ. sub-category: place) “in our society” and Role (sub-category: guise) “*as a fashion*” in enlisting the side-effects of smoking on the society rather than using the circumstances for adding information to support the main stance on ‘smoking ban’.

At Argument stage, ENL and PELL discussed different reasons to justify their thesis statement by utilizing different components of transitivity system. ENL started argument about the disturbance of public's private life as the result of smoking ban at hyper-claim phase. ENL used CMeP “*don't believe*” and participant (sensor) “*I*” to portray the stance as a fact. Then, hyper-claim was further proceeded via IIRP “*is*”, to highlight that smoking ban is not government job. Further, CIRP like “*want to regulate*” was used to establish causal link between participants as token “*commercial establishments*” and participants as value “*their own establishments*” to convey that decision pertaining to smoking ban is an individual right. It was further backed by the IARP such as “*is fine*”. Next, in claim phase ENL employed CMP like “*believe*” to put forward his/her viewpoint and suggested alternate possibility to ban smoking. H/she used firstly, RP “*are interfering*” to develop chain of argument with cause-effect relation on the people's lives, by using “*the government*” as participant: token and “*ordinary people*” as participant: value. Next, suggestion for smoking ban was negotiated with PRP “*have and has*” by offering alternative option “smoking and non-smoking restaurants”. Then, ENL used CMP “*decide*” and MP “*eat*” to use costumers' democratic right “*let customers decide for themselves where they want to eat*” as an argument for his/her stance. In the support phase, the ENL utilized another effective reason chain by using different processes to establish the causal relationship between the smoking ban imposed by government and democratic norms. Finally, the restatement phase opened with MaP. processes “*elect and put*”, having people as human actors and government as non-human goal and CMP (*decide*) to persuade that it is people's right not government to decide smoking ban. Argument stage finished with IRP to identify token “*that*” and value “*democracy*” as participants. It means that writer justified its argument ‘decision made by people’ by relating it logically to democracy as another support to sustain main stance.

PELL mostly employed Attributive Relational Processes (subcategory: circumstantial) “*involve*” and intensive “*became and is*” to characterize the smoking with attributes “*bad habit, common and very harmful thing*” rather than Intensive Relational Process. This style only facilitated to narrate the impact of smoking on

youngsters through MaP (*destroy, do, finish* and *avoid*). It made PELL essay a narrative rather an argumentative essay.

In this way, it can be deduced after the comparison of both essays that ENL used dominantly relational and material processes. Relational processes define main stance with logical relation of token and value to indicate democratic rights of people and material processes demonstrate cause effect relationship between the choice and its consequences at different phases. Besides this, ENL achieved dialogic interaction with reader through mental processes about smoking ban to achieve persuasion. Contrarily, PELL majorly deployed ARP rather than creating causal relationships and interaction with reader. It might be inferred that PELL is unaware of social purpose and generic structure of argumentative essay to unfold and build up argumentation at clause level.

ENL employed various types of circumstantial element such as Location, Manner, Cause and Accompaniment, and Angle in the argument stage to add information for backing up main stance. For instance, “*seriously*” [Circ. Manner; quality] and “*far better*” [Circ. Manner; degree] were used to highlight the governmental interference in common people’s lives and suggested the government to leave this decision to owners. To enrich the claim, different circumstances “*in restaurant*” [Circ. Location; place], “*for themselves*” [Circ. Cause; purpose], “*after all*” [Circ. Accompaniment; additive], and finally “*in my opinion*” [Circ. Role; viewpoint] were exploited. PELL used a few circumstantial elements to describe how smoking is injurious to the society as “*slowly and properly*” [Circ. Manner: quality]. Hence, it can be deduced that PELL circumstantial elements were used ineffectively.

At concluding stage, ENL started conclusion stage with IARP like “*I am certain...*” to elaborate the freedom of individual with an emphasis “*certain*” to reiterate propositional stance. The consolidation, affirmation and close phases were realized through PIRP “*would have*” to negotiate the concept of respect between the people and the government. Then, VP “*being told*” and MaP “*do*” were utilized to finish the argument by expanding the perspective of proposition. However, in consolidation phase PELL used emotive MeP like “*hate*”, VP “*talk and tell*”, MaP “*finish, avoid and keep*” and IARP “*became*” processes to describe effects of smoking on the youth. Principally, no mental process is required at conclusion stage because it does not need to negotiate with readers. ELL began conclusion with mental process.

Further, IRP, VP and MeP neither make causal links nor suggest any solution to problem. Even at conclusion stage lack of argumentative style can be noticed.

Moreover, ENL employed different circumstances such as “*for the government*” [Circ. Cause; purpose], “*rather than*” [Circ. Comitative: additive], “*all the time*” [Circ. Extent: duration] circumstantial elements to reinforce the main proposition. While, PELL used circumstances such as “*always*” [Circ. Manner: degree], “*in the right path*” [Circ. Location: place] to recount the impacts of smoking on the society.

### *Logical Meta-function*

Apart from semantic components, paratactic and hypotactic relations describe how writers manipulate interdependency to achieve their purpose. Therefore, the tactic system of both writers is shown in Table. No.5

Table 5

*Tactic System in ENL and PELL's Essays*

	ENL				PELL			
Stage	Analyzed Sentences	Simplexes	Hypo tactic	Para-tactic	Analyzed Sentences	Simplexes	Hypo-tactic	Para-tactic
<b>Thesis</b>	5	1	4	0	3	1	1	1
<b>Argument</b>	7	0	4	3	8	4	3	1
<b>Conclusion</b>	1	0	1		6	4	1	1
<b>Total</b>	13	1	9	3	17	9	5	3
<b>%</b>		15.3	69.3	46.1		52.9	29.4	17.64

Table No. 5 reveals that ENL used more hypotactic relations than PELL who used more simplexes for meaning construction and rhetorical organization. ENL has overt reasoning by combining the clauses with hypo tactic relations. For example: “*I think that it should be left up to owner's discretion.*” The independent clause first packed the information then independent clause unpacked to make reasoning clear and

convincing. ENL used clause complex and simplex strategically. For instance at thesis stage, clause simplex “I don’t agree at all” announces his/her stance, then hypotactic relations were used to unfold information in compact manner. PELL employed more clause simplexes throughout the generic stages, which is spoken text style as proposed by Martin (1999). Similarly, ENL used nominalization to present densely packed information, e.g. “..., *many governments*”, “*ordinary folk’s daily lives*”. It is considered as a key feature of academic prose ( Liardét , 2018). It means that noun-dominated and lexically dense language is the primary feature of academic discourse which is prevalent in the ENL essay as compared to PELL’s essay. Therefore, it can be deduced that PELL’s lack of effective utilization of nominalization in the clause complexes reveals his/her incompetence in language skills for packing and unpacking of information at discourse the level.

Tenor of both essays was analyzed to determine what interactive mode were used by writers to present their judgements and attitudes. Interpersonal grammatical metaphors (IGMs) were explored to analyze stance and engagement of both writers. ENL deployed five IGMs to establish personal voice to negotiate certainty and veracity of thesis statement, i.e. “I think that it (smoking ban) should be left to owner’s discretion.” These expressions bring objectivity as opined by Ishikawa and Shin'ichiro (2013). Whereas, ENL writer encodes stance with metaphor of modality. Modality expands IGM to persuade reader by exploiting dialogic expansion, which is an attempt to invite and entertain readers’ as claimed by Mori (2017). PELL neither internalized voice nor attempted to externalize the voices by deploying any grammatical metaphor in the essay. It shows PELL’s inability to use dialogic interaction as a strategic device to achieve persuasion. In other words, PELL tends to write essay by presenting his/her opinions as facts.

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), mode organizes information in text with grammatical resources. It helps reader to navigate, to track the development of the main claim of essay through macro theme and hyper-theme and brings cohesion and coherence in text. Liardét (2018) claimed that thematic position orient reader for decoding of information in desired direction with specific linguistic resources in the text. For this purpose, thematic choices: topical theme, interpersonal theme and textual theme of both essays were analyzed in following section. ENL used 14 unmarked themes i.e. “*I don't believe ...*, and *I feel ...*”, It shows that ENL argues about the smoking effectively by providing personal judgement and attempts

to critically observe the issue in contrast to PELL, who employed 13 unmarked themes i.e. “*Smoking is very bad things ...; Young boys try...; our country has needed...*” for generalized description. Hence, it can be assumed that PELL is unfamiliar to construct his/her personal stance and to deploy marked theme as a sign post for the construction of a critical argument in the text. ENL utilized more marked themes: 2 conditional, one commutative additive and one purpose to engage reader by presenting main claim from different angles to validate his/her stance. Conversely, PELL deployed three temporal and one conditional marked themes. These theme did not back up authorial stance as a point of departure. It is likely to suggest that PELL is unaware of linguistic resources use to construct stance and argumentation and resulted in lack of coherence and critical insights in the essay. The analysis of interpersonal themes of both essays underlines subtle differences between ENL and PELL. ENL adequately utilized the interpersonal themes, viz. 6 % interpersonal metaphor, 8% mood-making comprising 4% imperative suggestive, and 4% Wh-devices. PELL simply used 6% mood- making devices. ENL used appropriate interpersonal grammatical metaphors in his/her essay to project evaluative stance for the given prompt by using modality responsibility scale i.e. explicit subjective (I believe), implicit subjective (I think), implicit objective (it is certain) and explicit objective (let customer). It showed that ENL overtly accepts responsibility for the attitude being expressed which is in accordance to Hawes (2015) work. PELL did not manipulate interpersonal theme and interpersonal grammatical metaphor. It might be inferred that the non-native writer does not know how to encode one's attitudinal commitment and critical judgment towards the main claims. This finding is in corroboration with numerous other researches such as (Chang & Lee, 2019), (Chang & Lee, 2019), (Al Bakaa, 2015) and (Chang & Lee, 2019).

The analysis describes that ENL employed 2 % summative conjunction, 2% verification conjunctive conjunction, 4% temporal conjunctive adjuncts (i.e. then) and finally 7% conditional conjunctive adjunct to orientate the situation in order to foreground the significant information. Conversely, PELL utilizes 6% summative conjunction for presentation of conclusion, 3% adversative conjunction “*but*” to oppose what has been said, 6% conditional conjunctive adjunct i.e. “*if*” to specify the different conditions regarding smoking ban and 10% temporal conjunctive adjunct (*then*) to list the reasons. Both writers used many conjunctions and conjunctive adjuncts, but PELL speaker did not properly used the textual themes to pack and organize the information. PELL used Most of the textual themes to describe events

rather than as a causal links. It resulted in coherence as pointed out by Liardét (2018) work. The same differences in usage of summative textual themes by PELL and ENL as reported in the work of Wei (2013) as described in the following examples:

- (a) “The people elect the government anyway, so why not put it to the people and let them and the restaurants decide?” (ENL).
- (b) “So, this is very harmful thing, which became a bad habit in our generation.” (PELL).

In example (a) ENL first presents an opinion in the first clause then summative conjunction “so” to sum up the responsibility of government to draw the conclusion in the next clause. PELL used summative conjunction at the onset place of clause (b) and did not use it to build a causal link between two clauses. It exposes PELL grammatical incompetency. Hence, it indicates that ENL used linguistic resources more efficiently to expand experiential meanings to the neighboring clauses than PELL as reported by work of Soleymanzadeha and Gholamib (2014). Similarly, inappropriate use of conditional textual theme can be observed in the following examples:

- (a) “If we allow governments to legislate everything, supposedly in the publics' best interests, then where is it going to end?” (ENL)
- (b) “If generation involve in these activities, they should destroy their country and their family.” (PELL)

In example (a), ENL first deployed the conditional conjunctive adjunct “if ” to capture the focus of reader with a condition then, h/she presented his/her opinion to back up main stance. On the contrary, PELL did not employs “If” conditional conjunctive adjunct to back up the thesis statement with argument. Since, it is clear that PELL’s was unable to maintain logical coherence and functional links between the clauses with textual themes.

### ***Text Level: Generic Structure***

#### *Macro Theme and Hyper Theme in ESL and PELL’s Essays*

The following section compares ENL and PELL utilization of macro and hyper theme. ENL used macro-theme at thesis stage, to indicate main stance .It predicts the organization of the next argument stage. Next, the hyper-theme at argument



stage connects main argument with macro-theme. Finally, the macro-rheme at the conclusion stage is reiterated to sum up the whole discussion in the essay. PELL used proposition despite of main claim in macro theme; he/she did not give any preview to indicate hyper claim at argument stage. Then, at conclusion stage, PELL did not reiterate thesis statement and macro rheme at consolidation phase to develop link with thesis stage. Hence, it can be inferred that PELL needs exposure of proper schematic structure of argumentative essay to develop flow of information in the essay.

According to Chang and Lee (2019), appropriate usage of thematic progression at the clause level creates flow of information and brings cohesion and coherence around the text. The thematic progression pattern of both essays was analyzed. It is presented in table: 15. It shows that ENL used 94% derived and 6 % constant thematic progression out of total 17 clauses and PELL used 83% constant and 17 % liner thematic progression. More deployment of constant themes denotes PELL's unawareness towards the text's underlying organization required in the argumentative writing. Invariably, ENL utilized derived thematic progression excessively, which is required to build the logical flow of arguments by connecting hyper-themes to an overall "macro-theme" of the text as cited in Wei (2013). Consider analysis in table: 6.

Table 6

*Thematic Progression Frequency in ESL and PELL's Essays*

Thematic Progression	ENL	Percentage	PELL	percentage
Total clauses	17		24	0
Derived theme-rheme	16	94%	0	0
Constant theme-rheme	1	6%	20	83%
Linear Thematic Progression	0	0	4	17 %

Table 6 shows that ENL gave priority to derived thematic progression to achieve cumulative force of different clause to solid argumentation. PELL used majorly constant thematic progression. It reveals writer's lack of content knowledge of the given prompt as corroborated by numerous researches(Chang & Lee, 2019; Hawes,

2015; Promwini, 2010). PELL needs exposure to argument literature as claimed by Crowhurst (1990) to learn better argumentation skills.

### **Findings**

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate PELL deficiency in linguistic resources usage for effective argumentation by comparing with ENL essay's all generic stages and phases. After thorough research, it is observed that ENL performed better due to greater linguistic competency and better capability to control generic stages of argumentative essay. Firstly, at discursive level, PELL as compared to ENL, did not exploit argumentative schematic structures proposed by Hyland (1990) effectively to direct the knowledge of linguistic resources for construction of desired meanings in the essay. Secondly, at clause level, PELL did not construct desired ideational, interpersonal and textual meta-functions to realize appropriate register variables with reference to main issue of prompt and casual links via ideational relational processes, dialogic expansion to achieve persuasion through subjective IGM. Finally, PELL did not organize logical message with linear and derived thematic progression. Findings exposed learning gaps in PELL argumentative writing skills and linguistic competency. They need conscious effort at institutional setting as endorsed by Kachru (2001).

### **Conclusion**

In such scenario, genre pedagogy with reading to learning approach, as recommended by Rose and Martin (2012) for international PELLs, might be a rational pedagogy to support PELL's argumentative writing skills development at tertiary level in L2 context as well. Although the case study analysis could not be generalized beyond the specific learners and context, this work has potential to call research at large sampling level to generalize the findings and advocate for the adoption of generic pedagogy for the development of argumentative writing skills of Pakistani PELLs.

### References

- Al Bakaa, A. J. (2015). Functional analysis of marked and unmarked theme in demonstrating a critical argument written by iraqi and australian postgraduate students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 247-254.
- Bhatia. (1993). *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. New York: longmann.
- Bhatia. (2002). Applied genre analysis: a multi-perspective model. *Iberica*, 4, 3-19.
- Chang, P., & Lee, M. (2019). Exploring textual and interpersonal themes in the expository essays of college students of different linguistic backgrounds. *English for Specific Purpose*, 54, 75-90.
- Cheng, F. W., & Chiu, M. C. (2018). Scaffolding chinese as a second language writing through a systemic functional linguistics approach. doi:10.1016/j.system.2017.11.003
- Coffin, C. (2004). Arguing about how the world is or how the world should be : the role of srgument in IELTS tests. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(3), 229-246.
- Coffin, C., & Donohue, J. P. (2012). Academic literacies and systemic functional linguistics: How do they relate? . *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11, 64-75.
- Crowhurst, M. (1990). Teaching and learning the writing of persuasive/argumentative discourse. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 15(4), 348-359.
- Dreyfus, & Macnaught, L. (2013). Joint Construction in the SLATE project. *Linguistics and Human Sciences*(Special Edition), 77-99.
- Halliday. (1996). Literacy and Linguistics: A functional perspective. In R. H. a. G. Williams (Ed.), *Literacy in Society* (pp. 339-376). London: Longman.
- Halliday. (2003). The Language of Early Childhood. In J. Webster (Ed.), *Collected Works of M.A.K Halliday* (Vol. 4). London: Continuum.

- Halliday, & Matthiessen. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Hawes, Z., Tepylo, D., & Moss, J. (2015). Developing spatial thinking. In B. Davis (Ed.), *Spatial reasoning in the early years: Principles, assertions, and speculations* (pp. 29). New York: Routledge.
- Humphrey, Martin, Dreyfus, & Mahboob. (2010). The 3x3: Setting up a linguistic Toolbox for teaching Academic Writing. In A . Mehboob & N. Knight (Eds.), *Applicable Linguistics: Reclaiming the Place of Language in Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (1990). A genre description of the argumentative essay. *RELC Journal*, 2(1), 66-78.
- Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and Invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(8), 1091-1112.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in Three Traditions: Implications ffor ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(4), 693-722.
- Ishikawa, & Shinichiro. (2013). The ICNALE and sophisticated contrastive interlanguage analysis of Asian learners of English. . *Kobe University, Learner Corpus Studies in Asia and the World*.
- Kachru, B. (2001). Models of World Englishes *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and ELT* (pp. 27-37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liardét, C. L. (2018). As we all know': Examining Chinese EFL learners' use of interpersonal grammatical metaphor in academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 50, 64-80.
- Martin. (1985). *Factual Writing: Exploring and challenging Social Reality*. Waurn Ponds , Victoria: Deakin University.

- Martin. (1999). Mentoring Semogenesis: 'genre-based' literacy pedagogy *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness: Linguistic and Social Processes* (pp. 123-155). London: Casell (Open Linguistics Series).
- Martin. (2008). genre and Language learning: A social simotic perspect. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(10-21).
- Martin, & Rose. (2008). *Genre Relations : Mapping Culture*. London ; Oakville, CT . Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Martin, & Rose, D. (2007). Interacting with text: the role of dialogue in learning to read and write. *Foreign Languages in China*, 5(4), 66-80.
- Mori, M. (2017). Using the Appraisal framework to analyze source use in essays: a case study of engagement and dialogism in two undergraduate students' writing. *La Linguistique Journal of the International Society for Functional Linguistics*, 4(1), 4-11. doi: 10.1186/s40554-017-0046-4
- Nagao, A. (2019). The SFL genre based approach to writing in EFL contexts. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 4.
- Paltridge. (2007). Approaches to Genre in ELT. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching* (Vol. 15, pp. 931-943). USA: Springer.
- Promwinai, P. (2010). *The demand of argumentative essay writting: Experiences of Thai tertiary students*. (PhD), University of Wollongong. Retrieved from <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3298/>
- Rose, & Martin. (2012). *Learning to Write, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School*. London: Equinox.
- Sajid, M., & Ahmed, J., S. (2015). Lack of Academic Writing Skills in English Language at Higher Eduction Level in Pakistan: Causes, Effects and remedies. *International Journal of language and Linguistics*, 2(4), 174-186.
- Schleppegrell. (2006). The linguistic features of advanced language use: The grammar of exposition. In M. Scheleppegrell (Ed.), *Advanced Language Learning: The*

*Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 134-146): University of Wollongong library e-reading.

- Soleymanzadeh, L., & Gholami, J. (2014). Scoring argumentative essays based on thematic progression patterns and ielts analytic scoring criteria. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1181-1819. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.610
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wei, J. (2013). Corpus based research on the development of theme choices in Chinese learners' English speech. *Journal of eEducation and Practice*, 4(16), 38-45.