

TEXTUAL AND LANGUAGE FEATURES OF STUDENTS' WRITTEN DISCUSSION TEXTS

Su-Hie Ting¹

Ai-Sze Chai²

¹Centre for Language Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

²State Education Department, Sarawak

¹shting@cls.unimas.my

²alison_ice03@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study examined textual and language features of discussion texts written by university students. The discussion texts were written by 100 students enrolled in an English for Academic Purposes course at a Malaysian university. The advantages-disadvantages essay was analysed using Feez's (1998) framework for discussion texts. The results showed that about half of the students were unable to state the issue clearly in the introduction and assess the issue based on foregoing arguments in the conclusion. For the arguments, the topic sentences and supporting details were satisfactory. Analysis of the language features in the student discussion texts revealed that conditional clauses were seldom used to present hypothetical situations to move the arguments forward but connectors were frequently used, particularly "because". More causal connectors were used than sequential connectors because of the need for reasoning in discussion texts. Shifts in arguments were signaled using adversative connectors but these were used less frequently than additive connectors for connecting similar ideas. The discussion texts were also characterised by the frequent use of modal verbs for hedging and boosting, mainly "can" and "will". The study shows that while the student texts had the relevant language features of discussions, they sometimes lacked the characteristic textual structure of discussion texts.

Keywords: English for Academic Purposes, academic writing, discussion, argumentative texts, exposition, textual structure

Introduction

Expository texts encompass both argumentative texts requiring the writer to take a stance on the issue and discussion texts requiring a balanced discussion of the issue at hand (Derewianka, 1991, 2003; Jenkins & Pico, 2007; Feez, 1998). Examples of argumentative expositions include editorials, letters to the editor, sermons, political

speeches and debates (Martin et al., 1983) whereas discussions include talk shows and forums on issues. In Derewianka's (1991) words, argument and discussion belong to a "genre group called 'Exposition', concerned with the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of the world around us" (p. 75). In this paper, expository texts do not include explanations of processes, following the definition of Derewianka (1991, 2003). Research on expository texts has largely focused on comprehension (e.g., Hall, Sabey, & McClellan, 2005; Weaver & Byrant, 1995), some involving recall (e.g., Hidi & Baird, 1988; Wolfe, 2005).

Another focus is the writing of expository texts and, for this the writing of argumentative texts has been studied more than the writing of discussion texts. For example, Lee (2005) found that East-Asian students are not as successful as Australian-born native speakers of English in showing audience awareness through the argument structure and interpersonal components of language features. Another study identified the problem with the argument structure. From their analysis of the writing of English majors in Argentina and students learning English for the purposes of pursuing post-secondary education or re-entering a profession in Australia, Jenkins and Pico (2007) found that the difficulty lies in the introductions and conclusions for the weaker writers. Similar findings on the argument structure were reported by Ting, Raslie, and Jee (2011). Based on their analysis of argument texts in the form of Letters to the Editor written by proficient and less proficient Malaysian learners, they reported that learners with lower English proficiency could not state and restate the stance clearly, and some omitted these crucial stages. Both groups of learners hardly used conditionals and nominalisations to move their arguments forward but their language proficiency made a difference in the use of other persuasive language features. The less proficient learners also used fewer and a narrower range of connectors in their argument texts to signal transition in ideas, relying mainly on "because". The results also showed that although proficient and less proficient learners did not differ much in the frequency of modal verbs used, the less proficient learners tended to use "need", "would" and "must" to convey strong meanings of necessity while the proficient learners preferred "will" and "should". The study also showed that the less proficient learners were not as adept as proficient learners in using modal verbs (e.g., could, may, might) to signal remote possibility. Use of modality is not easy – even academics who are non-native speakers of English sometimes use modal verbs inappropriately in their research articles (Flowerdew, 2001; Guinda, 2003). Other differences in patterns of using modality in argumentative texts have been found. For example, Japanese students used downtoning expressions in their argumentative texts whereas American students use emphatic devices (Kamimura & Oi, 1998).

In comparison to argumentative texts, the writing of discussion texts has received less research attention. A literature search using "discussion" as one of the key words led to studies on the discussion section of research articles rather than discussion of issues, and searches of expository texts led to articles on argumentative texts. In view of the paucity of research on discussion texts, studies are needed because although both argument and discussion texts make use of persuasive language features such as connectivity, transitivity and modality (Jenkins & Pico, 2007), their textual structure is different. Argument texts begin with a

statement of the stance taken on the issue and closes with a restatement of the stance after arguments have been put forward. However, discussion texts begin with an open statement of the issue for discussion and do not include a stance. Feez (1998) outlines the following as essential elements of discussion texts: Statement of Issue, Arguments for and against, and Assessment/Recommendation (p. 99). In the conclusion of discussion texts, the foregoing arguments presented on the issue are assessed and a recommendation may be made. Since the textual structure of discussion texts differs from argument texts, the findings on learner difficulties with argument textual structure may not be applicable. Hence, studies are needed to throw light on areas which may compromise the effectiveness of discussion texts. The importance of teaching students expository writing cannot be emphasised enough. In Martin et al.'s (1983) words, "exposition has an important place in our culture – particularly in our education system where students' lives quite literally depend on their mastery of this genre in evaluation situations towards the end of secondary and throughout tertiary education" (p. 91).

The study examined university students' writing of discussion texts from the aspects of textual structure and language features, focusing on conjunctions, modality and conditional clauses.

Method of Study

The discussion texts analysed in this study were written by 100 students enrolled in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course at a Malaysian university. The students from different language backgrounds, aged 21 to 22, were in their second or third year of their degree and from different disciplines. These students had spent about 12 years learning English in school before entering university.

In the EAP course, the students learnt to write these academic genres: classification, explanation and discussion. They were also taught to cite authoritative sources in their writing using the American Psychological Association style. Each academic genre was covered in 12 hours, spread across three weeks. Vygotsky's (1978) notion of scaffolding was adopted whereby the instructor built up students' background knowledge on the topic (general knowledge and vocabulary) and genre in the initial field-building stage, followed by a modeling or text deconstruction stage in which the instructor explained the textual structure and language features of the genre using sample texts (Appendix 1), and this was followed by joint and finally independent construction of the text (for details, see James, Chua, & Lim, 2007).

The topic of the discussion text analysed in this study was "advantages and disadvantages of human dependency on computers". The framework for analysing the textual structure of discussion texts was taken from Feez (1998). The student discussion texts were analysed for the presence and absence of the following stages: Statement of Issue, Arguments for and against, and Assessment/Recommendation. If the arguments were repeats of earlier arguments, they were not counted as appropriate arguments the second time.

In this study, the language features analysed were conjunctions, modality and conditional clauses. Feez (1998) listed modal verbs, conditional clauses and

reader engagement strategies as important in discussion texts. Reader engagement strategies were not analysed as they could take various forms such as second person pronouns, imperatives, question forms and asides (Hyland, 2001). Instead conjunctions were included in the analysis because Derewianka (1991) had stated that connectors associated with reasoning to express cause-and-effect are more commonly used than sequence connectors in expository texts. For conjunctions, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman's (1999) categorisation was used: additive, adversative, causal, and sequential. For additive and adversative connectors, only those used in the sentence initial positions were counted but not those in inter-clausal positions (e.g., "and", "also", "but"), as illustrated in the following examples:

- "The dependency on computers has both advantages and disadvantages" (Text 47)
- "They feel that computer networking, also known as the internet, helps their business grow faster" (Text 12)
- "Computers have revolutionized the world, and we have become dependent on computers – even computers give advantages but we can argue in many ways" (Text 11)

Care was also taken to ensure that "since" for indicating reasoning and "since" for indicating duration (e.g., since the creation and revolution of computers) were appropriately identified as causal and sequential connectors respectively. Use of modality in the student discussion texts was analysed by counting the frequency of "can", "could", "shall", "should", "will", "would", "may", "might" and "must". The percentages with which each of these modal verbs were used was computed to identify the more frequently used modal verbs.

Results and Discussion

In this section, excerpts from student discussion texts are included to illustrate the use and the texts are referred to as Text 1 to Text 100. See Appendix 2 for sample student discussion text, marked for textual structure and language features.

Structure of discussion texts

In this study, the discussion texts were analysed for the presence or absence of required stages. The results showed only 47 of 100 students clearly stated the issue (Table 1). The remaining 53 students either stated a different issue from what was presented in the question (34) or took a stance on the issue (19). If the deviation in content is disregarded, this means that 81 students began their discussion texts with a statement of the issue, showing awareness of the compulsory nature of this initial stage.

Table 1
Presence of stages in discussion texts

Stages of discussion	Frequency
Issue	47
Argument 1 –point	98
• Elaboration	98
Argument 2 – point	90
• Elaboration	92
Argument 3 – point	32
• Elaboration	28
Argument 4 – point	29
• Elaboration	29
Assessment	40

Table 1 shows that more than 90 students constructed the first two arguments appropriately, and these were usually positive points to show human dependency on computers. In contrast, the students found it more difficult to argue that humans have not become dependent on computers in certain aspects of their lives such as in counseling (Arguments 3 and 4). Less than one-third of the students were able to present the counter-arguments appropriately (32 for Argument 3 and 29 for Argument 4). They strayed into presenting negative effects arising from misuse of computers and the general weaknesses of computers (e.g., virus attack, loss of files and high cost). The problem could be topic-related as students were more familiar with ways how computers have benefitted the world but not the counter-argument.

The students did not write the closing of the discussion as well as the introduction in that only 40 students wrote an assessment of arguments presented for the issue. Example 1 indicates that the student had a good grasp of the issue discussed:

Example 1

In conclusion, after considering the arguments against and arguments for, I suggest that people are not fully dependent on computers. Computers only needed when they have some problems or work to do. But for some reason, people may become dependent on computer because they are too lazy to think and find solutions for their work. So, people must consider the attitude of the people who using computers before make a conclusion or decisions. (Text 64)

Closures similar to Example 1 assess the foregoing arguments but conclusions like Example 2 takes a definite stance and are more reflective of argumentative texts:

Example 2

Thus, in summary we can see that in terms of production, we depend on computer to increase our production. In addition, we also use computer to surf the internet to get information and communicate with others. However,

not every people in this world can afford to buy a computer. Furthermore, some people do not know how to operate a computer. Therefore after examining all the arguments, the statement 'computers have revolutionised the world and we have become dependent on computers', we should learn more about computers so that we can fully maximise the function of computers. (Text 75)

Besides these two types of conclusions, there were others which either deviated from the issue or were general conclusions along the line of "There are advantages and disadvantages of human dependency on computers" which could be written without referring to any of the arguments raised earlier.

The results on students' difficulty with introductions and conclusions concurred with the findings of other studies on argumentative texts (Jenkins & Pico, 2007; Ting, et al., 2011). It seems that regardless of the type of expository text, students tend to write introductions and conclusions which are not specific to the purpose of texts. If the introduction identifies the issue clearly, this provides a focus for readers to evaluate the viewpoints on the issue. If the conclusion assesses the viewpoints presented, then readers would have a clear idea of the arguments without even reading through the whole discussion text. Other studies have shown that university students have similar problems in writing focused introductions and conclusions for explanations (Ting, Campbell, Law, & Hong, 2013; Ting & Tee, 2009). Researchers have attributed the problem of general introductions and conclusions to instruction on the tripartite structure of general discursive essays (introduction-body-conclusion) which does not take into account the communicative purpose of the text (see Cahill, 2003; Gautreau et al., 1986; Liu, 2005). For a start, students need to be alerted to the fact that introductions and conclusions vary with the intended message of the text. Then they need to be taught the textual structure of common types of academic texts that they are expected to write at university (e.g., explanation, research articles) so that they can organise the content appropriately to achieve the purpose of the text effectively. Teaching students the conventional textual structure of common types of academic texts is a good starting point to help them master the conventions as well as understand how the textual structure enable the texts to achieve the intended purpose.

Language features of discussion texts

In this section, results are presented for the three language features of discussion texts: conditional clauses, modal verbs and connectors.

Conditional clauses. Out of 100 discussion texts analysed, only 35 students used conditional clauses. "If ... then" statements were used by 29 students once, two times by four students, and three times by two students. The only type of conditional sentence used was the "if + simple present + will (verb)" to express likelihood and possibility of the condition to be fulfilled. For instance, "if the computer doesn't work, the people will be afraid and frustrated" (Text 37). The use of the present/indicative if-conditional frames the condition as factual. The students did not use other conditional constructions such as "if + future/subjunctive" (e.g., If

it rains, they will cancel the game) or “if + past imperfect/subjunctive” (e.g., If it rained, they would cancel the game) to frame the condition as hypothetical (see Ferrari, 2002). Conditional clauses open up possibilities in logical reasoning and are useful as an alternative to using facts as evidence to support arguments. In the context of research articles, if-conditionals are found to have an interpersonal role in the discussion section:

to guide the reader’s interpretation while allowing for a certain degree of independence in reaching the conclusions, to engage the reader by leaving some questions open for further discussion, to negotiate terms and concepts, to ward off possible criticism, to signal problem areas, to acknowledge other points of view or potential threats to the cogency of argumentation, and to involve the readers by directly soliciting their approval. (Warchal, 2010, p. 140)

In the discussion section of research articles, researchers assess the viability of alternative interpretations of results. Thus, in the context of discussions, and expository texts in general, if-conditionals are useful to limit the assertiveness of a claim by making its validity conditional on some other premises and also as emphatics to promote a claim to the status of the obvious once another claim is accepted (Warchal, 2010). However, the potential of if-conditionals in handling claims in arguments was not fully exploited in the student discussion texts.

Modal verbs. The students frequently used modal verbs for cohesion in their discussion texts, at an average of 95.3 modal verbs in a text of about 250 words (Table 2). The most frequently used modal verb was “can” (55.8%). For example, “People can complete their work easily ...” (Text 23). As a marker of modality, “can” here could mean a high level of probability but as a marker of modulation, it would mean a median to high degree of obligation or inclination (Martin et al., 1983). The students’ intended purposes for using “can” in their discussion texts were not investigated and, as such, the potential ambiguity in the functions of “can” could not be resolved. It is also possible that the students might not be sure of the exact meanings intended because Neff-van Aertselaer and Dafouz-Milne (2008) found that non-native writers use “can” in a dynamic sense with variable meanings whereas native writers use “can” more to denote definite possibility to present a change from problem to solution. Neff-van Aertselaer and Dafouz-Milne came to this conclusion based on their analysis of editorials, a type of argumentative text, written by American university writers and Spanish non-native speakers of English. In a related study, Neff et al. (2003) found that “can” was overused by non-native speakers of English (Italian, Spanish, Dutch, French, and German), in descending order of frequency.

Table 2
Frequency of language features of discussion texts

Modal verbs	Frequency	Percentage
Can	532	55.8
Will	217	22.8
May	57	6.0
Must	39	4.1
Could	33	3.5
Should	33	3.5
Might	30	3.1
Would	11	1.1
Shall	1	0.1
Total	953	100.0

The rather extensive use of “will” in the student discussion texts needs to be interpreted with the knowledge that for the Malaysian variety of English, the future tense marker is often used in place of the present tense to express a statement of fact (Checketts, 1999; Nair-Venugopal, 2003). For instance, “without computers, these presenters will not be able to present well” (Text 34). In view of the localised use of English, “will” may not carry meanings of certainty and the high frequency of “will” in comparison to “would” cannot be concluded as a deliberate choice between certainty and possibility.

A closer examination of Table 2 shows that the modal verbs were mainly used for hedging (“can”, “may”, “could”, “might”) rather than boosting (“will”, “must”, “should”). By hedging, the students avoided sweeping generalisations and unqualified claims that would jeopardise their arguments. The inclination towards modal verbs for hedging is partly because discussions does not require advocacy of action which is more common in argumentative texts. The findings of Ting et al. (2011) support this conclusion because their study was on argument texts and more modal verbs were used for emphasis rather than hedging. Use of modal verbs for mitigation rather than assertiveness is a characteristic of non-adversarial argumentation according to Helms-Park and Stapleton (2003).

Connectors. Table 3 shows that the most frequently connectors are causal connectors (309 occurrences or 34.56% of 894 connectors). More causal connectors are used than sequential connectors because discussion involves reasoning rather than ordering of events as in explanations of processes. The results provide empirical evidence to substantiate Derewianka’s (1991) claim on the greater relevance of causal connectors than sequential connectors in expository texts. Among the causal connectors, “because” is the most popular causal connector (146 occurrences or 47.25% of causal connectors). The students tended to introduce reasons using this sentence structure, “This is because ...”. The other causal connectors (“so”, “since”, “therefore”, “as a result”, “hence” and “consequently”) were used in sentence-initial positions.

Table 3
Frequency of connectors used in discussion texts

Category	Connectors	Frequency	Percentage	Total
Causal connectors	Because	146	47.25	309
	Thus	48	15.53	
	So	35	11.33	
	Since (reason)	30	9.71	
	Therefore	26	8.41	
	As a result	14	4.53	
	Hence	9	2.91	
	Consequently	1	0.33	
Additive connectors	Besides (that)	108	49.77	217
	In addition	46	21.20	
	Furthermore	37	17.05	
	Moreover	26	11.98	
Sequential connectors	When	57	29.23	195
	In conclusion	39	20.00	
	first(ly)	34	17.44	
	Since	30	15.39	
	Secondly	14	7.18	
	Finally	9	4.61	
	In summary	9	4.61	
	In a nut shell	3	1.54	
Adversative connectors	However	76	43.93	173
	On the other hand	54	31.21	
	Although	13	7.51	
	Instead	10	5.78	
	Even though	8	4.63	
	Apart from that	8	4.63	
	In contrast	3	1.73	
	Despite	1	0.58	
Total		894		894

Sequential connectors were mainly used to mark the co-occurrence of circumstances and the conclusion of the discussion text. In fact, “when” is the most frequently used sequential connector, accounting for 29.23% of 195 sequential connectors. “When” is useful for linking clauses in elaboration of arguments. For example, “This can minimise time for work where we do not need to send letter to the post office when we can just e-mail them to the respective persons” (Text 3). “When” may appear either at the beginning or in the middle of the sentence but the sequential connectors for signaling summary were all placed in sentence initial positions. “In conclusion”, “finally”, “in summary”, “in a nut shell” constituted 30.77% of sequential connectors used by students in their discussion texts (Table 3). The range is extensive compared to connectors used for signaling their first two arguments (“first(ly)”, and “second(ly)”).

The analysis revealed that the students used a larger variety but lower frequency of adversative connectors than additive connectors. The most frequently used adversative connectors are “however” (76 times or 43.93% of 173 adversative

connectors) and “on the other hand” (54 times or 31.21%) (Table 3). Besides these, another six adversative connectors were used to signal counterclaims (“although”, “instead”, “even though”, “apart from that”, “in contrast” and “despite”). On the other hand, to signal addition of similar ideas, the students depended on “besides” (108 times or 49.77% of 217 additive connectors). Only three other additive connectors were identified from the analysis, namely, “in addition”, “furthermore” and “moreover”. While both additive and adversative connectors are needed to signpost advantages and disadvantages of human dependency on computers respectively, the larger number of additive connectors indicates that the positive aspects of human need for computers were elaborated in more detail than the negative aspects of human dependency on computers. The textual organisation results also showed that the pros (Arguments 1 and 2) were written better than the cons (Arguments 3 and 4), and this seems to be reflected by the higher frequency of additive connectors. Generally, the English-speaking discourse community uses more adversative markers than additive markers because they use a retrogressive strategy which requires writers to present “different sides of argumentation to reach a plausible result” (Neff-van Aertselaer & Dafouz-Milne, 2008, p. 95). The results suggest that to develop good counterarguments, adversative connectors are necessary.

From the aspect of language features, the results suggest that the students do not have much difficulty with the lexicogrammatical features of discussion texts. Connectors are used frequently to mark connections and relationships between ideas in an argument, and the only weakness lies in the reliance on a few connectors, notably “because”, “besides”, “when” and “however”. Jenkins and Pico (2007) attributed the ease with which students insert connectors in their argumentative writing to the discrete nature of connectors but they noted that the learners may have difficulty mastering the semantics and usage as evidenced by the use of “moreover” in place of “in addition” by many Hong Kong students in Australia. In terms of frequency, the students also did not have problems inserting modal verbs in their discussion texts and they shifted between modal verbs for hedging and boosting but whether they were aware of the role of modality in signaling the writer’s attitude was not examined in this study. It is highly possible that the university students in this study were also unsure about the attitudinal meanings of modal verbs that they were using. Appropriate and accurate use of connectors and modality is an area worth future investigation.

Conclusion

The study showed that the university students had more difficulty producing the textual structure of a conventional discussion text than using persuasive language features to discuss the issue. The difficulty with the textual structure lies in the unclear statement of the issue in the introduction and unsatisfactory assessment of foregoing arguments in the conclusion. The findings suggest that while it is important to teach the conventional structure of discussion texts, and expository texts for that matter, adequate practice may be needed to internalise the production of the conventional structure, without which the effectiveness of the

text would be compromised. Out of the three language features analysed, only the conditional clause was minimally used in the discussion text but a high frequency of modal verbs and connectors were used. The findings suggest that to develop the university students' academic language further, it is not adequate to teach students to insert modal verbs and connectors in their writing but to emphasise the semantics and usage to ensure appropriate usage to convey intended attitudinal and propositional meanings.

This study has succeeded in identifying the textual and language features which need attention when teaching students to write discussion texts, and the findings suggest that consciousness-raising on the conventional discourse features of different types of texts need to take real-life communicative situations and roles into account. Although the study did not investigate the approach for raising language awareness, the literature is not lacking on suggestions to implement this from established researchers in the field. Bhatia (1991), for instance, explains how business writing materials can incorporate genre analysis and input from the specialist informant who is familiar with the institutional context that governs the use of language. Breeze (2006) showed through an experimental study that even with short intensive writing programmes of this nature, students can "make rapid progress on aspects such as register or metadiscourse, seemingly independently of issues such as grammatical accuracy" (p. 446). Undoubtedly, some researchers are of the view that teaching conventionalised genres of writing restricts creativity in writing (e.g., Freedman, 1994; Kay & Dudley-Evans, 1998) whereas others such as Thompson (2001) advocate combining discourse analysis with teaching of writing skills to deconstruct "the mystique of effective writing" as it is "an essential step in progressing from novice to initiate" (p. 96). Suffice it is to say that helping students to see how texts work through textual and lexicogrammatical choices is more time-saving than learning through trial and error and by immersion in the respective discourse communities.

References

- Bhatia, V. K. (1991). A genre-based approach to ESP materials. *World Englishes*, 10(2), 153-166.
- Breeze, R. (2006). *A contrastive approach to genre-based pedagogies*. Retrieved from <http://www.unizar.es/aelfe2006/ALEFE06/02.%20didactics/61.pdf>
- Cahill, D. (2003). The myth of the "turn" in contrastive rhetoric. *Written Communication* 20(2), 170-194.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *Grammar book*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Checketts, S. (1999). *On the tip of my tongue: Insights into some things English*. Subang Jaya, Malaysia: Pelanduk.
- Derewianka, B. (1991). *Exploring how texts work*. Newtown, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Derewianka, B. (2003). Trends and issues in genre-based approaches. *RELJ Journal*, 34(2), 133. Retrieved from <http://rel.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/34/2/133>

- Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. Sydney, Australia: Macquarie University.
- Ferrari, L. V. (2002). A sociocognitive approach to modality and conditional constructions in Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 1(3). Retrieved from http://www.shakespeare.uk.net/journal/1_3/ferrari1_3.html
- Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 121-150.
- Freedman, A. (1994). "Do as I say": The relationship between teaching and learning new genres. In A. Freedman & P. Medways (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 191-210). London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Gautreau, A. L., Averett, J. B., Trusock, D., McFerren, S. E., Phipps, C., Lynch, M. ... Speer, L. W. (1986). Our readers write: What's a practical idea for teaching organization in writing? *The English Journal*, 75(5), 61-68. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/818208.pdf?acceptTC=true>
- Guinda, C. S. (2003). Contractual role of modality as convergence strategy in technical research articles. *RAEL: revista electrónica de lingüística aplicada*, 16, 219-233.
- Hall, K. M., Sabey, B. L., & McClellan, M. (2005). Expository text comprehension: Helping primary-grade teachers use expository texts to full advantage. *Reading Psychology*, 26(3), 211-234. doi:10.1080/02702710590962550
- Helms-Park, R., & Stapleton, P. (2003). Questioning the importance of individualized voice in undergraduate L2 argumentative writing: An empirical study with pedagogical implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 245-265.
- Hidi, S., & Baird, W. (1988). Strategies for increasing text-based interest and students' recall of expository texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(4), 465-483.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic articles. *Written Communication*, 18(4), 549-574.
- James, J. E., Chua, F. D., & Lim, P. L. P. (2007). *Applying a socio-cognitive model to the teaching of expository writing: A pedagogy for shaping student thinking and genre practice*. Proceedings of the Redesigning Pedagogy: Culture, Knowledge and Understanding Conference, Singapore.
- Jenkins, H. H., & Pico, M. L. (2007). *SFL and argumentative essays in ESOL*. In B. Leila & T. B. Sardinha (Eds.), Proceedings of the 33rd International Systemic Functional Congress, PUCSP, São Paulo, Brazil. Retrieved from <http://www.pucsp.br/isfc>
- Kamimura, T., & Oi, K. (1998). Argumentative strategies in American and Japanese English. *World Englishes*, 17(3), 307-323.
- Kay, H., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1998). Genre: What teachers think. *ELT Journal*, 52(4), 308-314.
- Lee, S. H. (2005). The use of interactional resources in argumentative/persuasive essays (APEs) by tertiary ESL students: A critical perspective. In T. Lé & M. Short (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory into research* (pp. 379-403). Launceston, Tasmania, Australia: University Tasmania.

- Lee, S. H. (2006). The use of interpersonal resources in argumentative/persuasive essays by East-Asian ESL and Australian tertiary students. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sydney, Australia.
- Liu, L. (2005). Rhetorical education through writing instruction across cultures: A comparative analysis of select online instructional materials on argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(1), 1-18.
- Martin, J. R., Peters, P., Clyne, M., Borel de Bitche, R., Eagleson, R., Maclean, R., Nelson, J., & Smith, J. (1983). On analysis of exposition. In R. Hasan (Ed.), *Discourse on discourse: Workshop report from the Macquarie Workshop on Discourse Analysis, Occasional Papers Number 7* (pp. 61-92). Wollongong, N. S. W.: Applied Linguistic Association of Australia.
- Nair-Venugopal, S. (2003). Malaysian English, normativity, and workplace interactions. *World Englishes*, 22(1), 15-19.
- Neff-van Aertselaer, J. A., & Dafouz-Milne, E. (2008). Argumentation patterns in different languages: An analysis of metadiscourse markers in English and Spanish texts. In M. Pütz & J. A. Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 87-102). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Neff, J., Dafouz, E., Herrera, H., Martinez, F., Rica, J. P., Diez, M., Prieto, R., & Sancho, C. (2003). Contrasting learner corpora: The use of modal and reporting verbs in the expression of writer stance. In S. Granger & S. Petch-Tyson (Eds.), *Extending the scope of corpus-based research: New applications, new challenges* (pp. 211-230). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: Learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 58-78.
- Ting, S. H., Campbell, Y. M., Law, L., & Hong, H. H. (2013). Explanations without a purpose? Genre-based instruction and academic writing. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 7(1), A26-A39.
- Ting, S. H., Raslie, H., & Jee, L. J. (2011). Case study on persuasiveness of argument texts written by proficient and less proficient Malaysian undergraduates. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 8, 71-92.
- Ting, S. H., & Tee, F. P. F. (2009, April). *Organisational and grammatical features of explanations written by Biology undergraduates*. Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on English Language Learning Conference (ELT-CON 2009), Georgetown, Malaysia.
- Weaver, C. A., III, & Bryant, D. S. (1995). Monitoring of comprehension: The role of text difficulty in metamemory for narrative and expository text. *Memory & Cognition*, 23, 12-22.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Warchal, K. (2010). Moulding interpersonal relations through conditional clauses: Consensus- building strategies in written academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(2), 140-150.
- Wolfe, M. B. W. (2005). Memory for narrative and expository text: Independent influences of semantic associations and text organization. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 31(2), 359-364.

Appendix 1: Sample of deconstructed discussion text

The Pros and Cons of Human Cloning

Introduction

Background Info When Dolly, the first cloned sheep became news, cloning interested the masses. Not only did researchers investigate deeper into the subject but even the common people showed great interest in knowing all about how cloning had been done. *Most of us want to know the pros and cons of cloning, its advantages to society and its potential risks to mankind.* While cloning **can** solve infertility problems and enhance genetic studies, it also causes controversies related to human rights and religion.

Statement of Issue (italicised)

Preview (underlined)

Body

Argument For No. 1 The first advantage of human cloning is that it provides a solution to infertility. Cloning has the potential of serving as an option for producing children especially for couples who **cannot** have a child. Cloning **may** make it possible to reproduce a certain trait in human beings. Therefore, cloning enables childless couples to have children with some of their traits.

Argument For No. 2 Furthermore, the second advantage of human cloning technologies is its usefulness to researchers in genetics. They **might** be able to understand the composition of genes and the effects of genetic constituents on human traits in a better manner. Thus, it simplifies their analysis of genes. The cloning technology allows researchers to eventually combat a wide range of genetic diseases.

Argument Against No. 1

However, one disadvantage of human cloning is that it puts human rights at stake. It remains unclear as to whether cloning **may** fit into our ethical and moral principles. Cloning leave man just another man-made being. It **can** devalue human kind and human beings **might** end up being a product as human beings with better traits **would** be sought after as materials for cloning whereas those with poor traits **would** be side-lined.

Argument Against No. 2

Another disadvantage of human cloning is that it challenges and questions the religious beliefs. It has been argued that cloning is equal to emulating God. Many religious groups have stated that religions prohibit human from trying to imitate the act of God by recreating themselves. Hence, it **would** be a very controversial issue **IF** human cloning is allowed and people are allowed to make other human beings.

Conclusion

Assessment of issue To conclude, it is clear that human cloning **can** solve problems related to infertility and genetics research but it is also ethically and religiously wrong. Thus, researchers **should** weigh the pros and cons of such act before promoting its use to the world.

Language features:

Modal verbs (bolded); connectors (boxed); conditional clauses (capitalised and bolded)

Appendix 2: Sample student discussion text

In discussing the impacts of computers, it is necessary to examine a number of arguments for and against before making a decision.

Since the innovation of computers few decades ago, history of human being has been turned into new era which is era of technology. Gradually, computers become vital in the life of human being.

Issue is stated but not accurate – human dependency on computers is not mentioned.
No preview of arguments.

First of all, computers are utilized in most of the daily matters in human life. Computers are the necessary tools in the life of human whereby human use it for various purposes such as communication, finding information, entertainment and working as well. Such functions bring by the computers make it widely used in the life of human. After all, multifunctions of computers have lead human depend more on the computers.

Argument For No. 1 – main point and elaboration are satisfactory

The conveniences bring by the computers enhanced the degree of dependent of human on the computers. The conveniences bring by the computers include portable computers, efficiency, accuracy of works and accessibility to the internet. For example, people engaged in the accounting field used computers to calculate and manage their work by easy and fast. In addition, utilized of computers can greatly decreased the percentage of making mistake in work. Therefore, human become more depend on the computers.

Argument For No. 2 – main point and elaboration are satisfactory

On the other hand, human can be more independent and thrived to enhance the function of computers to achieve better living quality. To improve living standards, innovation of computers encouraged more thriving human to continue improve and increase the variety of benefits generated from the computers. Therefore, human will be more independent and put effort to innovate to make sure computers continue contribute to the development of human.

Argument Against No. 1 – does not address issue

Lastly, human life is still well-rounded even without the computers. There are a lot of things which can be done without using computers. Human can cultivate hobbies, visit relatives and foods. For example, human can involve in outdoor activities such as badminton, football and basketball to spend their time. It is healthy to the life of human rather than sitting in front of the computers.

Argument Against No. 2 – main point and elaboration are satisfactory

As a conclusion, computer may help human in different ways but somehow we must control it and not become over dependent on computers.

Conclusion – does not assess viewpoints presented earlier

Language features:
Modal verbs (bolded); connectors (boxed); conditional clauses (capitalised and bolded)