

Cohesion and Coherence in Pakistani Expository Argumentative Essays: A Corpus-Based Study

* Shahbaz Haider

** Prof. Dr. Muhammad Asim Mahmood (Correspondence Author)

*** Ayesha Asghar

Abstract

The current study aims to investigate the cohesion and coherence strategies employed by Pakistani English Language Learners (PELLs) in expository argumentative essays. For this purpose, the concept of Ideational Grammatical Metaphor premised upon Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory proposed by Devrim (2015) was applied to 50 expository essays drawn from International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE). The deployment of IGM linguistic resources (i.e., lexically dense nominal groups) in the text generates lexically condensed clauses, text cohesion, and causal linkages within the clauses (Thompson, 2014). The results reveal that most PELLs in this research contained an inadequate understanding of the cohesion and coherence realized by IGM linguistic resources in argumentative writing. The overuse of communicative conjunctions in the PELLs' texts common in spoken English primarily formed their expository essays into descriptive texts. Pedagogically, it is safe to assume that, through the research findings, English Language Teachers (ELTs) can systematically teach PELLs about the employment of IGMs to produce cohesion and coherence in their argumentative written texts.

Keywords: Grammatical Metaphor, Ideational Grammatical Metaphor, Systemic Functional Linguistics, Argumentative Writing, Nominalization

Introduction

Argumentation can safely be presumed to be the commonly practiced genre for university learners, especially in arts, humanities, and social sciences (Hirvela, 2017; Wingate, 2012). Although the apparent nature of argument may vary according to different disciplines, the development of sound argument is a key component of successful writings across disciplines (Lea & Street, 1998). Therefore, effective argumentative essays are one of the leading indicators of second language (SL) writing ability to cultivate the critical thinking of graduate students. The composition of argument in essay writing can be further clarified by focusing on the writing format of two international standardized tests used to examine the students' writing skills. The writing task in IELTS (International English Language Testing System) explains that argumentative writing should contain concise and well-structured arguments (International English Language Testing System, 2020). Second, an argumentative essay as one part of the writing tasks of TOEFL (Test of English as Foreign Language) should entail an unambiguous stance regarding the topic supported by convincing claims and reliable evidence (Test of English as a Foreign Language, 2020). The above-mentioned parameters of the two essay writing tests indicate the essential prerequisites for argumentative writing.

To fulfill the requirements of an argumentative essay, cohesion, ties that bind the text, and coherence, the contextual appropriacy of any text in its relevant discourse community, are the two decisive factors to maintain unity among the interdependent ideas (Eggins, 2004). Textual unity means the enhancement of textual readability by integrating logically consistent notions (Martin, 1989). Therefore, the present study employed the grammatical metaphor, particularly ideational grammatical metaphor (IGM), to investigate the discourse-level strategies of cohesion and coherence in Pakistani expository, argumentative essays. According to Liardet (2016), IGM is construed by nominalization, i.e., the conversion of lexical items that are not usually nouns into nouns (Bloor &

* Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

** Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

Email: masimrai@gmail.com

*** University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan

Bloor, 1995), and it can consequently establish the interlinkages within the clauses, sentences, and paragraphs. These interconnections among discourse segments, according to Thompson (2014), are constructed via three linguistic tools of IGM: condensation realized by nominal groups (i.e., the transformation of simultaneously co-occurring meanings into a lexically dense nominal group), encapsulation (, i.e., chain of reasoning among the clauses), and the depersonalization (i.e., the in-clause causality).

Numerous past researches (Halliday & Martin, 1993; Halliday 2004; Humphrey, Dogra & Feez, 2012; Martin, 2008; Thomas & To, 2016) have explored IGMs as an effective linguistic resource to generate the highly persuasive written discourse. Through IGMs, agents are converted into abstract nominal groups to create a high social distance between the writer and the reader. The objective and formal voice of writers constitute the formality and impartiality of text. The socially distant relationship of writers with the readers is likely to result in achieving the social purpose of expository, argumentative essay, i.e., persuasion. Finally, this current study sought to corroborate the results of the previous studies while analyzing the fifty Pakistani expository, argumentative essays. Whereas the previous researches mostly studied the varied ways IGMs compacted the information into the written texts, the research utilized IGM as the linguistic construal to examine the cohesion and coherence of expository writings.

Literature Review

The previous studies based on their findings can be classified into two major areas: ideational grammatical metaphor (IGM) and its direct connection in enhancing the lexical density and uses of IGM in the development of coherence and cohesion in the argumentative texts.

Analyzing the IGM impact on lexical density, the organization of experiential meanings in written language differs from spoken language (Halliday, 1989, 2001). The information in the spoken language is commonly organized with more clauses to provide the lexical material. In contrast, the information in the written language is typically represented with, “a much denser pattern of lexicalized content” (Halliday, 1989, p. 76). The densely packed information is linguistically realized by nominalization predominately featuring in the written discourse. Thus, the spoken language is organized by clauses while the written language is the nominally dominated language (Biber D., 1991; Biber D., 2006; Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999; Charles, 2003; Schleppegrell M. J., 2008; Coffin, et al., 2003; Gebhard, Chen, & Britton, 2014). The difference between the spoken and written languages underlines that the dynamic nature of spoken mode is comprised of the higher grammatical intricacy (, i.e., a higher number of clauses) and the lower lexical density (, i.e., lower number of content-carrying words). By contrast, the synoptic nature of the written mode is characterized by the higher lexical density (, i.e., higher number of content-carrying words) and the lower grammatical intricacy (, i.e., lower number of clauses) (Halliday M. A., 2001; Martin J. R., 1991; Halliday, 1989, p. 77-78; Eggins, 2004; Ure, 1971; Gregori-Signesca & Clavel-Arroitia, 2015)

Contributing to the lexical density of the text, numerous research studies (Ryshina-Pankova, 2015; Derewianka, 2003; Arkoudis, 2005; Christie & Derewianka, 2008; Davison, 2005; Haneda & Wells, 2008; Hood, 2008) have explicated the different impacts of nominalization in the various disciplines, such as science, math, social studies, and English in schools. In scientific discourses, technicalities are actualized through the prefiguration of the world in scientific terms by converting the generalities into uncommon interpretations. It means that the words of common sense are translated into specialized knowledge through a definition that linguistically functionalizes as nominalizations. Contrarily, the discourse of humanities consists of abstractions to interpret worldly notions. The abstract ideas are grammaticalized via nominalizations to classify, assume, or describe the abstractions. (Martin J. R., 1991; Martin J. R., 1993).

Regarding cohesion and coherence, Liardet (2016) has deployed ideational grammatical metaphor as a key linguistic resource to investigate lexical density, text cohesion, and the causal linkages in the five successful and five unsuccessful argumentative texts. The corpus of high and low-scoring essays respectively contained 5821 and 5277 words. She noted that higher-scoring texts efficiently utilized the IGMs to convert the multiple co-occurring meanings into the nominal groups, and then used the IGMs as anaphoric references to achieve Given-New prosody. The Given-New prosody is the movement from Theme to Rheme. The theme is “the departure of the clause”, and Rheme is “the remainder of clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The Rheme of the preceding

clause is first condensed into the lexically dense nominal groups which will be retained as the Theme of the subsequent clause. The third tool manipulated by the expert writers was the metaphorical cause-and-effect network. To build causal relationships, the cause-and-effect linguistic choices such as cause leads to and contribute to, etc.) were incorporated between the extended nominal groups to realize the textual cohesion within the clauses of the argumentative essays.

Corroborating the findings of Liardet (2016), To, Thomas and Thomas (2020) employed the concepts of Systemic Functional Linguistics to explore the development of ideational grammatical metaphors in the 32 high-scoring persuasive texts ranging from 187 words to 427 words. They observed the increase in the utilization of IGMs following the learners' proficiency level to maintain the formality of text and the social distance. Through Grammatical metaphors, the effective structure of the essay was realized by introducing the abstractions and condense constructions in the thesis statement, the topic sentences, and the reiteration statement. To structure the ideas coherently, they further noted that the proficient learners manipulated IGMs to generate the causality inside the clauses to strengthen the arguments and form them more concisely. These uses of grammatical resources of causal explanations in the well-crafted arguments are one of the characteristics of grammatical metaphor as highlighted by numerous leading scholars (Christie & Derewianka, 2008; Derewianka, 1995).

In summary, the above studies can be subsumed into two groups: the impact of grammatical metaphor on the lexical density and the analysis of IGM impact on cohesion and coherence. Although the former group of research studies employed a large corpus of texts to identify IGMs as the primary feature of written discourse, most studies utilized the strata model (Halliday M. , 1985; Halliday M. , 1988; Halliday M. , 1998) and semantic model (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999) to analyze nominalizations in terms of their condensation effects rather than exploring the role of IGMs in discourse construction. On the other hand, a few research studies, e.g., Liardet (2016) and To, Thomas, and Thomas (2020) analyzed the cohesion and coherence strategies actualized by IGMs in the high-scoring essays. However, they were comprised of small sample size, and their major focus was on the writings of proficient learners. Resultantly, these researches could not comprehensively explain the discourse-level errors made by ELLs in their write-ups. In the Pakistani context, very few research studies were conducted to investigate the deployment of IGMs in expository argumentative essays.

To fill the research gaps, the current research has deployed the integrated model of GM designed by Devrim (2015) because of its focus on language teaching and rhetorical orientation. In other words, the integrated model of GM employs the grammatical metaphor in the English as second language (ESL) context to examine its impacts according to different stages of texts. Additionally, this research paper also consists of a larger date to explore the implications of IGMs in the development of cohesion and coherence, specifically in Pakistani expository essays. Through the findings of this research, it is likely to infer that Pakistani ELTs can precisely pinpoint not merely the issues related to cohesion and coherence in the Pakistani argumentative essays but can also pedagogically utilize IGMs to nourish the academic writing skills of PELLs.

Research Questions

Based on the textual of IGM proposed by Devrim (2015), the current research investigated the quantitative and qualitative usage of coherence and cohesion through the following research questions:

- i. What was the quantitative usage of cohesion and coherence of Pakistani expository, argumentative essays?
- ii. What was the qualitative usage of cohesion and coherence of Pakistani expository, argumentative essays?

Research Methodology

Theoretical Framework

This current paper utilized the integrated model of ideational grammatical devised by Devrim (2015) for teaching purposes. By using this approach of GM, the cohesion and coherence strategies were explored in PELLs' essays by focusing on three interlinked aspects of ideational grammatical metaphor: encapsulation construal, condensation construal, and depersonalization construal (Christie & Derewianka, 2008; Thompson, 2014).

Encapsulation Linguistic Construal

The first tool “encapsulation” similar to compacting, chain, or reasoning by Thompson (2014, p. 244) is the deployment of GMs incongruent to incongruent and vice versa patterns across the text. A congruent process or quality in the text is repacked into its incongruent forms which come at the theme position in the subsequent clause to create a Given-New relation.

Condensation Linguistic Construal

The second tool is the condensation tool linguistically construed by the complex nominal group. Through this property, the multiple co-occurring meanings can simultaneously be condensed into a single nominal group, resulting in “an extended explanation of information” which presents the explicit condensed wording.

Depersonalization Linguistic Construal

The third tool is the depersonalization tool that embodies interaction between experiential and logical grammatical metaphor (i.e., relators as circumstances, e.g., *because as due to*; relators as processes, e.g., *because as leads to*, and relators as participants, e.g., *because as the result of*) to cohesively organize and build arguments via a wide range of cause-and-effect relationships.

Sampling

The purposeful random sampling of mixed-methods approach was selected to collect the data of fifty essays ranging, from 500 to 1000 words, from the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) (Granger, Dupont, & Meunier, 2020).

Analysis

Not every nominalization, as Christie and Derewianka (2008) assert, can be termed as grammatical metaphor unless it can be unpacked into the congruent form of language. Based on this parameter, the multidimensional analysis tagger (MAT) <https://sites.google.com/site/multidimensional-tagger/home> was first employed to find out the possible nominalization instances of the essays, and, after it, only those nominalization patterns that could be converted into clauses were manually chosen for the analysis in this study.

Analysis and Discussion

The researcher employed Devrim’s framework of IGM (2015) to analyze the cohesion and coherence strategies of Pakistani expository essays. The analysis and discussion of essays were classified into three sections based on three interconnected aspects of IGM: the realization of condensation in PELLs’ essays, the realization of encapsulation in PELLs’ essays, and the realization of depersonalization in PELLs’ essays.

Realization of Condensation in PELLs’ Essays

After the examination of fifty essays, the overall frequency of nominalizations in the essays was tabulated below:

Table 2

Frequency of Words and Nominalization in the Fifty Essays

Total Number of Words in the Fifty essays	65295	Total Number of Nominalizations	703 (1%)
---	--------------	---------------------------------	-----------------

In above the table, it can be analyzed that, out of fifty essays, 1% of nominalization was utilized in the PELLs’ expository essays to depict the doings and happenings of participants, e.g.

- i. If **both of the parents** do not take part equally in the bringing up of the children.... (Essay PAAO1022)
- ii. **They** take better care of their children and home as well. (Essay PAAM1002)

In the above examples, the human participants (, i.e., animated actors) were employed to perform the actions such as “do not take part and take better care” unlike the uses of nominalization. The small number of nominalizations (, i.e., the depersonalized subjects) indicated the higher number of animated actors in the essays. This overuse of animated actors marked the highly personalized writings of PELLs, resulting in biased texts. The subjectivity of Pakistani texts, thus, affected the persuasiveness of argumentative discourse.

Following the parameters of analysis, only those nominalizations that could be unpacked into clauses occurrences were selected (To, Thomas, & Thomas, 2020). The types and structures of nominalization used for grammatical metaphor were presented in table No.3 below:

Table 3
Types and Structure of IG Ms

Types of IGMs	Frequency	Percentage	Structure of IGMs	Frequency	Percentage
Process as noun	194	0.3%	Nominalization post-modified with nominal group	274	0.4%
Quality as noun	104	0.2%	Nominalization post-modified with relative clause	24	0.04%
Total No.	298	0.5%		298	

Table No. 3 shows that, out of the total number of words (, i.e., 65295), the student learners utilized 0.3 % nominalization (, i.e., process as a noun) and 0.2% nominalization of quality as a noun in their essays. The minimal number of grammatical metaphors (, i.e., nearly 1%) could neither compact the information nor depersonalized the complete text. Thus, the Pakistani expository essays were observed to be highly personalized essays, unlike the argumentative essay. Despite the PELLs’ subjective writing, incongruent forms of nominalization and their congruent forms were illustrated in the table below:

Table 4
Congruent Forms of Ideational Grammatical Metaphors

Nominalization (, i.e., Process as noun)		Nominalization (, i.e., process as adjective)	
Incongruent form	Congruent form	Incongruent form	Congruent form
the desires, necessities, requirements, demands, and needs of their children (PASU1005)	They do not comprise what their children desire, which things are necessary, what they require, demand, and need.	more attachment with the children (PARJ1008)	She is more attached to children.
the cause of nation’s reverence (PAAO1014)	This causes that nation to revere her.	perplexity for the children, (PAVL1006)	She remains perplexed for her children.

The above table displayed the unpacking of grammatical metaphors into the clauses. According to, Thomas, and Thomas’s study (2020), the nominalized clauses in the argumentative essays contribute to the achievement of the persuasiveness comprising the formality and social distance. Through IGM, human agents are removed to generate “high social distance”. This formality and objectiveness of texts create a credible relationship between the readers and the writers. Although PLLs deployed IGMs, the scantiness in the usage of IGMs could not produce cohesion and coherence in the essays.

Moreover, GMs realized by the nominalizations with relative clauses and nominal groups in the essays were, respectively, 0.04 % and 0.4 %. The post-modification of nominalization with relative clauses, e.g., “the very beautiful relation in which the young ones and the kids”, “a perfect personality that becomes the cause of great honor for her and the nation.”, and “the only personality than no one can take place of her” increased the number of clauses in the PELLs’ texts. The increase in the number of clauses led to the high grammatical intricacy and lower lexical density. Therefore, the average lexical density of essays was 38. The average lexical density of Pakistani expositions correlated with the lexical density of spoken text (Ure, 1971).

Uses IGMs in the Stages of PELLs’ Essays

The small number of IGM occurrences in the essays exhibited the PELLs’ heavy reliance upon conjunctions to build coherence among their viewpoints. The calculations of clauses of expository essays were given in table No.5 below:

Table 5
Clause Simplexes and Complexes in Pakistani Expository Essays

Stages of Essay	Analyzed sentences	Simplex	clause complexes
Thesis Stage	920 (38%)	444 (18%)	476 (20%)
Argument Stage	1284 (53%)	528 (23%)	756 (31%)
Conclusion Stage	228 (9%)	90 (4%)	138 (6%)
Total	2432	972 (39%)	1370 (56%)

The above table shows that the Pakistani writers utilized 20% complex clauses as compared to clause simplexes, i.e., 18% at the thesis stages. A similar situation was with the conclusion stage, i.e., 6 % complex clauses and 4% clause simplexes. The higher number of clause complexes of thesis and conclusion stages was deployed to unnecessarily elaborate the points as illustrated in text No.1:

Text:1

Since the beginning of this universe, since the very first day when man and woman became part of this world, there is a discussion about man and woman. In the opinions of some people women are better **and** in the views of some men is better. **But** there is no conclusion about this discussion **that** who is better. (thesis stage, PAAO1022)

The above example from the thesis stage indicates that the student-writer explained the arguments through conjunctions (, i.e., and, but, and that). This excessive usage of coordinate and subordinate linkages enhanced the number of clauses which probably revealed unawareness about the strategical manipulation of ideational grammatical at thesis, argument, and conclusion stages.

According to the researches (Schleppergrell M. J., 2004; Christie & Derewianka, 2008; Meyers, 2016; Ravelli, 2004; Miller & Pessoa, 2016), the elaborated nominal groups can be properly analyzed concerning their uses in the clauses of the thesis, argument, and conclusion stages. The strategical packing and unpacking of clauses lead to the required clause structures needed for the thesis stage, argument stage, and conclusion stage. The phases of thesis and conclusion stages provide the synoptic information that will be followed in the incoming argument stages and reiterated the arguments in the essays, respectively. Therefore, the number of highly condensed clause simplexes is higher as compared to the argument stage to compactly convey information in the thesis and conclusion stages. As Halliday (1998) mentioned, the lexically dense relational clauses are the key feature of scientific writing. The reason behind the use of semantically condensed clauses is to encapsulate the multiple meanings within a few clauses. On the other hand, the argument stages in the essays majorly unfold the arguments to justify the stance through the clause complexes.

In this study, the clause simplexes deployed by PELLs were not lexically dense clauses as mentioned below:

- a) This topic has great importance as parents play a great role in a family. A man and woman together become a family with their children. (Thesis stage, essay PACJ1005)
- b) In the topic Are woman better parents than men we can check the examples of those families which have lack of woman. (Thesis Stage, essay PACJ1005)

The examples of clause simplexes taken from essay PACJ1005 illustrated the descriptive attributive clauses rather than lexically dense clauses. The excessively deployed descriptive clauses in the PELLs' texts affected the written argumentative discourse grammatically and pragmatically. Grammatically, the higher number of functional words resulted in a statistical decrease in grammatical density, and pragmatically marred the social purposes of Pakistani expository texts: formality, social distance, and objectiveness in argumentative written discourse.

Apart from the lexically plain clause simplexes, the higher majority of clause complexes in the essays were mostly combined through communicative conjunctions characteristic of spoken English, e.g., adverbial conjunctions (, i.e., because, if, and when, etc.) as shown in the above thesis stage. These clause combining strategies in the Pakistani expository argumentative essays, as Schleppergrell (1996) pointed out, were the indicators of the developing writers' lack of experience with the highly valued lexical and grammatical resources of academic writers. She further affirmed in her study that the clause combining strategies commonly used in spoken English was dominant in the PELLs' texts to link the discourse segments rather than using the highly valued features of written discourse: nominalizations, adjectives, complex verbs, and prepositional phrases to condense information and ideas into single-clause structures. Hence, it can be deduced that the clause integration, i.e., lexically condensed clauses, rather than the clause combination is the valued linguistic choice of written discourse.

Realization of Encapsulation in PELLs' Essays

To begin with the encapsulation tool, not any single instance in the argumentative essays could build the Given-New relationship among the clauses. The incoherence of clauses in the Pakistani expository text was exemplified below:

Text 2

- a) Parents are the person who makes ourselves best to live in a society. Here the question arises **that** whether the man or woman are better parents as both equally do the effort for their children. Man go outside **and** do work to get money for their children and to run his family. The woman works day and night for their children. (thesis stage, PAGW1007).

From the above example, it can be examined that although PELLs utilized nominal structures, they could not formulate Theme-Rheme Parosody (i.e., conversion of information at the Rheme position into lexically dense nominal groups and then used as the theme of the incoming clauses). In the above example, the underlined information “the person who make ourselves best to live in a society, better parents, and effort for their children ” at the Rheme position was not utilized at the theme position of the next clause by condensing the previous information. Although the learners attempted to use cohesive devices of subordinate (, i.e, as and that) and coordinate conjunctions (, i.e, and) to build coherence among the sentences, the temporal, additive, and adversative cohesive devices (, i.e, textual themes) deployed by PELLs disturbed the cohesion and coherence of the expository essays as mentioned by Chang & Lee (2019).

Instead of explicit cohesive devices, Liardet (2016) pointed out that the proficient learners preferred to utilize the grammatical metaphors in the anaphoric form at the Theme positions of subsequent clauses by condensing the previous chunks of information to create the “Given-New prosody”. She (2016) further found that the expert writers also used the Theme-Rheme relationships as “the packing and unpacking of the GM across larger stretches of text as a type of referencing tool” to emphasize the recurrent claims. In contrast, the thin lexical chains in the Pakistani expository essays indicated the weak arguments because of not precisely manifesting numerous dimensions of an argument (Chang & Lee, 2019). Thus, it can be presumed that the total absence of encapsulation construals in the Pakistani expository essays disrupted the cohesive effects of Theme-Rheme /Given-New prosody.

Realization of Depersonalization

Moreover, the third essential feature of ideational grammatical metaphor is the depersonalization that is enacted inside the clauses through the cause-and-effect network. This in-clause causality was missing in the essays due to the absence of logical metaphors. The deficiency of cause-and-effect links demonstrated the Pakistani university learners’ incomplete understanding of the proper utilization of the grammatical metaphors. For example, the following thesis stage was retrieved from the essays PAGW1007 to reveal PLLs’ descriptive writing style:

Society is a set of people living in it. it. In a society bad and good people **are living** We are living in a society known by our deeds. We are living in a society with our parents. Parents are the person who makes themselves best to live in a society. Here the question arises that whether the man or woman are better parents as both equally do the effort for their children. Man go outside and do work to get money for their children and to run his family. The woman works day and night for their children. Some are working ladies and some are housewives. ... (Thesis stage, Essay PAGW1007)

The above thesis stage indicates that PELL initiated the thesis stages through the pronominal as exemplified, “Society ... In a society We ... We.. Parents ... The question ... Man ... Woman.” The dominant usage of pronouns highlighted the incoherent ideas in the Pakistani expository essays by adding more and more information rather than extending arguments. Hence, it can be safely assumed that PELLs’ inattentiveness towards the construction of cause-and-effect networks within the clauses manifested the student writers’ inexperience about the preferred written style as mentioned by To, Thomas, and Thomas (2020).

The long series of pronouns at the Theme positions made the PELLs’ writing texts repetitive, static, and personalized account rather than cause-and-effect networks required to build reasoning within the clauses (Almaden, 2008; Jalilifar, 2010; Mellos, 2011; Gill & Jangua, 2020). Apart from the overuse of pronouns, the utilization of attributive relative clauses such as “a set of people”, and material clauses (e.g., are living, work, and go, etc.) reduced the depersonalization and formality of argumentative essays. The personalized texts of PELLs largely reflected their narrative and descriptive mode of writing. The ineffective organization of Pakistani expository essays caused incoherent essays because of lacking the interconnectivity of arguments in the PELLs’ expository essays. However, in Liardet’s study (2016), the internal cohesion in the proficient writers’ texts

formulated a web of cause-and-effect relationships through logical metaphors between the lexically dense nominal groups to structure the sequence of the hierarchy of arguments.

Conclusion

The appropriate employment of ideational grammatical metaphors in expository essays constructs the cohesive and coherent written discourse. In this research, the analysis of Pakistani expository essays indicates that the unsystematically organized and few complex nominal groups failed to communicate proper meanings. Not any single instance in the essays could neither realize the encapsulation construals to achieve the Given-New prosody nor pack or unpack the GMs to emphasize a certain argument. Instead, PELLs overused the ongoing series of pronominals to describe the personalities in the essays. This descriptive mode of writing of essays was, thus, due to the absence of causal networks which primarily denoted the PELLs' unawareness about the informational structure of arguments. Although the sampling of fifty essays was not the representative corpus, the present study utilized the IGMs as the powerful linguistic tool to identify the cohesion and coherence of expository argumentative essays that could be quite insightful for future researches. Finally, it is reasonable to assume that the pedagogical implications of this study provide English Language Teachers (ELTs) the explicit discourse-level strategies to improve the cohesion and coherence of argumentative essays by making them more conscious about their discourse-level errors.

References

- Almaden, D. O. (2008). An analysis of the topical structure of paragraphs written by Filipino students. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 15(1), 127-153.
- Arkoudis, S. (2005). Fusing pedagogic horizons: Language & content teaching in the mainstream. *Linguistics & Education*, 16(2), 173-187.
- Biber, D. (1991). *Variation across speech & writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken & written registers*. Philadelphia/ Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken & written English*. London: Longman.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (1995). *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Chang, P., & Lee, M. (2019). Exploring textual & interpersonal Themes in the expository essays of college students of different linguistic backgrounds. *English for Specific Purposes*, 54, 75-90.
- Charles, M. (2003). 'This mystery...': a corpus-based study of the use of nouns to construct stance in theses from two contrasting disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(4), 313-326.
- Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2008). *School Discourse: Learning to write across the years of schooling*. London: Continuum.
- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T., & Swann, J. (2003). *Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Davison, C. (2005). Learning your lines: Negotiating language & content in subject English. *Linguistics & Education*, 16(2), 219-237.
- Derewianka, B. (1995). Language development in the transition from childhood to adolescence: The role of grammatical metaphor. Retrieved from <https://www.researchonline.mq.edu.au/vital/access/manager/Repository/mq:20269>
- Derewianka, B. (2003). Grammatical metaphor in the transition to adolescence. In A. M. Simon-Vandenberg, M. Tavernier's, & J. Ravelli (Eds.), *Grammatical Metaphor: Views from Systemic Functional Linguistics* (pp. 185-219). Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Devrim, D. Y. (2015). Grammatical metaphor: What do we mean? What exactly are we researching? *Functional Linguistics*, 2(3), 1-15.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Gebhard, M., Chen, I. A., & Britton, L. (2014). "Miss, nominalization is a nominalization:" English language learners' use of SFL metalanguage & their literacy practices. *Linguistics & Education*, 26, 106-125.
- Gill, A. A., & Jangua, F. (2020). Genre pedagogy & ELLs' writing skills: A theme analysis. *English Language Teaching*, 13(8), 8-18.

- Granger, S., Dupont, M., & Meunier, F. (2020, May). *International corpus of learner English. Version 3*. Retrieved from ResearchGate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341408088_International_Corpus_of_Learner_English_Version_3
- Gregori-Signes, C., & Clavel-Arroitia, B. (2015). Analyzing lexical density & lexical diversity in university students' written discourse. *Procedia - Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 198(24), 546 – 556.
- Halliday, M. A. (1978). *Language as a social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1985). *Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1988). On the language of physical science. In M. Ghadessy., *Registers of written English*. London: Pinter.
- Halliday, M. A. (1989). *Spoken & written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar. 2nd edition*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. (1998). Things & relations: regrammaticising experience as technical knowledge. In J. R. Martin, & R. Veel (Eds.), *Critical & Functional Perspective on Discourses of Science* (pp. 185-235). London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. (2001). Literacy & linguistics: relationships between spoken & written language. In A. Burns, & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analyzing English in a Global Context* (pp. 181-193). London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M., & Martin, J. R. (1993). *Writing Science*. Pittsburgh: PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Halliday, M. (1998). Things & relations: regrammaticising experience as technical knowledge. In J. Martin, & R. Veel (Eds.), *Reading Science: Critical & Functional Perspectives on Discourse of Science* (pp. 185–235). London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2008). Learning an additional language through dialogic inquiry. *Linguistics & Education*, 22(2), 114-136.
- Hirvela, A. (2017). Argumentation & second language writing: Are we missing the boat? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 1-5.
- Hood, S. (2008). Summarizing writing in academic contexts: Implicating meaning in processes of change, 19(4), *Linguistics & Education*, 351-365.
- Humphrey, S., Droga, L., & Feez, S. (2012). *Grammar & meaning*. Sidney: Primary English Teaching Association Australia.
- International English Language Testing System. (2020, May 14). *IELTS*. Retrieved from International English Language Testing System: <https://www.ielts.org/about-the-test/test-format>
- Jalilifar, A. (2010). Thematization in EFL students' composition writing & its relation to the academic experience, 41(1), *RELC Journal*, 31-45.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157-172.
- Liardét, C. L. (2016). Grammatical metaphor: Distinguishing success. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 22, 109-118.
- Martin, J. R. (1991). Nominalization in science & humanities: Distilling knowledge & scaffolding text. In E. Ventola (Ed.), *Functional & Systemic Linguistics: Approaches & Uses* (pp. 307-338). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter Berlin.
- Martin, J. R. (1989). *Factual writing: exploring & challenging social reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1993). Life as a noun: Arresting the universe in science & humanities. In M. A. Halliday (Ed.), *Writing science, literary & discourse power* (pp. 241-293). London: Palmer Press.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre Relations Mapping Culture*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Mellos, V. D. (2011). *Coherence in English as a Second Language Undergraduate Writing: a theme-rheme analysis*. Retrieved from SDSUnbound Scholarship. Research. Heritage: <https://digitallibrary.sdsu.edu/islandora/object/sdsu%3A4217>
- Meyers, A. (2016). *Longman Academic Writing Series 5: Essays to Research Papers*. White Plains: Pearson Education.

- Miller, R. T., & Pessoa, S. (2016). Where's Your Thesis Statement & What Happened to Your Topic Sentence? Identifying Organizational Challenges in Undergraduate Student Argumentative Writing. *TESOL*, 7(4), 1-27.
- Morrison, Manion, & Cohen. (2011). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Ravelli, L. J. (2004). Signalling the organization of written texts: Hyper-themes in management & history essays. In L. J. Ravelli (Ed.), *Analysing academic writing: The contextualized framework* (pp. 104-125). London, England: Continuum.
- Schleppergrell, M. (1996). Conjunctions in Spoken English & ESL Writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 271-285.
- Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2015). A meaning-based approach to the study of complexity in L2 writing: The case of grammatical metaphor. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 29, 51-63.
- Schleppergrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistic Perspective*. London: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Schleppergrell, M. J. (2008). *Historical Discourse: The Language of Time, Cause & Evaluation (Caroline Coffin, 2006)*. London: Curriculum Inquiry.
- Test of English as a Foreign Language. (2020, May 05). *Test of English as a Foreign Language*. Retrieved from TOEFL: <https://www.ets.org/toefl>
- Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- To, V., Thomas, D., & Thomas, A. (2020). Writing persuasive texts: Using grammatical metaphors for rhetorical purposes in an educational context. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 40(2), 1-21. doi:10.1080/07268602.2020.1732867
- Ure, J. N. (1971). Lexical density & register differentiation. In G. E. Perren, & T. J. L. (Eds.), *Application of Linguistics: Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of Linguistics, Cambridge 1969* (pp. 443-452). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wingate, U. (2012). 'Argument!' helping students understand what essay writing is about. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(2), 145-154.