REFINING INTERPERSONAL STANCE IN ELLS ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAYS WITH R2L METHODOLOGY

Dr. Ayesha Asghar Gill[1], Dr. Fauzia Janjua[2]

Original Article

1. Lecturer at University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan
    Email: ayesha.asghar@uaf.edu.pk

2. Associate Professor at International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan
    Email: fauzia.janjua@iiu.edu.pk

Abstract

Researchers (Ilyas et al., 2015) have found out that PELLs face the problem of integrating perception and lexico-grammar to build an authoritative stance on a given issue. In addition, the ways proficient writers construct interpersonal meanings by evaluating evidence and persuading the reader are not made explicit to students. This paper examines the Reading to Learn (R2L) approach to build a persuasive, authoritative stance on undergraduate Pakistani English language learners' (PELLs) argumentative writings. It has with two-group pre and posttest design on a sample of 36 students in each group. Then, it evaluates R2L efficacy by comparing linguistic analysis of the interpersonal stance in pre and posttest argumentative essays of PELLs. The linguistic analysis used Appraisal theory based on systemic functional grammar. The Pretest revealed that PELLs constructed a stance with inappropriate Appraisal System subsystems. They ignored dialogic control to establish reader alignment for an authoritative stance. After a four-month intervention, the posttest analysis showed that the experimental group's performance had significantly improved. This experimentation provides a concrete academic assessment of R2L genre pedagogy in the Pakistani context. It could help teachers to teach stance-taking in their argumentative writings.

Keywords: Appraisal System, Interpersonal Stance, R2L Genre pedagogy, Systemic Functional Grammar

Introduction

This study argues that teaching ELLs needs to be sensitive to language-related problems to develop better argumentative writing. As quoted by Chang & Schleppegrell, ELLs' traditional pedagogy offers just a guide or formulas that are only superficial or abstract, examples of scattered sentences. It focuses on decontextualized language teaching to build language competency, which is insufficient for ELLs to express contextually valued stances for argumentative responses. To write effective argumentative responses, PELLs require establishing an authoritative stance and developing a dialogic space to persuade the reader with relevant supporting details. To fulfill these demands, they need contextualized exposure to lexico-grammar structures. This study proposes a Reading to Learn (R2L) instructional approach based on systemic functional linguistics to teach PELLs according to the demands of the argumentative genre as recommended by various educational linguists (Rose and Martin, 2012).

R2L instructional approach can explicitly explain lexico-grammar resources enabling PELLs to write successfully at macro and micro levels of argumentative response. At the macro level, R2L assists ELLs in constructing their stance about a topic and unfolding it logically and strategically. It also assists in understanding how their view authoritatively confronts the existence of other ideas to convince the readers at the micro-level. R2L explicitly explains each move's

specific purpose argumentative genre and requires linguistic expressions to realize them properly. R2L has the potential to enable ELLs to use suitable linguistic resources to construct a stance through practice and application.

This work used selected linguistic resources for linguistic analysis to offer more detailed information about the performance of ELLs before and after the implementation of the R2L teaching methodology on 72 Pakistani undergraduate students (PELLs) for developing interpersonal stances in their argumentative writings. It uses the following research questions:

1. What are the interpersonal stance patterns present in ELLs' Argumentative Writing skills before implementing the R2L methodology?
2. What changes did R2L methodology bring in interpersonal stance patterns in ELLs Argumentative writings?

The authors aim to demonstrate language-related drawbacks in ELLs pretest argumentative writings and highlight improvements in presenting an interpersonal stance regarding linguistic resources related to rhetorical moves after R2L teaching methodology implementation. Posttest argumentative writings elucidate that R2L cultivates awareness in PELLs about potential linguistic and discursive strategies. They became familiar with valuable linguistic resources to project a stance as they introduced their claim for an argumentative essay.

Literature Review

When called upon to respond to a literary text argumentatively with an authoritative stance, PELLs, even at the undergraduate level, may experience a gap between their disciplinary knowledge and their ability to write that knowledge in English, despite attending university writing courses. Recent works on learners' corpora have shown that ELLs and natives have differences in using linguistic resources and rhetorical moves in constructing stance in their argumentative responses. It indicates that ELLs need more thoughtful teaching intervention to help them handle advanced argumentative academic writings demands.

Hyland and Milton (1997) identified that ELLs' writings have a "lack of control" to projection of an authorial voice regarding the deployment of assertion and doubt. Similarly, Hood (2004) found that published writers used more Appreciation system linguistic resources for evaluating a construct and writing their findings. In contrast, ELLs use more linguistic resources of Attitude subsystem Affect (feelings) and Attitude subsystem Judgment (opinion about people). These two subsystems, Affect and Judgment, rather than the Appreciation subsystem, make their argumentative writings more personal and subjective. In addition, to project an interpersonal stance for an argumentative essay, the writer needs management of "prosody," a specific arrangement of linguistic resources to strengthen an argument. Lemke (1992, p.7) defines prosody as the repetition of particular linguistic structures to fulfill a definite purpose that usually spreads across the clause and sentence structures.

Lemke further argues that the writer does not limit an argumentative response's interpersonal stance to any specific sentence or paragraph. A writer develops an interpersonal stance at the text and clause level with grammatical and lexical choices of appraisal system. Both options organize the writing into the structure and cohesive text rather than unrelated words and clauses. As Hood (2006) claims, carrying out a consistent stance through the Discourse with appropriate lexical and grammatical choices is challenging for ELLs. Chang (2010) argues that ELLs usually fail to pick up the right grammatical and lexical appraisal system resources to reinforce their perspective about an entity and develop their interpersonal stance. Their incapacity makes their stance weak. This writing

style produces static and inconsistent stances, while experienced writers can use various appraisal system resources to structure a more focused and dynamic stance. These resources have the potential to accumulate force to enhance the projection of stance.

In argumentative writing, the interpersonal stance presents the author's view. Its efficiency depends on its logical and accessible articulation to readers and how the author's view acknowledges the existence of other opinions. All these aspects depend on the linguistic resources of the appraisal system. However, presenting the stance is problematic for ELLs. Various research on ELLs' argumentative writing style has advocated shifting the attention of advanced academic writing instruction towards the explicit instructional framework. It could help ELLs understand discursive techniques and appropriate lexico-grammatical choices for writing practical interpersonal stances in argumentative genre writing at the macro and micro levels. This study proposes an R2L instructional approach to draw the focus of teaching on interpersonal meanings to identify the interactive (contrast connectors, code glosses) and interactional (hedges, boosters) linguistic resources. It can enable the ELLs writers to construe rhetorical moves to establish a practical interpersonal stance for an argumentative response.

Different studies based on the R2L instructional framework in the context of ELLs have reported significant improvements in the construction of interpersonal stance in their argumentative essay. For example, Kongpetch (2006) used an R2L method to teach argumentative essays to students at the University of Thailand. It has found significant improvements in student control over their proposed interpersonal stance. Similarly, Emilia (2005) used a genre-based approach to Indonesian ELLs to teach effective linguistic and lexico-grammar resources management. It means that the different views in teaching authorial stance, such as the lexico-grammar effect on the argument (Hoeken &

Hustinx 2009), the role of the audience (Maneli 1994) is a prerequisite for developing writing control, intellect, and persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo 1986). These all attributes are likely to be developed by R2L.

The authoritative stance projects the writer's view to create dialogic expansion after analyzing and evaluating points of shared knowledge in an argumentative essay. It helps to correct potential misunderstandings and recommendations by providing evidence and justification for engaging and interacting to bring the anticipated reader into Discourse in alignment with the writer's view and offer dialogic control. An efficient stance has some discursive resources. The first of them is hedging. Hedging uses evidential verbs (seems, appears, suggest), low certainty adverbs (perhaps, possibly), and low probability modal expressions (may, might, could) to express the writer's subjectivity of the authorial voice. It reduces authorial commitment to the proposition for cautiousness or opening up dialogic space for alternative views.

Theoretical and Analytical Orientation

Linguistic resources of stance include phrase and clause structure that form an authorized stance in the text and convey meanings to the expected reader. The framework that guides this Analysis is Appraisal Theory from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). James R. Martin and Peter R.R. White (2005) developed an Appraisal System built on Michael A.K. Halliday's (1994) functional grammar for mood and modality. The framework uses three related subsystems to track demographic choices: The Attitude subsystem explores how text constructs emotions, human judgment, and evaluation. The Graduation subsystem analyzes how a writer uses Force and Focus subsystem to instill feelings and perceptions in text. The Engagement subsystem explores how Heterogloss and Monogloss subsystems present different values to align prospective readers with the writer's opinion (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 16). The engagement system uses various linguistic

resources such as acknowledging, counting, approving, and confronting others' words and ideas.

In short, an interpersonal stance needs the lexico-grammatical resources of the appraisal system. It helps to carry on ongoing Discourse to construct a space for their interpersonal stance. This work used lexical resources of appraisal system to conduct linguistic analysis of interpersonal stance of PELLs argumentative response to evaluate the effect of R2L methodology in improving the performance of PELLs undergraduate students.

Methodology

This study aims to measure the change in constructing an authoritative interpersonal stance in PELLS argumentative writing before and after implementing the R2L methodology. This study used two groups with a pre-and posttest design. The Researchers performed a Pretest on a convenient sample population of undergraduate Pakistani English Language Learners (PELLs) using an argumentative prompt based on a literary text. Then sample population was equally divided into two groups randomly. The Researcher analyzed their pretest argumentative responses critically regarding interpersonal stance construct according to a set rubric (See Annexure B). The Researcher modified Humphrey et al.'s (2010) assessment tool kit to develop this rubric to achieve the objective of this research. It has 36 PELLs in each category: experimental group (E-group) and control groups (C-group).

The Researcher led the control group according to a conventional grammar-translation method and taught the E-group with the R2L teaching method for four months. The Researchers used pretest findings to schedule R2L teaching sessions for E-group. They embedded reading and writing skills in teaching text contents to improve understanding of the text and develop a stance for the argumentative written response. It proceeded in three steps. Firstly, researchers developed sensitivity to text construction and

patterns of language structures to develop literary text interpretive skills. They provided an oral summary to preview the short story events. Then the text was divided into discourse semantic rank scales. The following generic stages were further divided into discourse phases as proposed by Rose and Martin (2012) to get content information (field) and interpersonal relations of characters (tenor). Researchers used SFL tools (transitivity and appraisal system) based on meta language to explore implied meaning through dialogic interaction with students. It aimed to focus students' attention on linguistic structures and patterns of text to analyze, discuss, and criticize for developing a viewpoint about the characters' different attitudes. Secondly, in the joint construction teaching session, the researchers used argumentative genre schematic structure and register variables to construct contextualized written responses. She used dialogic interaction with students about content knowledge of text obtained by register variables and genre analysis to develop a main stance for the argumentative response. She then developed different text-based arguments to support the main stance of their argumentative response. After deciding on content information for an argumentative response, the researchers introduced the argumentative essay's generic stages, phases, and appropriate lexical and grammatical features to construct an argumentative response with close collaboration between researchers and students. Then, researchers provided a functional analysis of this jointly constructed argumentative response of ELLs according to a set rubric. Argumentative response functional analysis was done to communicate ELLs' deficiencies and guide them to overcome their drawbacks. For four-month, the Researcher repeated deconstruction of text and joint construction of argumentative response activity with ELLs for more practice and exposure. Thirdly, after four months of teaching, the Researcher directed both groups' experiments and controlled the writing of an argumentative response to a literary text

independently. Lastly, the researchers conducted the linguistic analysis of their essays' content based on a rubric (See Annexure B). It explores the differences in PELLs' use of lexico-grammar resources to realize interpersonal stance construct in Pre-and Posttest before and after R2L implementation in the E-group. The researchers also measured change in E-group performance by comparing with the C-group to ensure the efficacy of the R2L teaching methodology.

Analysis & Discussion

This section deals with the functional linguistic analysis of interpersonal meanings from two perspectives: interactional (metaphorical realization) and interpersonal implications (Appraisal system). Various lexical items represent interpersonal meanings. These are verbs of emotions, adverbs, adjectives of emotions, and nominalizations, as Xinghua and Thompson (2009) claimed. Martin and White (2005) argued that the reader perceives attitudinal meanings. It might introduce undesired subjectivity into the analysis. This subjectivity is undoubtedly critical when analyzing invoked evaluation to specify the reader's position (2006, p.62). Different studies (Hirose, 2003; Lee, 2008a) have pointed out the significance of Appraisal System resources in building argumentation for a specific stance. The Researchers took compliant reading for having the same cultural and value systems as undergraduate ELLs and used a bottom-up approach to analyze their pre and posttest writings.

The Researcher analyzed interpersonal meanings in PELLs argumentative responses language by the Appraisal System following various previous works (Martin, 2000; Martin & Rose, 2003; Martin & White, 2005). Likewise, this research focused on the presence and frequency of all subsystems of Appraisal system inscriptions in pre and posttest writing to evaluate the efficiency of the R2L methodology.

Pretest Argumentative Essays Analysis of Both Groups
Table: 1
Appraisal subsystem Attitude inscriptions in Pretest essays of both groups to analyze their interpersonal meanings

		C-group %age	E-group %age
Attitude	Affect	------	--------
	Judgement	0.018	0.022
	Appreciation	0.110	0.208

Table 1 presents the compositional percentage of Attitude system Lexical resources. ELLs used more Appreciation system items than other Attitude subsystems: Judgment and Affect. There was more inclination in using Composition System than Valuation System (Appreciation subsystem) inscriptions in pretest essays. However, overall, the frequency of Attitude System inscriptions in ELLs' argumentative responses indicated their meager use. The absence of Attitude subsystem Affect System inscription in Pretest might be due to ELLs' ignorance about the role of Attitude system inscriptions in developing a personal stance.

Consider the following student exemplars of Attitude System inscriptions:

Pretest Student Exemplars of Capacity, Judgment, Appreciation Inscriptions

a) Consequently, reading involves the interactive model. We usually ***[Attitude: Judgment: Capacity]*** do three readings. In the First two (readings), we use the top-down model. In our last detailed reading, we used the bottom-up model to say that the 'Interactive model is the best ***[Attitude: Appreciation:***

Reaction] description of what happens when we read.'

b) Reading is a fluent *[Attitude: Appreciation: Valuation]* process of readers combining information from a text and their background knowledge to build meaning

c) When we read any text strategically *[Attitude: Judgment: capacity]*, we use these two models, respectively, which could be said the interactive model.

Pretest Student exemplar (a) exhibited the writer's opinion on the working of the interactive reading model by using the appreciation subsystem Reaction inscription "best." Next, in 7 (b), PELL used the Appreciation subsystem Valuation inscription "fluent" to develop an orientation by defining reading to take a position regarding the efficiency of the interactive model. Then, in exemplar (c), the student used the Appreciation subsystem reaction inscription "strategically" to develop an argument to support the claim. It helped the writer to conclude the discussion.

The requirement of the pretest prompt (See Annexure B) was to use more linguistic resources for evaluating constructs and working of the top-down and bottom-up models separately and then their combined effect in the interactive model with the Appreciation System. Appreciation subsystems: Reaction, Composition, and Valuation might help build up an argument that top-down and bottom-up reading strategies assist cognition for better comprehension. Conversely, ELLs used more linguistic resources for defining and expressing opinions (Attitude subsystem Judgment) about the three reading models. Thus, it is likely that most students could not respond to the given prompt argumentatively. They did not know how to construct an argumentative stance by exploiting the Appreciation rather than Judgment System. Most of the ELLs used the Appreciation subsystem Composition related to the perception of ELLs about three reading models. They described and classified an interactive reading approach using the Appreciation subsystem Valuation and Reaction. Still, such use was contrary to developing an argumentative response stance. For instance, consider the following student exemplar1:

Pretest Student Exemplar 1

Engagement System	
Mono-gloss resources	"In the interactive approach, Readers use both bottom-up and top-down models to decode the texts they read. When the knowledge of word structure and background knowledge simultaneously, they can understand effectively *[Judgment: Capacity]*."

Furthermore, most students used the Engagement subsystem Mono-gloss inscriptions in the Pretest. A few students used Hetero gloss inscriptions. However, they used different external resources quotes to define the interactive reading model rather than support their argument. The Hetero-gloss inscriptions serve as a base to persuade prospective readers (Marin & White, 2005) as the desired feature of an academic argumentative response. The dominant Engagement subsystem Mono-gloss inscriptions usage means that the writer might not know the prerequisite of referring to

other voices or alternative opinions in developing arguments. Moreover, in the pretest majority of the PELLs' used a personal viewpoint by using personal pronouns such as "I, We" to project a subjective stance for their argumentative response. Only a few PELLs (23.53%) used impersonal and demonstrative pronouns (it, this) for writer's detached position in an argumentative response.

The detached argumentative stance also needs Graduation subsystem resources: Force and Focus. In the Pretest, mostly ELLs

used the Graduation subsystem Force resources to intensify and quantify the description compared to the Graduation subsystem focus inscription: sharpening and softening. Table 2 presents pretest graduation system lexical items.

Table 2

Pretest Average Graduation System of Both Groups

Graduation	Subsystems	E-group	C-group
	Force	0.998%	0.926%
	Focus	0.219%	0.213%

Regarding, Pretest interpersonal interactive structures and metaphorical expressions, modality plays an essential role in construing interpersonal meaning by negotiating the probability or obligation of the proposition/proposal, as proclaimed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004). Modality is a vital feature to achieve argumentative rhetorical goals. Various L2 studies have demonstrated the usefulness of modality in developing argumentative writing skills (Izutsu & Izutsu, 2013; Xuan & Huang, 2017). These studies proposed that the deployment of modal auxiliaries depends on the writing topic (Hinkle, 2009a). Proficient writers deploy modality to negotiate how probable an argument is. Contrarily, this research found that most PELLs used modal finite verbs compared to modal adjuncts and modal adverbs. It is likely to infer that ELLs were unaware of the structures mentioned above for effective argumentation to open a space for negotiation on a given topic for effective persuasion. Contrarily, Pretest writings showed an insufficient and low level of argumentative skills. The following table 3 shows the students' trend in modal auxiliary usage. Tables 3 & 4 present the pretest values of both groups obtained by the UAM Corpus Tool.

Table 3

Pretest E-group Modality

Modality		Total	%age
Epistemic	certainty	2	2.083333
	probability	1	1.041667
	possibility	6	6.25
	improbability	0	0
	impossibility	0	0
	uncertainty	0	0
Deontic	obligation	26	27.08333
	advisability	16	16.66667
	permission	10	10.41667
	not-necessary	0	0
Dynamic	ability	28	29.16667
	willingness	0	0
	intention	7	7.291667

Table 4

Pretest C-group Modality

Modality		Total	%age
Epistemic	certainty	1	0.684932
	probability	2	1.369863
	possibility	2	1.369863
	improbability	0	0
	impossibility	0	0
	uncertainty	0	0
Deontic	obligation	76	52.05479
	advisability	18	12.32877
	permission	18	12.32877
	not-necessary	0	0
Dynamic	ability	25	17.12329
	willingness	0	0
	intention	4	2.739726

Table 5

Pretest Average Modality Development in Both Groups

Modality				
Epistemic	Total	%age	Total	%age
Certainty	1	0.6849	2	2.0833
probability	2	1.3699	1	1.0417
Possibility	2	1.3699	6	6.25
Improbability	0	0	0	0
Impossibility	0	0	0	0
Uncertainty	0	0	0	0
DEONTIC				
Obligation	76	52.0548	26	27.0833
Advisability	18	12.3288	16	16.6667
Permission	18	12.3288	10	10.4167
Not-necessary	0	0	0	0
DYNAMIC				
Ability	25	17.1233	28	29.1667
Willingness	0	0	0	0
Intention	4	2.73973	7	7.2917

Table:6

Detailed description of Modality subsystem Modalization & Modulation

	Modalization		Modulation		
Low	Probability	Usuality	Obligation	Inclination	Potential
Can	10	4	-	12	27
Might	10	-	-	-	-
Allow	-	-	2	1	-
Could	1	-	-	-	1
Total	**21**	**4**	**2**	**13**	**28**
%	**15.789%**	**3.01%**	**1.503%**	**9.77%**	**21%**
Medium					
Will	8	4	-	12	1
Should	-	-	8	-	-
Would	3	1	-	-	5
Total	**11**	**5**	**8**	**12**	**6**
%	**8.27%**	**3.75%**	**6.01%**	**9.02%**	**4.51%**
High					
Must	-	-	4	-	-
Have to	-	-	7	-	-
Total	**-**	**-**	**11**	**-**	**-**
%	**-**	**-**	**8.27%**	**-**	**-**

Tables 3 & 4 indicate students' modality use in the writings of both groups. They preferred Modality subsystem modulation over modalization (Table:6). Overall, out of all elements of modulation usage, ELLs' trend was more towards a sense of potential (27%) rather than obligation and inclination. In contrast, the prompt required more use of obligation sense of modulation. Consequently, their responses did not effectively convey a sense of urgency or necessity to the reader. It made their authorial stance an opinion, not a fact, to convince the reader to agree with the claim. They communicated the sense of the efficiency of the interactive model. They did not reason with persuasive arguments to justify that the interactive model is a required reading model for English language learners to increase their reading comprehension. Similarly, tables 3 & 4 display that majority of the students used a low level of modal verbs to establish their position in the essays. It made their authoritative stance weak and reduced their stance validity.

For instance, in the Pretest, PELLs projected the potentiality of the interactive modal. They deployed modal auxiliary "can" to construct an authorial stance for the recommendation of the interactive modal. Consider the following examples taken from ELLs' pretest argumentative responses:

1. "Interactive approach provides learners with benefits ….. they can read by using reading skills, and they can read without going through word-level they can get provided information."
2. "… a student who encounters an unknown word might use surface structure systems like grapho-phonic, or letter-sound, knowledge to decode the

word. A different student might find it easier to use deep structure systems like semantic knowledge, such as meaning and vocabulary, to decode the same unknown word."

Modality communicates the degree of probability/obligation in a clause. Argumentative response requires high modal verbs to increase the stance validity to persuade the reader. Low modal verbs cannot fulfill the demand of solid argumentation, as they are called speculation modals. They provide more room for disagreement. Examples 1 and 2 show students' weak argumentative writing skills. They deployed low modal verbs like "can read," "might use," and "might find," It stands for weakness in the judgment or uncertainty in the opinion about the target entity. The low modality expressed for the argumentative stance of this research has an affinity with Izutsu andIzutsu's (2013) work on ELLs. It means they are unaware of the standard requirement to incorporate a sense of obligation for the reader by using high-level modal verbs such as "must-have to" to indicate a high level of certainty. Besides this, Table 5 shows the overuse of the modal verb "can" (40%), which has a similarity to the research done on Chinese ESL by Xuan (2017) and other previous studies (Hinkle, 2009b).

Similarly, the Researcher observed that most writings used simple and congruent modal realization, which indicated their less developed writing skills (Christie & Derewianka, 2008). When required to express negotiation, they turned to modal verbs instead of employing other lexical and grammatical resources. However, few incongruent orientations of modality realization were present in students' writing. Table7 presents their usage.

Table 7

Pretest Deployment of Grammatical Metaphors (metaphorical modal expression)

E-group		C-group	
Mental clauses	Rel. Attributive clauses	Mental clauses	Rel. Attributive clauses
6.161%	10.327%	1.88%	3.70%

Table 7 shows that ELLs in both groups seldom used incongruent modal expressions in their writing. It was another indicator of less developed writing skills. The incongruent realizations consisted of cognitive mental clauses and attributive relational clauses. Students used both incongruent modal expressions, which sometimes had objective orientation and sometimes subjective orientation towards prompt. The pretest examples from both groups are presented below:

Subjective

- I [sensor] might find [Pr.] it is easier to use a deep structure system [phenomenon].
- We [sensor] will consider [Pr.] these aspect from top to bottom [phenomenon].

Objective

- The surface structure processing [Carrier] is [Pr.] a sensory portion of reading [Attribute].
- It [Carrier] is [Pr.] an approach to begin with the idea of comprehension resides in the reader [Attribute]

Table 8

Posttest E-group and C-groups Analysis of Appraisal System

Appraisal Subsystems		Posttest CG %	Posttest EG %
Attitude	Affect	0	0.604
	Judgement	0.197	2.251
	Appreciation	11.61	0.428
Graduation	Force	0.862	0.929
	Focus	0.235	0.311
Engagement	Clauses	967	932
	Mono-gloss	95.432	81.652
	Hetro- gloss	4.568	18.652

Table 8 shows the frequency of Attitude subsystem Affect inscriptions encoded emotional reactions in explicit, implicit, positive, and negative grammatical and lexical resources. ELLs used these inscriptions to "approve and disapprove, enthuse or abhor, applaud and criticize," as proposed by J. R. Martin and White (2007, p. 1) to support their evaluation of the given statement in response to a literary text. Lemke argued (1998) that Attitude System lexical resources project ELLs as meaning makers having specific impressions and beliefs into a broader context of the world having myriad viewpoints on the given topic. The following section presents the Attitude System inscriptions constructed in primary linguistic resources such

as nominal group, adjective group, or adverbial group by ELLs in posttest writings with the help of the following selected students' exemplars from the E-group:

Posttest E-group Student Exemplar 2

"Yes, Mangu was frustrated [-Affect: dissatisfaction: authorial]. He was happy [+Affect: Happiness: authorial]. He was optimistic [+Affect: security: authorial]. He believed [-Affect: satisfaction: authorial] that [proposition] he would get the power. The new constitution did not bring any change [-Affect: dissatisfaction]. It became the source of frustration [-Affect: dissatisfaction:

authorial]. These reasons might be the causes of frustration."

In exemplar 2, the writer developed his thesis statement, "Yes, Mangu was frustrated," by explicitly expressing the protagonist's different stages of behavior and feelings. He used a chain of explicit resentment and frustration to build periodicity to consolidate his thesis statement in the above paragraph. For instance, the writer developed the argument by describing the gradual change of the protagonist from "happy," "optimistic," "believed….get power" to "frustrated" because the "new constitution did not bring any change" and then justified his stance that "Mangu was frustrated."

Posttest C-group Student Exemplar 3

- "He was conscious [Attitude: negative emotion] to some extent that he could avoid being deceived [Attitude: emotion] again, but Duchess was very cleaver [Attitude: Judgment] lady. She trapped

[Attitude: negative emotions] him because of his feelings for Diana. …"

- "She distracted [Attitude: negative emotions] him by talking about Diana. She knew Oliver was in love [Attitude: positive emotions] with her daughter."

C-group PELLs used Attitude System inscriptions, but these inscriptions add up informational detail. Their writing has a narrative style rather than an argumentative style. These inscriptions did not increase the strength of their argument.

Next, Table 8 shows that the E-group used mostly Composition System inscriptions compared to valuation and Reaction Systems inscriptions. These findings have harmony with the high-grade achievers in the research conducted by Lee (2008b). The following student's exemplar 3 demonstrates the authorial stance of the writer based on an Appreciation System inscriptions of the product or process for the thesis statement in a paragraph.

Posttest E-group Student Exemplar 4

Appraisal System Authorial and Objective stance	Firstly Oliver desired for a standard life *[Attitude: +appreciation: valuation]*. In England, he was a rich jeweler *[Attitude: +appreciation: valuation]* but had no social realization, i.e., rank in high society.
Supporting evidence	He wanted to move in aristocratic circles *[Attitude: +appreciation: composition]*. For instance, "With the right brandies, whiskeys and liqueurs," "perfectly dressed …but dissatisfied still" *[Attitude : +appreciation: composition]*.
Sum up	These lines indicate that he was not a satisfied man with what he had.

The above student exemplar 4 clearly shows that the writer took an authorial and objective stance in the thesis statement by using the Valuation and Composition Systems to describe

the product (everyday life, wealthy jeweler) and transitivity processes (move-in aristocratic circle…….with good brandies, whiskeys, and liqueurs).

Posttest C-group Student Exemplar5

No authorial stance	The writer tells us about the state of grief of Mr. Woodfield. He has forgotten everything.
Supporting detail	He became able to remember the grave of his son after drinking whiskey. He talked about his son and his grave but did not feel any pang of grief *[Appreciation: valuation]*.
Sum up	This clearly shows that the time has made him forget his grief

Student exemplar 5 demonstrates that the writer did not take an authorial stance due to the absence of any attitude inscription. The writer used a single token of Appreciation System inscription in supporting detail, but it is not applied to make it reliable. Then, the usage of Attitude subsystem Judgment shown in table 8 describes that the ELLs in the Posttest employed more Social Esteem subsystem inscriptions than Social Sanction subsystem inscriptions, as they did in their Pretest writings. Their use is consistent with the previous studies on ELLs (Lee, 2008a, 2008b; Wu & Allison, 2003). ELLs evaluated literary text characters' intellectual capacity and behavior rather than their ethical and legal judgment of attitudes and their responses to build up arguments. Although ELLs used more Judgement subsystem social esteem inscriptions in both Pre and Posttest, there was a marked difference in the manner of capacity inscription usage. As the above student exemplar illustrates, in Posttest, ELLs used Judgment System inscriptions about the target character, process, or process in semiotic expression and did not mention the target explicitly in a specified manner as they did in their pretest writings.

Posttest E-group Students Examples 6

a) His ambitions to change nature *[Attitude: N+Judgment: Capacity]* result in the devastation of human beings and animals *[Attitude : N-Judgment: Capacity].*
b) His fantasy for science *[Attitude: N+Judgment: Normality]* caused her daughter's death.
c) His poisons were a barrier for lovers to be united [N-Judgment: Capacity].

Examples a, b, and c of C-group PELLs present that the writer used Judgment inscription only to add information. These inscriptions are not developing cause-effect logic for an effective argumentative response.

The ELLs used the Engagement System subsystem Mono-gloss and Hetero-gloss to enter different evaluators for participation in Discourse. They used the Engagement System, both subsystems, to adjust the responsibility and obligations of discourse resources. Table 8 provides an overview of the frequency and types of mono-gloss and hetero-gloss formulation concerning the staging and argumentation of the student's Posttest responses. In the Posttest, ELLs majorly used hetero-gloss statements (81.04%) compared to mono-gloss comments (18.957%) for contracting and expanding the dialogic space for effective persuasion of their arguments. These findings agree with the high-rated script in Wu's (2007) study, in which students wrote academic argumentative essays with more hetero-gloss statements. ELLs in Posttest writings also used mono-gloss comments to assert their stance on the given issue. For instance, in the following example, the writer declared his position in a mono-gloss statement:

Posttest C-group Students Examples 7
a) He talks about his son and his grave but does not feel any pang of grief *[Attitude: Judgment: Capacity]*
b) Now his present state of pain is different *[Attitude: Judgment: Capacity]*
c) He wanted to feel the same pang of grief that he used to feel *[Attitude: Judgment: Capacity]*

Examples a, b, and c of C-group PELLs present that the writer used Judgment inscription only to add information. These inscriptions are not developing cause-effect logic for an effective argumentative response.
The ELLs used the Engagement System subsystem Mono-gloss and Hetero-gloss to enter different evaluators for participation in Discourse. They used the Engagement System, both subsystems, to adjust the responsibility and obligations of discourse resources. Table 8 provides an overview of the frequency and types of mono-gloss and hetero-gloss formulation concerning the staging and argumentation of the student's Posttest

responses. In the Posttest, ELLs majorly used hetero-gloss statements (81.04%) compared to mono-gloss comments (18.957%) for contracting and expanding the dialogic space for effective persuasion of their arguments. These findings agree with the high-rated script in Wu's (2007) study, in which students wrote academic argumentative essays with more hetero-gloss statements. ELLs in Posttest writings also used mono-gloss comments to assert their stance on the given issue. For instance, in the following example, the writer declared his position in a mono-gloss statement:

Posttest E-group Student Exemplars 8

a. "He was a rival to Nature."
b. "Rappaccini was so engrossed in his scientific experiments that he did not hesitate to contaminate nature. He interfered in nature's power."

In Posttests Basically, ELLs sometimes used Mono-gloss statements to conclude the dialogue or initiate negotiation between writer and readers to persuade an argument. It is evident in student exemplar 8(a,b), in which the writer starts a conversation about the character of Dr. Rappaccini.

Table 9

An overview of Posttest Engagement Subsystem Hetero-gloss Sub-system usage by the PELLs

Contract				Expand				
Disclaim		Proclaim		Entertainment			Attribute	
Counter	Deny	pronounce	endorse	probability	appearance	Hearsay	Acknowledgement	distance
5	0	2	63	27	0	16	57	01
2.93%	0	1.169%	3.684%	1.578%	0	0.935%	3.333%	0.584%

Table 9 portrays a Hetero-gloss subsystem overview. It shows that there was less tendency in using Counter (2.93%) and Pronounces System resources (1.169%). It might be because for developing an argumentative response to a literary text, PELLs need to express their interpretation to strengthen a stance implicitly and disclaim the given argument that might be risky or require more competency. ELLs use more Hetero-gloss subsystem Endorsement inscriptions to develop affirmative and authoritative opinions. They used Endorsement (3.684) inscription to conclude the discussion in favor of the main and sub-claims of their argumentative responses. However, ELLs used probability (1.578) and acknowledgment System (3.333) resources more as compared to distance resources (0.584%) to expand the dialogic space, which has in accord with the work of Wu (2007) and Wu and Allison (2003).

Martin and Rose (2005) classify hetero-gloss subcategories: endorse, probability, and acknowledgment as extra-vocalizing resources to present examples and develop arguments for persuasive rhetoric effect. In this context, PELL E-group used the Engagement subsystems either to attribute the responsibility of inter-subjectivity to external voices (extra-vocalizing) or to keep it authorial (inter-vocalizing) to make their claim persuasive. In the Posttest, there was a dominant use of endorse inscriptions (3.684%), which shows that PELLs mostly used external voices to support their claims. It helped them exploit exterior views to incorporate examples and arguments to make their text authoritative and persuasive.

Posttest E-group Student exemplar 8

- "As the narrator describes *[Engagement: Attribute: Acknowledgment]* that "avoided their

touch," "placed a covering over his mouth and nose," while examining plants."

- "These actions only point *[Engagement: Proclaim: Endorse]* that he has poisoned these plants so much that he cannot touch them directly *[Engagement: Entertainment: probability]*."

The student exemplar 8started with the Expand subsystem Acknowledge to verify the description of the character's movements and used it as an endorsement for his claim. Then he elaborated his claim by entertaining the probability of the inference of his claim. As proclaimed by Lee (2006), it is challenging to achieve the rhetorical effect of authority and persuasion if the writer does not place extra-vocalizing resources in the appropriate textual location.

Similarly, Martin and White (2005) opined that the writer needs to arrange the Hetero-gloss information strategically in a text because this arrangement helps to develop prosody (evaluative language rhetorical effect) and periodicity (information flow) in a text. These features help readers to navigate through different phases of Discourse.

Posttest C-group Student Exemplar 9

- "She wept for whole days with chagrin, with regret with despair and disappointment. Mathilda was a vain, proud woman. Her life is shattered at this event"

C-group exemplar 9 presents that most writers used a mono-gloss statement. They did not use a hetero-gloss statement to develop an external source or voice to increase the authenticity of their stance.

Graduation is the third subsystem of an appraisal system that monitors subsystem Force and Focus of utterances inscriptions (semantics) in terms of scales: intensifier, enhancer, sharp, soft (Martin, 1989b, p. 201).

In the Posttest, all Graduation subsystem resources were present. There was a slight but significant increase in subsystem Quantification (15.517%) and Softening (1.574%). These were new traits in ELLs' posttest writings. Both resources introduced the strategic use of lexical and grammatical resources. Consider the following E-group student exemplar

Posttest E-group Student Exemplar 10

"Nick was not good enough [Graduation: Softening] to judge whether he should offer help to Ole Anderson. As we can see, Ole Anderson's plain behavior made him realize that he does not want his help. So, he said, "Maybe it was a bluff.""

In Posttest student exemplar 10, the writer used "good enough" to lower the intensity of describing Nick's absence of solid judgment sense (protagonist). The writer did it strategically to support his primary stance for the prompt that Nick qualifies as a code hero of Hemmingway's story "The Killer." From his point of view, Nick has heroic qualities, but he is in the developing phase of the code hero. Thus, he instantly responded to Ole Anderson's reaction, "Maybe it was a bluff," to maintain his face value and avoid disturbing Ole Anderson more.

Posttest Graduation System analysis improved lexical precision to develop and negotiate argumentative positions effectively. It had two distinct features in the Engagement subsystem deployment. The first was the interplay among graduation resources, and the second was the interaction between graduation and attitude resources. The interaction between graduation and Attitude produced rhetorical resonance to support the authorial stance of the text because lexical items representing graduation resources and strategies also carry the Ideational meanings of the text. They played a double role.

On the one hand, they convinced the reader, and on the other hand, they provided content information. Such rhetorical resonance present in this work corroborates with the Analysis of Wu and Allison's (2005) study. They investigated evaluative expression in developing the analytical argument of ELLs' argumentative essays. The Researcher described Pre and Posttest written responses to highlight the improvement.

Posttest E-group Student exemplar11

Negative Stance ➡	"It shows that failure of love *[Attitude:-Affect: dissatisfaction]* leads to great *[Graduation: +Force: intensification]* frustration

[Attitude: Judgment: normality].

Supporting ➡Evidence	Besides this, a confused state of mind produces dissatisfied figurative sense evidence *[Attitude:-Affect: Insecure],* quoted that "when she addressed the first words [*Graduation: Force: Quantification]* to me
Supporting Evidence➡	I was so confused *[Attitude:-Affect: insecure]* that I did not know what to answer *[Attitude:-Affect: insecure].*"

Posttest E-group Student Exemplar 12

Positive/authorial stance	*"…She was at the happiest [Graduation:+Force: intensification] moment of her life when she met Giovanni, but her father's plot did not stay long*
Negative Judgement	*[Graduation:+Force: quantification] lasting [Attitude: -Judgment: capacity]. She was disappointed [-Affect: dissatisfied] by her father…*

In the above posttest student exemplar12, the cynical authorial Affect inscription "failure of love" was intensified by "great" and followed by a negative Judgment system based on Social Esteem, "frustration." The writer has packed more semantic load by normalization of "failure of love" and "great frustration" by establishing a cause-effect relationship and relational identified process. Likewise, in student exemplar 12, positive authorial Affect inscriptions "the happiest moment of her life" were encountered by her father's evil intentions and encoded in implied negative Judgment "father's plot did not stay it long " by the writer. On the contrary, in the pretest essays, as shown in the student exemplar 9. It helped PELLs create rhetorical prosody of resonance through the interplay between Graduation resources and Graduation and Attitude resources.

Pretest E-group Student Exemplar 13

Graduation ➡ "This activity can quickly *[Graduation: Force: Intensification]* be related

Inscription down model. Here we are going from context to the lower level *[Force: Quantification]* of words and sounds.

Pretest E-group Student Exemplar 14

Graduation ➡ "This approach is the best [F*orce: Intensification]* in reading as

Inscription compared to individual study in bottom-up and top-down because we read the text quickly [F*orce: Intensification].*

PELLs primarily used Graduation resources in isolation or to scale experiential meanings in the above exemplars. The isolated use of Graduation resources and lack of interplay between Graduation resources and Attitude inscriptions produced a description rather than develop an argument for the persuasion of given facts. They present their stance as a fact by ignoring other possibilities or pieces of evidence,

which is the most desired feature of argumentative essays. Whereas in the Posttest, the ELLs employed Appraisal System in an improved manner. It is discussed in student exemplars 15

The following section describes the improvement in various lexico-grammatical resources of PELLs in Posttest compared to Pretest essays.

Table:11

Pre & Post test Interactive Structure and Metaphorical Expression

Posttest			Pretest		
Total Clauses	Mental Clauses	Relational Identified Clauses	Total clauses	Mental Clauses	Relational Identified Clauses
932	133	203	422	26	61
	42.596 %	21.781%		6.161%	10.327%

Various studies (Hood, 2010; Hyland, 2000) asserted interactive structures and metaphorical expressions (meta-discourse) as the significant elements for constructing a pragmatically impressive argumentative written response. However, various researchers (Hyland, 2004; Hyland & Tse, 2004; Perez-Llantada, 2010) have reported that it is difficult for ELLs to use modality as a metaphorical expression. ELLs

mostly do not apply modality inscriptions to moderate interpersonal imposition, which is essential for constructing a suitable argument structure with appropriate relationships between supporting details and claims in argumentative writing. Hence, the Researcher focused on developing meta-discourse on a priority basis for improving students' writing skills.

Table 12

Comparison between Pre and Posttest E-group Modality Deployment

Modality Inscription	Posttest			Pretest			
	Low	Medium	High		Low	Medium	High
N= 67	43	18	6	N= 29	17	5	7
%	64.179%	26.86%	8.95%		58%	17%	24%

Table 12 displays the improvement in the deployment of one meta-discourse modality in Pre and Posttest. In the Posttest, ELLs constructed different propositional claims and

sub-claims by using a range of finite modal operators from low to high strengths presented in Tables11 & 12. The increase in modal verbs usage as compared to Pretest is another

development in the writing skills of PELLs' posttest writings. Table 12 displays that students used more modalization (50.744%) than modulation in their posttest writings. It was vice versa in their pretest writings. There was a dominant use of the low level of finite modal operators (64.179%).

The Researcher assumed that increasing the usage of medium and high modal finite operators was a significant achievement, especially in PELLS. Likewise, there was an increase in medium (26.86%) and high level (8.95%) finite modal operators in posttest writings. Their writings became more persuasive and effective and facilitated them to take an authoritative stance, which was mostly missing in the pretest writings. For example, student exemplar 18 built up an argument for the prompt "The new constitution was the source of frustration for UstadMangu. Give reasons to support the reasons in any case?" as shown under:

Posttest E-group Student Exemplar 18

Table: 13

Comparison of Pre and Posttest E-group incongruent grammatical metaphorical expression deploymen

Posttest			Pretest		
Total Clauses	Mental Clauses	Relational Identified Clauses	Total clauses	Mental Clauses	Relational Identified Clauses
932	133	203	422	26	61
	42.596 %	21.781%		6.161%	10.327%

Table 13 shows that PELLs used 36.435% mental clauses and 11.454 % relational identified clauses more than pretest writings. Both mental and relational identified processes had an objective orientation towards prompt. It was an essential change in the perception of

- "Lastly, he believed he must be empowered after implementing a new constitution. Mangu said, "I am bound to get the job." It would bring happiness People would get power gradually. There would be a reduction of unemployed people. The new constitution did not empower the people. Thus, it is clear that he was just dreaming of authority."

The writer in the Posttest exemplar 18 moderately built up the argument by using finite medium operators "would" three times. He provided textual evidence, "I am bound to get the job," to back up the claim "the empowerment of common people" with high modal operator "must." To register the firm belief of UstadMangu. That situation later turned out to be the leading cause of his frustration. Moreover, another Student Exemplar (below), while writing an argumentative response to a prompt, "The first love is the cause of their bad marital relationships. Justify your position with reasons," is presented under the literary text:

ELLs for developing argumentative writing. It helped create an argument sufficient to support the stance and established appropriate interpersonal meanings in their essays, a prerequisite for argumentative academic Discourse. Tables 14 & 15 present example

Table 14

Posttest Objective Orientation: Mental processes

	Sensor	**Process**	**Phenomenon**
1	In this disease patient	Find	it hard to forgive someone
2	He	was suffering	from a deadly mental disease
3	These shades	also, suggest	that one has not liveliness towards people

Table 15

Posttest Objective Orientation: Relational attributive processes

	Carrier	**Process**	**Attribute**
1	His lifestyle and dress Choice	was	a suggestiveness for evil
2	Absolutely right the first love	Is	the cause of their bad marital relationships
3	He	Was	More handsome, polished and socially well placed

Tables 14 &15 demonstrate that ELLs achieved objective grammatical metaphors through increased use of grammatical structures of abstraction and nominalization in mental and relational identified clauses. As mentioned in Tables 14 & 15, roughly, all clauses have used nominalization as covert writers to advocate their stance in a formal language, which various educational linguists recommend for academic Discourse (Martin, 1989b; Rose & Martin, 2012).

The Researcher observed the Posttest writings as compared to the pretest writings. ELLs increased authority or force to their primary and sub-claims by adding different grammatical resources for valid interpersonal meanings. For instance, particularly in the Posttest, ELLs used adverbs and modal adjuncts more in their writing to make their claims and sub-claims convincing and compelling. This increased usage of adverbs, modal adjuncts, or boosters, termed by Hyland (1998), is familiar with Bondi's (2008) opinion, who opines that modal adjuncts increase the strength of truthfulness writer's claim when they have the

necessary evidence. Similarly, Swales (1990) suggested that using modal adjuncts or boosters is likely to increase the persuasion of Written Discourse. For instance, the student exemplar 19 shows how the writer made his stance on a given prompt "The first love is the cause of Mr. & Mrs. Frank's bad marital relationships. Justify your position with reasons." For the literary text "The Shadow in the Rose Garden."

Posttest E-group Student Exemplar 19

- "Absolutely right, (booster) the first love is the cause of their bad marital relationships. First, love is tough to forget. There are three reasons for the unfulfilled love story. "

In student exemplar 19, the writer emphatically announced his stance with the help of the booster "absolutely right" at the onset of the paragraph. Then he developed his arguments to support his position to justify his stance. Next, consider student exemplar:

Posttest E-group Student Exemplar 20

- "Undoubtedly, Rappaccini was evil. His lifestyle and dress choice were suggestive of evil …........ All in all, his lust for science and experiments made him a cold-hearted and emotionless man, which made him an evil product for man and beasts."

In the student Exemplar,20writers conclusively labeled Dr. Rappaccini with a booster "undoubtedly…an evil" to strengthen his basic stance for the prompt. "Do you agree that Rappaccini was an evil? Support your answer with reason" from the literary text "Rappaccini's Daughter." Then, the writer provided his different arguments to justify his stance about the nature of Rappaccini's character judgment.

Posttest C- group Student Exemplar 22

- "We **can** see that he took all the precautionary measures before killing the old man. These measures **can** just have been done by an intelligent man who is mentally fit."
- " He wanted to stop her, but he **could not do** that made him feel lousy for Marjorie."

There was a little use of medium and high modal verbs. In C-group, writers used the most commonly used modal verbs. It shows that they did not become familiar with the importance of using modality to negotiate any proposition with the reader to achieve persuasion. They also displayed their lack of modal lexical and grammatical resources. The Researchers attributed great significance to genre pedagogy to increase medium and high modality deployment. However, such awareness of the stylistic peculiarities of academic tasks needs extraneous practice to put these stylistic prerequisites into their writings.

Conclusion

This study mainly aimed to find the effectiveness of R2L genre pedagogy implementation in improving PELLs' interpersonal stance for an argumentative response to a literary text. The Researcher conducted analyses to measure improvement in the stance using the Appraisal system in ELLs' argumentative response to a literary text. In light of the above discussion, it is likely to state that in the Posttest of the experimental group, ELLs showed an improved understanding of interpersonal resources deployment to construct an authoritative stance for an argumentative essay. However, given that ELLs have satisfactorily improved, they need more practice and exposure to interpersonal resources to overcome occasional errors in modality.

References

Bondi , M. 2008. Emphatics in academic Discourse: Integrating corpus and discourse tools in the study of cross-disciplinary variation. *In:* ADEL , A. & RAPPEN , R. (eds.) *Corpora and Discourse: The Challenges of different settings.*

Cheng , A. 2008. Analyzing Genre Exemplars in Preparation for Writing: The Case of an L2 Graduate Students in the ESP Genre Based Instructional Framework of Academic Literacy. *Applied Linguistics,* 29**,** 50-71.

Christie & Derewianka, B. 2008. *School discourse: Learning to write across the year of schooling,* London, Continuum.

Emilia , E. 2010. *Teaching writing : Deeloping critical learners,* Bandung, Rizqi Press.

Halliday, 1993. Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education***,** 93-116.

Halliday & Matthiessen 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*.

Hinkle, E. 2009. The effect of essay topics on modal verb uses in L1 and L2 academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 41**,** 667-683.

Hirose, K. 2003. Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 12**,** 181-209.

Hoeken , H. &Hustinx , L. 2009. When is Statistical Evidence Superior to

Anecdotal evidence in Supporting Probability Claims? The Role of Argument Type. . *Human Communication Research,,* 35**,** 491-510.

Hood , S. 2010. *Appraising Research : Evaluation in academic Writing,* London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Hood, S. 2010. *Appraising research: Evaluation in Academic Writing,* UK, Palgrave Macmilan.

Humphery, S. &Macnaught, L. 2011. Revisiting Joint Construction in the tertiary context. *Australian Journal of Language and literacy,* 34**,** 98-116.

Humphrey, Martin, Dreyfus &Mahboob 2010. The 3x3: Setting up a linguistic Toolbox for teaching Academic Writing. *In:* A . MEHBOOB & KNIGHT, N. (eds.) *Appliable Linguistics: Reclaiming the Place of Language in Linguistics.* London: Continuum.

Hyland , K. 1998. Boosting, hedging and the negotiation of acdemic knowledge. *Text 18,* 3**,** 349-382.

Hyland, K. 2000. Hedges, booster and lexical invisibility: Noticing modifiers in academic texts *Language Awareness,* 9**,** 179-197.

Hyland, K. 2004. Disciplinary interaction: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 13**,** 133-151.

Hyland, K. &Tse, P. 2004. Metadiscourse in Academic Writing. *Applied Linguistics,* 25**,** 156-177.

Ilyas, M., Iqbal, M. &Fazal, S. 2015. Post/Graduate Academic Writing Problems: A Pakistani Case. *Image of research Literacy and writing Pedagogies for Masters and Doctoral Writers.* Leiden: Brill Koninklijke.

Izutsu, K. &Izutsu, M. N. 2013. From discourse markers to modal/final particles. *In:*Degand , L., Cornillie , B. &Pictrandrea , P. (eds.) *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Categorization and description.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Kongpetch, S. 2006. Using a genre based approach to teach writing to Thai students: a case study. *Prospect : Australian Journal of TESOL,* 21**,** 3-33.

Lee, S. H. 2006. The use of interpersonal resources in argumentative/persuasive essays by East-Asian ESL and Australian tertiary students. Sydney, Australia: University of Sydney.

Lee, S. H. 2008. Attitude in undergraduate essays. *Prospect : Australian Journal of TESOL,* 23**,** 43-58.

Lemke, 1995. *Talking Science: Language, Learning and Values,* Norwood,NJ, Ablex.

Lemke , J. L. 1998. Resources for attitudinal meaning: Evaluating orientation in text semantics. *Functions of Language,* 5**,** 33-56.

Liu 2013. Evaluation in Chinese University EFL Students' English Argumentative writing: An Appraisal Study. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching,* 10**,** 40-53.

Liu &Thompson, P. 2009. Attitude in Students' argumentative writing: a constrastive perspective. *In:* GIANNONI, L. J. O. B. D. S. (ed.) *Language studies working papers (Vol. I; pp.3-15).* Reading: University of Reading.

Maneli , M. 1994. *Perelman's New Rhetoric as Philosophy and methodology for the next century,* Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Martin, 1989b. Technically and abstraction: Language for the creation of specialized texts. *In:* F, C. (ed.) *Writing in School.* Geelong: Victoria, Deaken University Press.

Martin, 2000. Beyond Exchange: Appraisal System in English *In:* IN HUNSTON , S. & THOMPSON , G. (eds.) *Evaluation in Text : Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin & Rose 2005. Designing Literacy pedagogy: Scaffolding democracy in the classroom. *In:*Webster , J., Matthiessen , C. M. I. M. &Hassan , R. (eds.) *Continuing Discourse on Language.* London: Continuum.

Martin & Rose, D. 2003. *Working with Discourse : meaning beyond the clause,* London, Continuum.

Martin & Rose, D. 2007. Interacting with text: the role of dialogue in learning to read and write. *Foreign Languages in China,* 5**,** 66-80.

Martin & White, P. 2005. *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*, palgrave.

Martin , J. R. 1999. Modelling Context: A crooked path of progress in contextual linguistics. *In:* GHADESSY , M. (ed.) *Text and context in Functional Linguistics: current issues in linguistic Theory.* Amsterdam/ Phildelphia: John Benjamins.

Perez-Llantada, C. 2010. The discourse functions of metadiscourse in published academic writing: issues of culture and language. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 9***,** 41-68.

Petty , R. E. & Cacioppo , J. T. 1986. *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change,,* New York, Springer.

Rose & Martin, 2012. *Learning to Write, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School,* London, Equinox.

Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Thompson , G. 2014. *Introducing Functional Grammar,* London, Arnold.

Wu , S. M. 2017. The use of engagement resourses in high and low rated undergraduate geograpy essays. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6***,** 254-271.

Wu, S. M. & Allison, D. 2013. Exploring Appraisal in Claims of student writers in argumentative essays. *Prospect : Australian Journal of TESOL, 18***,** 71-91.

Xinghua , L. & Thompson , P. 2019. Attitude in Students' Argumentative Writing: A Constrastive Perspective. *Language Studies Working Papers, 1***,** 3-15.

Xuan, W. W. 2017. Understanding Interpersonal Meaning making in Chinese high school students ESL writing: A systemic Functional Perspective. *The Asia Pacific Education Researcher.*

Xuan, W. W. & Huang, X. 2017. An exploratory study of ESL writing by Junior secondary students in China : Text type, register and textual features. *Functional Linguistics, 4.*