



**THE “PROS AND CONS” ESSAY AS AN ELT SCHOOL GENRE**  
**LAS REDACCIONES DE “PROS” Y “CONTRAS” COMO**  
**GÉNERO EN LA ENSEÑANZA DE INGLÉS**

**ANA LIS GALÁN DA COSTA**

**Tutora: Ana I. Moreno**

**UNIVERSIDAD DE LEÓN**

**Departamento de Filología Moderna: Inglés**

**TRABAJO FIN DE MÁSTER**

**Máster Universitario en Formación de Profesorado de Educación Secundaria  
Obligatoria y Bachillerato, Formación Profesional y Enseñanza de Idiomas**

**Curso 2017-2018**

**AUTORIZACIÓN DEL TUTOR PARA LA DEFENSA ORAL  
DEL TRABAJO FIN DE MÁSTER**

El/la Profesor D/Dña ANA ISABEL MORENO FERNÁNDEZ como Tutor/a del trabajo Fin de Máster titulado: **THE ‘PROS AND CONS’ ESSAY AS AN ELT SCHOOL GENRE / LAS REDACCIONES DE “PROS Y CONTRAS” COMO GÉNERO EN LA ENSEÑANZA DEL INGLÉS** y realizado por D/Dña. ANA LIS GALÁN DA COSTA en el *Máster Universitario en Formación de Profesorado de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Bachillerato, Formación Profesional y Enseñanza de Idiomas*, informa favorablemente del mismo y autoriza su defensa oral.

En León, a 3 de julio de 2018,

VºBº



Fdo.: Ana I. Moreno Fernández

## Table of contents

1.1. Significance of the study .....	3
1.2. Focus and purposes of the study. ....	3
1.3. Statement of problems.....	4
1.4. Hypothesis and research questions.....	4
2. Literature review .....	5
2.1. Genre analysis .....	5
2.2. The genre of argumentative essays .....	7
2.3. The rhetorical structure of “pros and cons” essays .....	8
3. Methods.....	11
3.1. Method for textbook selection.....	11
3.2. Method for corpus compilation. ....	12
3.3. Method of move analysis .....	12
3.3.1. The segmentation protocol .....	13
3.3.2. Coding protocol.....	14
3.3.3. The codebook .....	15
3.3.4. Revising the codebook and segmentation protocol.....	15
4. Results of text analysis and discussion .....	16
4.1. “Pros and cons” essays vs “for and against” essays. The indistinguishable twins.....	16
4.2. The generic structure of “pros and cons” essay .....	18
4.3. The formal structure of “pros and cons” essays .....	22
4.4. Aspects of the lexico-grammatical realization of the “pros and cons” essay.....	23
5. Conclusions and pedagogical implications .....	24
6. Pedagogical applications .....	25
7. Acknowledgements .....	27
8. References .....	28
9. Appendices .....	32
Appendix 1: Texts in the corpus .....	32
Appendix 2. The codebook .....	34
Appendix 3. Initial text selection .....	42
Appendix 4. An example of confusion .....	44
Appendix 5. Analysis of a prototypical text.....	45
Appendix 6. Obligatory and non-obligatory steps .....	48
Appendix 7. Linguistic expressions associated to each step. ....	49
Appendix 8. Types of formal structure .....	53

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1. Significance of the study**

The importance of argumentative essays in the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom cannot be denied. This genre is taught to students from the first year of Secondary education to the last year of *Bachillerato*. Moreover, it is a genre that is used by everyone on a daily basis since it allows people to justify their own (and others') actions, thoughts and beliefs. Therefore, the knowledge of this genre allows students to express their opinions, justify them, analyse both the advantages and disadvantages of an issue and to prepare the ground for a debate with other students. Furthermore, knowing how to construct "pros and cons" essays (PCEs henceforth), which is the subgenre with which we will be dealing, is essential for considering the positive and negative aspects of anything we may need to analyse in our everyday life.

### **1.2. Focus and purposes of the study.**

As a future highschool EFL teacher, the analysis of pedagogical material for the improvement of student's learning experience is one of my main interests. Because of this, the present study focuses on the analysis of a selection of argumentative texts, specifically PCEs, taken from textbooks of different publishing houses (Oxford, Burlington, Macmillan, Cambridge, Longman) and for the level of *Bachillerato*. The aim of this study is two-fold: to find out whether authors propose the same model for this subgenre and have a clear idea of its conceptualization, and to identify the typical generic structure of PCEs, also analysing which language expressions are associated with each move and step, and the different ways PCEs can be organised formally. The results from the analysis of the generic structure (see section 4.) will be used to create proposals for its application in the EFL class (see section 6.).

### 1.3. Statement of problems

There are different types of argumentative essays such as opinion essays, “for and against” essays (FAEs henceforth), PCEs ... In order to create texts belonging to these genres, we need to be aware of the differences between them and to know the rhetorical structure of each of them. However, textbooks explaining the generic structure of these texts seem to offer confusing explanations, expressions and structures. Apparently, the differences between these genres are not clear enough, which causes a great confusion concerning terminology and conceptualization. This issue proved to be a stumbling block for the present study. Moreover, not only does it seem that the subgenre of PCEs has not been studied by researchers, but researchers’ analyses of argumentative essays are unsatisfactory (discussed in sections 2.2. and 2.3.). Therefore, it was considered necessary to clarify this confusion before performing an empirical analysis of this genre. For this, the differences between FAEs and PCEs were explained (see section 2.2 and 4.1) and this explanation was used when selecting the texts to be included or excluded from the corpus.

### 1.4. Hypothesis and research questions

The hypothesis of this study is that the seeming lack of an adequate description of the generic structure of PCEs seen in researchers’ analysis will be replicated in the description of this genre as present in textbooks. The questions that will be answered in this study are then the following:

Do authors of textbooks seem to have a clear idea of what PCEs are?

What is the rhetorical and formal structure of PCEs provided in EFL textbooks?

Do the different textbooks propose the same model for PCEs?

How can the teaching of PCEs be improved?

Since this analysis is framed within the area of genre analysis some information about it, its different approaches and the most relevant authors are presented below.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1. Genre analysis

Although the area of genre analysis has been studied by a considerable number of experts from very different points of view, few of them have given a straightforward definition of it. The reason behind this is that the definition of “genre analysis” depends on that of “genre”, which is not univocal but rather each approach create their own. Following Bhatia (2002, p. 4; 1997, p. 629) and Swales (1990, p. 1), we could define the activity of genre analysis as the multi-disciplinary study of situated (produced within a discourse community in a specific situational and rhetorical context) discourse, be it written or spoken, for a specific goal. However, other definitions are possible, as we have said above. The definition of genre that is more relevant for the present work is that belonging to one of the approaches presented by Hyon (1996). According to her findings, a great number of studies related to the areas of teaching EFL and as first language (L1) appeared in the 1980s. The most important approaches that emerged in that context are the Sydney School or Systemic Functional Approach, the English for Specific Purposes (ESP henceforth), these two being linguistic approaches, and the New Rhetoric, which is non-linguistic. These three are explained below.

The first of the linguistic approaches is the Sydney School. It came into being thanks to the influence of Halliday, founding professor of linguistics at the University of Sydney, on the Australian Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) that was created after the Second World War (Feez, 2001, p.43). According to Halliday (1978), language varies depending on the context of situation, which is represented by three dimensions: field, tenor and mode. These define the register, that is to say, the linguistic resources that are associated to a specific situation or context by members of a particular culture. Because of this, context and text are closely interrelated and contained within each other. Implications of this theory for the concept of genre and teaching were drawn by other authors such as Jim Martin and Joan Rothery (Macken-Horarik, 2001, p. 20). Martin defines genre as “staged, goal oriented social processes” (1984), in which we can see a social rather than cognitive emphasis. The social purpose and contextual situation determine the genre and a specific register, which shapes the linguistic features of the text. Each genre is then associated with a specific schematic structure formed by structural elements called “stages”. Teachers following this approach during the 1980s

taught genres by presenting annotated model texts containing the main stages and linguistic characteristics, thus focusing only on structural aspects (Macken-Horarik 2001, p. 20-23).

The second of the linguistic approaches is the ESP. The first ESP analysis took place within studies about language features in register although it later developed in different ways (Swales, 1990), one of them being move analysis. It is an analytical method, originally created by Swales (1981) to explain the generic structure of academic articles. Move analysis is employed to reveal the generic structure of texts (from many other genres), that is, the moves and steps that constitute their macro structure (Biber et al., 2007, p. 23; Moreno & Swales, 2018, p. 40). Moves are defined by Swales as “discoursal or rhetorical units performing coherent communicative functions in texts” (2004, pp. 228-229), and steps are defined as “multiple elements that together, or in some combination, [...] achieve the purpose of the move to which it belongs” (Biber et al., 2007, p. 24). That is, while moves are parts of the texts that have a general function, steps are more specific functions within a given move. This emphasis on the communicative goal is a consequence of Swales’ definition of genre. For Swales, “A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes...constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constraints choice of content and style” (Swales, 1990, p. 58). Therefore, the primary focus of ESP is on the purpose, which determines the genre of the text. Swales’ definition of genre and his move-based approach has had an enormous influence in ESP genre analysis (Dudley-Evans, 2000).

As opposed to these two linguistic approaches, the New Rhetoric is a non-linguistic one since it is not interested in lexical or grammatical features or in the generic structure of texts. It is focused on more abstract elements such as the context, the functions and purposes of different genres, the values, beliefs and behaviours of those belonging to a specific discourse community (Flowerdew, 2001). While Hyland (2004) emphasises the importance of the genre approach when teaching writing to students, authors from the New Rhetoric believe that genres should not be objects of explicit instruction.

Since our work is concerned with the analysis of the generic structure of PCEs, its division into moves and steps and the identification of common linguistic expressions, we will draw on the ESP framework. Below, some information about the selected genre for analysis, PCEs, is provided. However, before explaining the characteristics of PCEs, it is necessary to explain the concept of argumentation and argumentative text.

## **2.2. The genre of argumentative essays**

Taking into account the multiple perspectives from which argumentation can be studied (pragmatics, natural or formal logic, dialectics, rhetoric and persuasion, etc.) several definitions are possible. As explained in Gutiérrez (2016, p. 136) the four most important theoretical approaches are those of rhetorical argumentation by Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958), Toulmin's (1958) logic argumentation, the constructivist approach or theory of natural logic by Jean-Blaise Grize (1982), and the linguistic approach to argumentation developed by Jean-Claude Anscombe and Oswald Ducrot (1983).

I opted, however, for a general and neutral definition of argumentation as an activity or form of dialogic expression in which a person provides arguments, that is, reasons, to support a thesis in order to convince the addressee(s) by successfully modifying his/her ideas or beliefs in relation to a controversial topic (Gutiérrez, 2016, p. 136; Coirier, P.; Andriessen, J. & Chanquoy, L., 1999, p. 26; Rijlaarsdam & Espéret, 1999, np.). However, is this the purpose of PCEs? Are PCEs argumentative essays?

Before going any further, it is now necessary to reflect on the nature of PCEs. Both opinion essays and PCEs, also found in textbooks as “debate essay”, “for and against essay”, “discussion essay”, “advantages and disadvantages essay”, “balanced argumentative essay” (the differences between these terms will be explained below), are classified in textbooks as two different types of argumentative essay, that is to say, as two subgenres. However, an analysis comparing both will show that while the first type can be considered argumentative the second cannot strictly speaking.



On the one hand, in opinion essays the writer takes a stand in favour of a thesis and supports that position (only one point of view) by providing arguments and concludes with his/her personal opinion. On the other hand, the writer of PCEs, as will be seen in the results section, does not support a position but provides positive or negative aspects in relation to an issue (that is, the advantages and disadvantages) and analyses both without choosing any of them. Therefore, the purpose is not to persuade or convince an implicit addressee of the benefits or drawbacks of an issue but to analyse them. Having said this and taking into account that genres depend on the purpose (Swales, 1990, p. 58), the question we pose in this work is whether PCEs should be categorized within the genre of argumentative essays or as analytical texts.

One criterion that is followed by some authors to determine the existence of a genre is that it be considered as such by the members of a discourse community. Since this genre is classified in textbooks and by experts as a type or subgenre of argumentative essay, we will continue classifying it in this way. However, we must admit its special nature. Although in PCEs, the writer provides a series of negative and positive aspects of an issue, the purpose is not to convince but to analyse the pros and cons. Moreover, PCEs should not be mixed up with balanced opinion essays, which are, in fact, a subgenre of the argumentative essay. In these, the author gives his opinion by providing subjective arguments on both sides of an issue and in the conclusion one of the two points of view is clearly chosen.

Now that the nature of argumentative texts and that of PCEs has been discussed, the next section focuses on the generic structure of PCEs, which is the object of analysis of this study.

### **2.3. The rhetorical structure of “pros and cons” essays**

The structure of argumentative texts has been studied by many authors. Some of them are Veel's (1997), with his tripartite structure of thesis, argument and reinforcement of thesis; Derewianka (1990), who developed a five-move model formed by the background, thesis, preview, argument and recommendations; Lock and Lockart (1998), who established a three-stage model composed by a thesis, an argument section and a conclusion (Qian, 2013); and Toulmin's model, formed by six components: claim,

data, warrant, backing qualification and rebuttal, which is considered as being very useful for the writing instruction of middle school students (Yeh, 1998, p. 126, 129, 130).

Nevertheless, the model by Hyland (1990) was preferred as a framework for this study since it is more similar to the structure found in textbooks and because he divided the rhetorical structure into stages and moves which is similar to the moves and steps division established by Swales (1990). Hyland's model has already been used by a number of students and scholars as a framework to analyse the move-step structure of essays. This is the case of Qian (2013), who analysed two corpora of 100 English argumentative essays each, from English and non-English majors, in order to compare their rhetorical patterns.

As can be seen in table 1 below, Hyland establishes a three-stage structure formed by the thesis, argument and conclusion. These stages are further divided into moves, of which those in brackets are optional. In the first stage, the writer introduces the topic of the essay and offers the proposition that is going to guide the development of the essay. The central part of the first stage is the specific proposition or thesis statement in which the writer takes a stand. In the second stage, the reasons to support the position established in the proposition are presented and explained. The claim move is the central part of the argumentation and the one in which the reasons for supporting the proposition are provided. The conclusion stage closes the essay by going back to the presented ideas and strengthening the position.

*Table 1. Hyland's (1990) structure for argumentative essays*

<b>STAGE</b>	<b>MOVE</b>
1. Thesis. Introduces the proposition to be argued.	(Gambit) Attention Grabber — controversial statement or dramatic illustration.
	(Information) Presents background material for topic contextualization.
	(Evaluation) Positive gloss — brief support of proposition.
	(Marker) Introduces and/or identifies a list.
2. Argument Discusses grounds for thesis.  (Four move argument sequence can be repeated indefinitely)	Marker Signals the introduction of a claim and relates it to the text.
	(Restatement) Rephrasing or repetition of proposition.
	Claim States reason for acceptance of the proposition. Typically based on: a. Strength of perceived shared assumptions. b. A generalization based on data or evidence. c. Force of conviction
	Support States the grounds which underpin the claim. Typically: a. Explicating assumptions used to make claim. b. Providing data or citing references.
	(Marker) Signals conclusion boundary
	Consolidation Presents the significance of the argument stage to the proposition.
3. Conclusion Synthesizes discussion and affirms the validity of the thesis.	(Affirmation) Restates proposition.
	(Close) Widens context or perspective of proposition

This model has been criticized by Dudley-Evans (2002), who considers that, although it is useful, there are a number of problems: the high number of optional moves, the fact that it does not consider the variation of the genre in different disciplines, hence being limited and that the model “seems based more on intuitions about what an essay should include than on detailed analysis of a suitable corpus of essays” (229). This lack of variation is also seen in the models mentioned at the beginning of this section. Moreover, although this model can be used to construct opinion essays, it cannot be used for other subgenres such as FAEs or PCEs, which have a different rhetorical structure and a different mapping of obligatory moves, as will be shown in the present work.

One of these problems, however, is solved by Jones (1993). This author does not provide a single model for all the disciplines but suggests a series of “strategies” or possible ways to construct “pros and cons” essays depending on the specific purpose of the essay. Thus, her proposal for writing PCEs takes into account a variety of possibilities for this subgenre. For example, in short essays, the body can be formed by a paragraph with the advantages and another paragraph with the disadvantages, while in longer essays dealing with many factors (economic, social, political, etc.) each paragraph deals with a different dimension from the two points of view.

In order to solve these problems, a model taking into account the above-mentioned aspects has been built. This model is the result of an empirical study based on the analysis of a corpus of PCEs. The methodology used for this study is explained in the next section.

### **3. Methods**

In this section, we first explain the methodology that has been followed to make an initial selection of texts. Then, the method employed to analyse that initial selection and determine which texts are included or excluded from the corpus is commented on. Finally, the method of move analysis which is used to analyse the generic structure of the texts included in the corpus is explained.

#### **3.1. Method for textbook selection.**

As a future highschool EFL teacher, one of my duties is to teach students how to write texts of different genres. As a result, the texts that have been selected were taken from highschool textbooks, which were selected according to their English level. To this end, the prologue or the webpages of various publishing houses were consulted. Some books indicate their level in the cover or in the backcover. Initially, only English textbooks belonging to the B2 (upper intermediate) level, which corresponds to the two years of *Bachillerato*, were selected. However, since the majority of the books for *Bachillerato* are B1-B2 level, textbooks belonging to this intermediate level were also included.

It was decided that the textbooks should be those used by Spanish students in the classroom and with which they work and study, that is, student's books and workbooks, in order to know how students actually learn to write PCEs and make suggestions for improvement that I can employ in my future teaching practices. Therefore, other English manuals belonging to the B2 or B1-B2 level and teachers' books were not taken into account. Moreover, textbooks specially adapted to learning EFL for Spanish students are preferred.

### 3.2. Method for corpus compilation.

The study is based on the analysis of a corpus formed by twenty texts, which were drawn from seventeen English textbooks for Spanish *Bachillerato* students who are studying EFL (see Appendix 1). The age of the *Bachillerato* students in Spain ranges from 15 to 17 years and their level of English ranges from B1, B1-B2 to B2, that is, from intermediate to upper-intermediate. The number of words per text is variable, from 120 to 200 words, and some of the textbooks include indications or guidelines on how to write PCEs, such as what their typical generic structure and phrases are.

As for the process of selection, we first made an initial selection of 39 model texts. Although this study is focused on PCEs, texts with the others terms in the title were included in the initial selection since the authors of textbooks did not seem to differentiate between these concepts clearly. As will be further discussed in section 4., while the terms “balanced argumentative essay”, “balanced opinion essay” “for and against essay”, “debate essay” make reference to a two-sided opinion essay in which the writer provides arguments from two points of view to **convince** the reader of something, the terms “advantages and disadvantages essay”, “pros and cons essay” and “discussion essay” make reference to texts in which the writer **analyses** the positive and the negative aspects of something.

Secondly, an initial (superficial) analysis of these texts was made to make sure that they were PCEs instead of texts belonging to any other genre or subgenre. The process of analysis is explained in the following section.

Thirdly, those texts which were identified as real PCEs were selected for the corpus. These are then analysed in depth. The others were discarded.

### 3.3. Method of move analysis

The method that has been followed for the initial analysis and for that of texts in the corpus is the analytical method of move analysis, already commented on in 2.1. The steps that have been followed to carry out the analysis are those proposed by Moreno and Swales (2018) and Moreno (2016). Their methodology for move analysis does not

focus on the move but on the step in a combined top-down and bottom-up approach. On the one hand, their approach is top-down in the sense that the analysis is influenced by the analysts' expectations of the genre and their knowledge of previous literature. This does not mean that pre-existing categories are imposed, as may happen with Biber et al. (2007), whose methodology seems vague and can lead to erroneous results such as the imposition of categories of moves to paragraphs that do not really have the stated function. On the other hand, their approach is bottom-up in the sense that each word in a relevant fragment needs to be processed before it can make sense in the context in which it appears (Moreno & Swales, 2018).

As for the process of analysis, Moreno and Swales (2018) and Moreno (2016) distinguish between the segmentation protocol and the codebook. The latter in turn includes the coding scheme (or hierarchy of functions), the definition of each step and examples with highlighted signals.

### 3.3.1. The segmentation protocol

The segmentation protocol consists in the division of the texts into meaningful fragments, which are not necessarily sentences, having a specific communicative function. To this purpose, while reading the text for the first time, a slash is drawn after each fragment when a communicative function in relation to the whole text or to the previous fragment is identified. This process is followed until the end of the text. Each fragment is put between square brackets while the interpretation of the communicative function is included between round brackets, and the relevant linguistic expressions are in bold, as illustrated below.

[You have the opportunity to do something you really believe in]<sub>5</sub> (This is stating a specific consequence of the positive aspect of the issue),/ [**such as** offering a new product or providing a new service.]<sub>6</sub> (This is offering an example of that positive consequence, thus reinforcing the claim that the issue has a positive aspect)

For the initial analysis only the segmentation is done. During this initial move analysis, a considerable number of texts, 19 out of 39, had to be excluded from the corpus. Although they had been categorized in textbooks as “advantages and

disadvantages” essays or PCEs some of them were FAEs and some of the texts categorized as FAEs or debate essays were PCEs. After having conducted the initial analysis, the texts that belonged to the genre of PCEs were selected for the final corpus of PCEs. A table with the selection, containing the number of words of each text, the English level of the textbook, the term used to refer to the genre, and the existence or not of guidelines is included in Appendix 1.

For the analysis of the texts in the corpus, after the segmentation process above mentioned was carried out, the fragments obtained were categorized or labelled as the codebook was being created.

### 3.3.2. Coding protocol

Regarding the coding protocol, as explained in Moreno and Swales (2018) and Moreno (2016), the communicative function of each segmented text fragment was interpreted and coded with a particular functional-semantic label. In this process, different labels were created for the different steps and for the moves in which they were later on grouped into. Then, each label was given an abbreviated code (see Appendix 2), and a preliminary coding scheme with the hierarchical list of functions and their codes was created. The different linguistic expressions (in bold) which may signal the existence of a step were also taken into account as part of the bottom-up approach.

[**In addition**, cars keep us warm and dry.]<sub>6</sub> (SC\_PA)/ [**Moreover**, with a car you can go exactly where you want to and when you want to.]<sub>7</sub> (SC\_PA).

However, following Moreno’s (2016) procedures, since the resulting number of categories is very high, they are reduced by resizing, merging and redefining them in order to create “mutually exclusive categories” (Moreno, 2016). Likewise, the resulting steps are then grouped into different moves depending on their function in relation to the text.

The coding scheme is then supplemented with a definition of each function and examples of fragments corresponding to that function, thus establishing the codebook.

### 3.3.3. The codebook

The complete codebook, which contains the coding scheme, the definition of each function and the examples, is included in Appendix 2. It is important to note that, as stated in Moreno & Swales (2018), the hierarchy of the functions that appear in the coding scheme does not necessarily correspond to the order in which these functions appear in actual PCEs. In the present study, moves appear in a logical order and steps are ordered according to their frequency but their order and position in PCEs can vary, as will be seen in section 4. In fact, what makes Moreno and Swales' (2018) approach different from others is that priority is given to the function of each fragment no matter what its position in the text is.

### 3.3.4. Revising the codebook and segmentation protocol

During the coding process some of the problems discussed in Moreno and Swales (2018) appeared. Because of this, a number of measures were taken and the coding scheme was revised. Following the author's recommendations, when it was difficult to differentiate between two functions, the definition in the codebook was changed or two functions were blended into a broader category. If a fragment had more than one function simultaneously, only the most prominent was coded. When fragments contained misleading markers or signals (marked in the segmentation process as an \*) or when they did not appear, the functional interpretation of the fragment was given priority: [**\*For example**, there would be fewer road accidents if there weren't so many cars.]<sub>10</sub> (This is a reason that supports the previous claim).

Another problem, also explained in Moreno and Swales (2018), was that of the fragments which are relevant for another step or move rather than to the general purpose of the text. These fragments do not contain new propositional content and, as a consequence, do not move the text forward. Because of this, following the author's recommendations, the concept of step was redefined as a fragment which has new propositional content, fulfils a specific communicative function and moves the text forward in order to accomplish the general purpose of the text. As a result, the announcing functions, those fragments which do not add new propositional content but announce other steps or moves, and elaborating functions, those fragments which



depend/are subordinated to other steps, were not considered steps although they are relevant communicative functions and they appear in the coding scheme as such.

After analysing the texts in the corpus, the results are presented and discussed in the following sections.

#### **4. Results of text analysis and discussion**

As commented on in section 1.3. a number of problems related to the fact that textbook authors confuse PCEs and FAEs appeared during the analysis of the texts, causing the study to slow down. Therefore, in this section, we first explain the specific problems we found, thus answering the first research question. Then, the generic structure of PCEs is presented, which answers the second research question. And, finally, the linguistic and grammatical realizations of this genre are discussed.

##### **4.1. “Pros and cons” essays vs “for and against” essays. The indistinguishable twins**

As explained above, out of 39 texts which were initially selected, only 20 were included in the corpus (see Appendix 3). Although the explanations, the title or the tables with useful language suggested that the model text belonged to the expected genre (PCEs), a superficial analysis indicated that there was some sort of confusion in relation to the conceptualization and terminology of the genre and, as a consequence, a lot of texts had to be excluded. Confusion here means that:

1. The title of the section refers to one genre while the model text of that section belongs to a different genre. However, they are presented as the same genre.
2. The suggested linguistic expressions and the outline of the structure or the explanations make reference to two different genres as if they belonged to the same one.
3. The author provides linguistic expressions from two different genres as if they were from the same genre.
4. The explanations, the guide containing the outline of the structure and the linguistic expressions make reference to a genre while the model text belongs to a different one.

As seen in table 7 from Appendix 3, although in 24 out of 39 cases, the title of the writing section was “for and against essay” only 11 of those essays were in fact FAEs while the other 13 were PCEs. In 8 out of 39 cases, the title of the section was “discussion essay”, but only 3 of them corresponded to that genre while the others were FAEs. Moreover, 6 sections were titled “essay” (which makes reference to a macro-genre), of which three are FAEs and three are PCEs (these being the subgenres).

This terminological confusion is aggravated by a conceptual confusion. In 20 out of 39 cases, the explanations, the outline with the structure and the “useful language” tables that accompany the model text contained indications of these two subgenres as if they were the same genre (see the page included in Appendix 4 as an example). To make things worse, in only 3 texts out of 39 it can be said that there are no signs that suggest that the author is mixing both subgenres. However, in the appendix or “writing reference” at the end of those same textbooks there are signs of confusion, which means that none of the authors can distinguish between the different subgenres and the terminology to identify it. This is surprising taking into account the differences between both, explained below.

On the one hand, FAEs, also called “debate essays” or “balanced opinion essay”, are two-sided opinion essays in which a series of arguments are provided with the aim to persuade the reader of something. Since they are balanced opinions, the arguments make reference to an issue from two opposing sides. Therefore, the nature of the issue (that is, whether the issue is good or bad, positive or negative) is being evaluated as a whole from the two points of view. Also, the arguments are usually subjective evaluations and, often, different values (for example, ethical values) may be involved.

On other hand, in PCEs, also called “advantages and disadvantages essay” or “discussion essay”, there is an analysis of the negative and positive aspects of an issue. The author of these texts does not try to convince the reader of anything but simply presents the advantages or disadvantages of something without necessarily choosing one of them. The issue, therefore, is not treated as a whole but the writer focuses on specific aspects, the arguments are now objective facts and the persuasive purpose is substituted by mere analysis weighing the pros and the cons of something.

The differing purpose of each genre has consequences on the structure of the texts: while in the introduction of FAEs the writer may say that some people believe that something is good (evaluation) but others think that it is bad, in PCEs the author says that something (independently of it being good or bad) has pros and cons: “like most things it has both advantages and disadvantages.” (HUS, Appendix 1). Also, while the arguments in the body of FAEs are evaluating the issue as negative or as positive or positioning the author for or against a thesis: “On the other hand, no one needs to be paid tons of millions of euros a year” (Grant & Edwards, 2015, 54), the claims in PCEs are presenting factual information (facts): “email is fast”, “email is easy”, “email messages are easily stored” (HUS).

The source of confusion, that is, the reason why the authors mix the two genres, is that an erroneous logical link is being established between the fact that something has disadvantages and something being bad, and the fact that something has advantages with something being good. Everything has both positive and negative aspects but it does not mean that it, as a whole, is good or bad. FAEs and PCEs are two different genres because they have different purposes. It will then be important for students to learn to differentiate evaluation and persuasion from analysis.

After having commented on the differences between FAEs and PCEs, in the following section we establish the generic structure of PCEs.

#### **4.2. The generic structure of “pros and cons” essay**

As can be seen in the analysis of a prototypical text in Appendix 5, there are six moves: *Preparing the ground* (PG), *Making a general analytical claim on the issue* (GC), *Making a specific analytical claim on the issue* (SC), *Substantiating the analytical claim* (SP), *Making a general evaluative comment on the whole issue* (GE), *Drawing implications* (DI), and two more communicative functions which are not moves or steps because they do not contain new propositional content: *Announcing a claim* (AC) and *Elaborating a step* (ES). Some of these moves roughly correspond to those identified by Hyland (1990) for argumentative essays: information and gambit, proposition and restatement, marker, claim, support and conclusion. Some of these are obligatory but others are optional.

In order to determine which moves and steps (and announcing/elaborating functions) are obligatory and which are optional, the frequency of each move and step has been taken into account. Many authors suggest different frequency intervals, for example, Kwan (2006) considers moves obligatory when they appear in 100% of the cases and the rest are optional, while Kanoksilapatham (2005) recognizes moves which occur in more than the 60% of the cases as conventional but optional if they fall below that percentage. For this study, criteria presented in Moreno (2016b) has been followed. Functions whose frequency ranges from 90% to 100% are obligatory (O), from 45% to 89% are conventional (C), from 16% to 44% are optional (Op) and below 15% are rare (R).

As can be seen in the table in Appendix 6, not all the moves and general communicative functions are obligatory and many steps are optional. In the first move, PG, the obligatory step is *Presenting background information* (PB) since some general contextual information is necessary so that the reader knows what the text is about. Sometimes a question (AA), which is answered in the concluding paragraph, is introduced in order to attract the attention of the reader, but it is optional. Also, some general information may be introduced to help the reader understand other step: *Presenting general information in relation to a positive/negative aspect* (PG), but it is rare.

When enough general information has been provided and the topic has been defined, the ground is prepared for the next move, GC. Here, the central and obligatory step is *Stating the analytical thesis* (ST). However, this step can be realized in different ways: explicitly (the most common), by stating that the issue has both advantages or disadvantages; implicitly (also very common), by mentioning positive and negative aspects in the previous move or in the restatement of the proposition; or partly implicit, for example, when the author says that the issue has disadvantages and mentions an advantage (for clarification see Appendix 2). This analytical thesis may be restated (RT), which is rare, or reformulated (RF), which is optional, in the concluding paragraph.

The next function, AC, which is not really a move, is optional but it is recommendable to include it since it makes it easier to follow the text and to know what the writer is saying. Furthermore, it reminds the reader what is being discussed. Its steps, *Announcing a positive aspect of the issue* (AP) and *Announcing a negative aspect of the issue* (NP) are equally frequent.

Since the proposition is dual by nature (pros and cons), one step of the following move, SC (obligatory), is devoted to the pros, *Presenting a positive aspect of the issue* (PA) while another step is dedicated to the cons, *Presenting a negative aspect of the issue* (NA). As will be seen later, the formal organization of these functions can follow three patterns. In one of these patterns, a third step is essential: *Presenting a counterclaim* (PC), which analyses the same idea as something negative if the claim was about a positive aspect, or as positive if the claim was about a negative aspect. Also, one or more of the claims may be reformulated and placed in the concluding paragraph. This step, *Reformulating a claim* (RC) is conventional. However, only the two first steps are obligatory in this move since the claims are the most important elements in an argumentative essay.

Although not strictly necessary, since its steps are optional, SU is another important element of the analysis. In SU the author provides explanations, data or evidence to reinforce the claim, so that this is not weak and to make it more comprehensible. The most frequent step here is *Explicating the analytical claim* (EC) and it can be realized in different ways: as an explanation of the causes and implications of the claim. Another step is *Offering evidence* (OE), which is data supporting the claim or a specification in which a positive or negative aspect of the issue can be seen. Finally, another way to offer support for the claim is *Making a specific evaluative comment on a step* (SE) but it is rare.

The next move, GE, goes back to what has already been mentioned while move DI has a prospective nature and both are conventional moves. GE has only one step, *Making a general evaluative comment about the topic*, whereas DI has two: *Recommending* (RE), which is conventional, and *Predicting* (PR), which is optional. However, they are important because they mean that the writer has understood the possible implications involved and that he/she has done a deeper analysis of the issue.

Finally, the elaborative functions (ES) are optional, since they offer incidental information, but they are important because they help the reader have a better understanding of what is being said. Also, these steps further reinforce the steps on which they depend. This move has different steps: *Illustrating* (IL), *Clarifying* (CL) and *Commenting on the consequences* (CC).

Having commented on the generic structure (for further clarification on the steps see Appendix 2) it is important to discuss the organization of the moves in texts. The different moves of a genre tend to combine in order to form 'stages', that is, a group of communicative functions formed around the same topic. In brief texts, each stage usually correspond to one paragraph. This is important because of its implications for teaching genres. When explaining to students how to write, for example, the introduction of PECs, the teacher can offer them the pattern or combination of communicative functions which usually appears in that stage. Therefore, teachers would not teach students what the generic structure of the genre they want students to learn is but they would present students the different stages and the patterns that form those stages. Also, as seen in section 4.3. there are different ways in which the stages can be presented, resulting in different formal structures.

The four most typical stages are the introduction, advantages, disadvantages and closing, which usually follow a general-to-specific or inductive direction although the last stage, the majority of the times, has a specific-to-general or deductive direction. I have used the previous four terms because they are the ones used in almost all the textbooks in the outline of the formal structure of the model texts.

The introduction is normally formed by the steps PB and AA from the first move (PG) and step ST from the second move (GC). The author first presents the general context, then the topic and, more specifically, the specific thesis in relation to that topic.

The advantages and the disadvantages have the same internal structure. Firstly, the positive or negative aspects (AP/AN) may be announced. Then, the positive or negative aspects are presented (PA/NA) and the claim is followed by a counterclaim or by the support, which is usually either EC, SE or OE but not EC and OE at the same time. The support or the claim is sometimes reinforced by one of the elaborative functions, IL, CL or CC and, in few cases, the claim needs some general information (PG) to make sure it is understood by the reader.

Finally, the closing paragraph is formed by the steps of different moves and it is the stage in which there is more variation, not only in the order in which the steps appear but also in the steps and the number of steps it includes. The reason is that the closing paragraph is the result of a personal reflection on the analysis that that author has done. The most frequent step here is a personal opinion on the topic and on what

has been said in all the text (GE). This may be followed by RT, RF or RC, of which the most frequent is the reformulation of a mentioned claim or claims, which is conventional, and the least frequent is the restatement of the thesis, which is rare. RT and RF are mutually exclusive steps since it would not make sense to repeat the thesis statement twice. Additionally, when the claim is reformulated, some supporting points (SP) are sometimes repeated. Some essays conclude with a prospective look in the future (DI), that is, RE, PR or both. Since the order of these steps may change, the inductive or deductive nature of this stage might also change from text to text. Models of this stage presented to students would include all the possible steps and, also a specific-to-general and retrospective-to-prospective (GE-DI) direction since it results in an ‘open’ text.

Having commented on the stages and the different patterns inside them, the different formal structures are commented on in the next section.

### **4.3. The formal structure of “pros and cons” essays**

In the same way steps and moves can be organized to create different stages, the stages and moves can be organized to create different formal structures. The third research question (Do the different textbooks propose the same model for PCEs?) will now be answered.

The different authors provide students with different models, not only as a consequence of authors’ confusion between FAEs and PCEs but also because the analysis of the texts in the corpus showed three different ways in which moves were organised formally. The frequency of each of these three formal structures and the texts having each structure are presented in the table in Appendix 8, also including an outline of each of the three structures.

The most frequent, in the analysed textbooks, is the “IADC” structure (introduction, advantages, disadvantages, closing) presenting the positive aspects in one paragraph and the negative aspects (in relation to different ideas) in another paragraph. Since the second paragraph is making reference to different aspects to those commented on in the previous paragraph, the number of reasons provided in one may be higher or lower than those in the other paragraph.

In other cases, each paragraph is constructed around one idea which can have negative and positive aspects. This is the “1I2C” structure (1 idea, 2 claims). Here, the negative and positive claims are in relation to the same idea. This means that there will be as many positive as negative aspects, and that one of them may be a counterclaim opposing the previous claim. In the next paragraph, another idea is introduced and negative and positive aspects are commented on it.

Another possibility is the “+A+D” structure in which, instead of two paragraphs for the arguments, there are various paragraphs for the pros and various for the cons. The pros are first exposed, with their support in each of the paragraphs and, when the exposition of the pros has finished, the writer begins with the cons. Here, the negative aspects usually make reference to the same ideas commented on in the pros. For example, in HUS one of the advantages is “Also, emails are easily stored”. When the author presents the negative aspects he goes back to the same idea: “Although, as stated above, it is an advantage that email messages are easily stored, this can also be a disadvantage. If you say nasty things about your boss...” and the same is done in the rest of the negative claims. This is the typical structure of those essays which take into account different criteria such as: economic arguments, social arguments, etc. and the pros and cons of each are analysed.

It is important to note that, since the methodology for analysing the texts is that of Moreno & Swales (2018), the focus was the function, not the form, while others’ analysis, such as that of Hyland’s (1990) and Biber’s (2007), give more importance to the formal structure and the order in which the steps usually appear in concrete texts. When analyzing the genre of a text, the first focus should be on the communicative function. The rest can be derived from that analysis at a later stage.

#### **4.4. Aspects of the lexico-grammatical realization of the “pros and cons” essay**

Each of the functions above mentioned is expressed linguistically in a different way and some recurrent words or expressions appear in most of the texts. The identification of the linguistic expressions associated to a step or a move is very important for the interpretation of the segmented fragments. However, in some cases



they are misleading and the fragment has a different function from that which the word is signalling. In these cases, following Moreno and Swales' (2018) recommendations, more attention is paid to the fragment's function. This is the case of [**\*For example**, there would be fewer road accidents if there weren't so many cars.]<sub>10</sub> (STSSA), which is a positive claim although it is presented as evidence. Many other cases have been found during the interpretation of the function of the fragments. A table with the different linguistic expressions which are associated to each step and an explanation of the type of expressions appearing in each step can be seen in Appendix 7.

## 5. Conclusions and pedagogical implications

As we have seen in the previous section, not only different models are provided in different textbooks but those differences are created by differences in the interpretation by the author of each textbook, who does not seem to have a clear idea of what the differences between different argumentative subgenres are and what terminology is associated to each genre. This has consequences on the written production of students. If the writer considers that two different subgenres are the same, the student is not going to be able to differentiate between the two. Also, if a student learns how to write FAEs or PCEs following only one model, it is possible that the student does not recognize other very different models as belonging to the same subgenre.

Therefore, a genre-based approach to learning to write EFL texts is necessary since it will help students understand how a text is constructed, why it was constructed that way, identify the different parts, their function(s) and associated linguistic expressions (Swales, 1990; Paltridge, 2001). But it will also help them produce new texts belonging to that genre. Furthermore, genre analysis provides teachers with the linguistic resources, concepts and structures of the genre they want to teach (Hyland, 1990). Nevertheless, when teaching genres in the classroom, the focus should be on the communicative function. If this is done, it will be difficult to confuse two different subgenres of the same genre (Moreno & Swales, 2018). Moreover, different formal structures of the same genre should be taught so that the student is aware of the possible variation and does not consider genres as something static but can grasp its evolving and varied nature.

## 6. Pedagogical applications

Since genres are the way users of a language use the linguistic resources in a specific communicative situation (Hyland 2003, 22) and for a specific purpose, it is essential to provide a context and an objective for each writing task. In all of the textbooks analysed, students are asked to write a composition with a specific word length and about a topic. However, they are not told why they have to write about that topic, who is going to read their composition and the purpose of the essay. Writing tasks must include the contextualization and a specific purpose so that the essay is perceived as something relevant and they can adapt their linguistic choices to the addressee and the recipient's context. Apart from the contextualization of the task, another way to make the writing task more relevant and motivating is to create a class or school newspaper or magazine. After all, a message only makes sense when it is read or listened by another person. Moreover, explanations about the genre and how to create a text of that genre, together with an outline of the stage patterns and formal structure of a prototypical text should accompany a model text. Only 12 out of 20 texts included these guidelines and, in the majority of the cases, it was quite deficient. In any case, as discussed above, the authors' confusion causes these explanations to be of little help.

Another aspect that must be taken into account is that the topics about which students have to write must be engaging, relevant for them (e.g. related to their life as students or as adolescents) but also related to current affairs so that they reflect about what is going on around them. The majority of the texts in the initial selection dealt with the same topics: buying things on the internet, the consequences of technology in our daily life and animal experimentation or hunting. However, only a few of them make reference to events related to their life as students: taking a gap year between secondary schools and university (Text T1SA), studying abroad (Text L2SA), and security cameras in schools (L1S). Textbooks should suggest a wider variety of topics, and these topics should be related to their life and subjects of their interest so that they are more motivated to do the writing task.

More importantly, students should learn to identify and produce exemplars of PCEs but they also have to learn how to differentiate between FAEs and PCEs. In view of the deficiencies observed in current EFL textbooks, a series of tasks focusing on

genre have been created by using the information provided in section 4. In these tasks, contextualization and feedback is very important. More activities related to genre can be found in Paltridge (2001).

Activity 1: The students are given two texts. One of them is a FAE titled: Are exams a good way to evaluate student's knowledge and abilities? The other one is a PCE titled: What are the advantages and disadvantages of doing vocational training? The students have to read both and, in groups or four, discuss and answer the following questions: Which of the texts is trying to convince the reader of something? Which of the two can be used for the preparation of a class debate? In which of the texts the author is analysing something and in which is the writing evaluating something? In which text the writer deals with the issue as a whole and in which of them the author deals with specific aspects related to the topic? What do you think are the differences between the two texts? Afterwards, each group reads their answers and the teacher explains the differences between FAEs and PCEs to them. Then, the teacher gives them more argumentative texts and the students have to identify which text belongs to which genre, taking into account what the teacher has said.

Activity 2: The teacher gives the students a model text written by a native speaker. That text is accompanied by a series of questions which guide the students to discover the stages and generic structure of the text, for example: what is the overall aim of the text? What do you think was the intention of the writer when writing the text? How does the writer organize the text? What is the function of each sentence in relation to the whole text? What meaning does it contribute? What expressions are used to introduce each paragraph? What is the main idea that the writer is discussing? What positive and negative aspects are mentioned? Then, the student has to write the structure that he/she has found on a piece of paper. After this, all the students discuss the structures that they have found. When the discussion has finished, the teacher provides them with an outline of the stages and the move and step patterns they follow, which he/she also explains to the students.

Activity 3: After the teacher has explained the stages and the move and step patterns of PCEs to the students, they are given three model texts which have the different formal structures: IADC, +A+D and 1I2C. The students have to identify the

moves and steps in those texts although the formal structure is different. The results are then discussed and corrected and, afterwards, the teacher asks the students a series of questions: what other variations of the formal structure can be proposed or which other do you know? Which is structure is more appropriate for short essays? And for longer essays? Which is more appropriate for discussing different factors (economic, social, cultural)?

Activity 4: The students have to follow one of these structures to create an essay. The contextualization of the essay is: your boarding school is considering whether they should spend the extra benefits from the last year to offer a transportation service for the students who live far from the school or not. The director has asked parents and students what they think. You have to write a semi-formal 200-word essay considering the pros and cons of spending that money on school transportation.

When students have created their essays they have to hand it to three other students and read the essays of another three students. They should evaluate each other's essay in terms of structure, language and leave a brief comment (for example: your vocabulary is advanced-level and accurate but it is not well-organised and it is difficult to follow). With this, students are able to see more real models and can receive feedback from different people. After this, students have to use those comments to try and improve their essays. Then, they hand them in to the teacher, who evaluates them and leaves another comment.

## **7. Acknowledgements**

The writing of this TFM has been a difficult task. During the search of suitable texts, the initial analysis and the analysis of the texts in the corpus many problems appeared but I could receive the help and kind support of a lot of people. I am profoundly grateful to Gonzalo Melón Morán and Sabela Ribera Mata for their help searching English textbooks and for their emotional support. I am also grateful to Gabriella Van Oudenhouve, who helped me improve my written English. I am completely indebted to my supervisor, Ana I. Moreno, for her immense patience and her efforts to help me improve my work. Finally, I want to thank my family for their loving support in my last year of university. I am the only person accountable for the errors in this TFM.

## 8. References

- Anscombe, J. C. & Ducrot, O. (1983). *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Sprimont: Mardaga.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1997). Genre analysis today. *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 75 (3), 629-652.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2002). Applied genre analysis: a multi-perspective model. *Ibérica*, 4, 3-19.
- Biber, D. et al. (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Coirier, P., Andriessen, J. & Chanquoy, L. (1999). From planning to translating: The specificity of argumentative writing. In Andriessen, J.E.B.; Coirier, P. *Foundations of Argumentative Text Processing* (pp.1-29). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring How Texts Work*. Rozelle: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (2000). Genre analysis: a key to a theory of ESP? *Ibérica, Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos* (2), 3-11.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). Teaching the academic essay. In Johns, M. Ann (ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* ( pp. 225-235). New York: Routledge.
- Feez, S. (2001). Heritage and Innovation in Second Language Education. In Johns, M. Ann (ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspective* (pp. 91-105). New York: Routledge.

- Flowerdew, J. (2001). Genre in the classroom: A linguistic approach. In Johns, M. Ann (ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspective* (p. 91-105). New York: Routledge.
- Gormley, K. & Storton, R. (2014). *Key to Bahillerato 1. Workbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p.116.
- Grant, E. & Kaitlin, E. (2015). *Living English Bachillerato 2. Student's book*. Limassol: Burlington, p. 54.
- Gutiérrez, V. S. (2016). Argumentación y lógica natural: la propuesta de Jean-Blaise Grize. *Signo*, 42, (73), 135.
- Grize, J. B. (1982). *De la logique à l'argumentation*. Genève: Librairie Droz.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: E. Arnold.
- Hyland, K. (1990). A Genre Description of the Argumentative Essay. *Relc Journal*, 21 (1) 66-78.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 17–29.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in Three Traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (4), 693-722.
- Jones, B. (1993). Writing good essays. In McIlroy, J., & Jones, B. *Going to university: The student guide* (pp. 290-322). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Kanoksilapatham, B. (2005). Rhetorical structure of biochemistry research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 269-292.
- Kwan, B. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 30-55.
- Lock, G. and Lockhart, C. (1998). Genre in an academic writing class. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 47-64.
- Macken-Horarik, M. (2001). "Something to Shoot for": A Systemic Functional Approach to Teaching Genre in Secondary School Science. In Johns, M. Ann (ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 17-43). New York: Routledge.
- Martin, J. (1984). Language, register and genre. In F. Christie (ed.), *Children writing study guide*. Victoria: Deaking University Press.
- Moreno, A. (2016a). Variation in research article rhetoric across English and Spanish: Using contrastive results to create pedagogical resources. *ULLC-Symposium: Academic writing across languages: multilingual and contrastive approaches in higher education*. Luxembourg.
- Moreno, A. (2016b). Course in Complementos I. Discourse Analysis for English Language Teachers. *Máster Universitario en Formación de Profesorado de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y Bachillerato, Formación Profesional y Enseñanza de Idiomas*. León: Universidad de León.
- Moreno, A. & Swales, J. (2018). Strengthening move analysis methodology towards bridging the function-form gap. *English for Specific Purposes*. 50, 40-63.
- Paltridge, B. (2001). *Genre and the language learning classroom*. Ann Harbor: The University of Michigan Press.

- Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1958). *Traité de l'argumentation: La nouvelle rhétorique*. Bruxelles: Éd. de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Qian, L. (2013) A comparative genre analysis of English argumentative essays written by English major and non-English major students in an EFL context. *AWEJ*. 1, (4), 213-223.
- Rijlaarsdam, G. & Espéret, E. (1999). Preface. In Andriessen, J.E.B.; Coirier, P. *Foundations of Argumentative Text Processing*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Swales, J. (1981) *Aspects of Article Introductions*. Birmingham: University of Aston.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres. Exploration and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Toulmin, S. E. (1958). *The uses of argument*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Veel, R. (1997). Learning how to mean – scientifically speaking: apprenticeship into scientific discourse in the secondary school. In Christie, F. and Martin, J.R. (eds.). *Genre and Institution: Social processes in the workplace and school*, (pp. 161-195). London: Cassell.
- Yeh, S. S. (1998). Validation of a scheme for assessing argumentative writing of middle school students. *Assessing Writing*, 5 (1) 123-150.



## 9. Appendices

### Appendix 1: Texts in the corpus

This appendix presents the texts which were selected for the corpus. The codes correspond to the selected books. The first letter corresponds to the title of the book, the number is the course of *Bachillerato* (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup>), the third letter means “student’s book” or “workbook” and the third letter means that the text appears in the writing appendix of the textbook. In the first column of the table, “N<sup>o</sup>” means number of words, a cross in “G” means that the model text is accompanied with an outline of the structure as a guideline, “L” means English level and “N” is used to make reference to the name given to the genre in the textbook: “F” stands for “for and against essay”, “Di” means “discussion essay”, “De” means “debate essay” and “E” stands for “essay”.

**Table 2. Characteristics of the texts in the corpus**

	VISA	T1SA	T2SA	T2S	L1SA	L1S	LIW	L2SA	TR1S	S2WA	S2SA	S2S	K1S	NPW	NPS	NUS	HUS	CF	CPFA	CPF	Total
<b>N<sup>o</sup></b>	146	137	158	143	166	182	162	195	175	192	177	166	185	149	167	244	470	186	197	186	140-200 (244, 470 exception)
<b>N</b>	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	Di	De	Di	Di	F	F	F	F	E	E	E	F: 13/20 E:3/20 Di: 3/20 De: 1/20
<b>L</b>	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B2	B1-B2	B1-B2	B2	B2	B2	B2	B2	B1-B2: 14/20 B2: 6/20
<b>G</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X								12/20

**Table 3. Bibliographical details of the textbooks in the corpus and their codes**

**TR1S:** Baines, M. & Rockwell, S. (2014). *Trends*. Limassol: Burlington, p. 84.

**CF:** Brook-Hart, G. (2014). *Complete First*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 93.

**L2SA:** Grant, E. & Edwards, K. (2015). *Living English 2 Bachillerato. Student’s book*. Limassol: Burlington, p. 163.

**L1S/L1SA:** Grant, E. & Edwards, K. (2014). *Living English 1 Bachillerato. Student’s book*. Limassol: Burlington, pp. 160, 50.

**LIW:** Grant, E. & Edwards, K. (2014). *Living English 1 Bachillerato. Workbook*. Limassol: Burlington, p. 34.

**VISA:** Grant, E. & Payne, K. (2009). *Viewpoints for Bachillerato 1. Student’s*

*book*. Limassol: Burlington, p. 155.

**CPF/CPFA:** May, P. (2015). *Compact First*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 108, 86.

**NUS:** Oxerden, C. & Lathan-Koonig, C. (2008). *New English File Upper-Intermediate. Student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 108.

**NPW:** Oxenden, C. & Lathan-Koonig, C. (2008). *New English File. Intermediate Plus. Workbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 66.

**NPS:** Oxenden, C. & Lathan-Koonig, C. (2008). *New English File. Intermediate Plus. Student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p 34.

**T2S/T2SA:** Rubio, J. M. & Grant, E. (2007). *Top Marks for Bachillerato 2. Student's book*. Limassol: Burlington, pp. 16, 134.

**T1S:** Rubio, J. M. & Grant, E. (2006). *Top Marks for Bachillerato 1. Student's book*. Limassol: Burlington, p. 149.

**HUS:** Soars, L. & Soars, J. (2005). *New Headway. Upper-intermediate. Student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 118.

**S2S/S2SA:** Wetz, B. (2005). *Steps to success. Student's book 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.103, 26.

**S2W:** Wetz, B. & Murphy, S. (2005). *Steps to success. Workbook 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p.59.

**K1S:** Wetz, B & Gormley, K. (2014). *Key to Bachillerato 1. Student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 78.

## Appendix 2. The codebook

This appendix contains the coding scheme and the definitions and examples of each function.

<i>Table 4. Coding scheme of communicative functions in PCEs</i>	
Code	Communicative function
<b>PG</b>	<b>Preparing the ground</b>
PB	Presenting background information
PG	Presenting general information in relation to a positive/negative aspect
AA	Attracting reader's attention
<b>GC</b>	<b>Making a general analytical claim on the issue</b>
ST	Stating the analytical thesis
RT	Restating the analytical thesis
RF	Reformulating the analytical thesis
<b>AC</b>	<b>Announcing a claim</b>
AP	Announcing a positive aspect of the issue
AN	Announcing a negative aspect of the issue
<b>SC</b>	<b>Making a specific analytical claim on the issue</b>
PA	Presenting a positive aspect of the issue
NA	Presenting a negative aspect of the issue
PC	Presenting a counterclaim
RC	Reformulating a claim
<b>SU</b>	<b>Substantiating the analytical claim (support)</b>
EC	Explicating the analytical claim
OE	Offering evidence
SE	Making a specific evaluative comment on a step
<b>GE</b>	<b>Making a general evaluative comment about the topic</b>
<b>DI</b>	<b>Drawing implications</b>
RE	Recommending
PR	Predicting
<b>ES</b>	<b>Elaborating a step</b>
IL	Illustrating
CL	Clarifying
CC	Commenting on the consequences

### Definitions and examples

- **Preparing the ground (PG)**

Definition: PG opens the text and introduces the general background of the essay and the topic of the essay. This part of the text provides a context and defines the specific topic of the essay so that it is easier for the reader to understand what will be said in the body of the text. Also, in this part, the attention of the reader is attracted towards the text.

[1] [**In the last few decades**, organic food has become very popular.]<sub>1</sub> (PG\_PB)/  
[The question is, should everybody start buying it?]<sub>2</sub> (PG\_AA) (V1SA)

○ **Background information on the topic of the essay (PB)**

Definition: PB offers a frame that establishes the general situation within which the thesis is framed and the topic with which it deals. In this step, the reader is given basic and general information in the form of a definition, description, categorization, in a similar way as in Hyland's (1990) "informing move".

[2] [**More and more** UK students are considering the option of doing their university studies abroad.]<sub>1</sub> (PG\_PB) (L2SA).

○ **Presenting general information in relation to a positive/negative aspect (PG)**

Definition: PG offers the reader some general information that he/she needs in order to understand the content of a step. It prepares the ground for another step.

[3] [**In addition\***, schools can charge money for using the ATM.]<sub>5</sub>

○ **Attracting the reader's attention (AA)**

Definition: AA aims at drawing the reader's attention. In this step, the author usually raises a question referring to an issue that is object of controversy, thus, opening the discussion of the negative and positive aspects of that issue. The question is usually answered in the closing paragraph. This is similar to Hyland's (1990) "gambit" move.

[3] [However, is it really a good idea to give children pocket money?]<sub>2</sub>  
(PG\_AA) (TR1S).

• **Making a general analytical claim on the issue (GC)**

Definition: in GC the writer provides the thesis statement which guides the development of the essay. It provides a focus to the essay by establishing the aspects that are going to be analysed through the text.

[4] [New technology **has both positive and negative effects**]<sub>2</sub> (GC\_AP) (S2S).

○ **Stating the analytical thesis (ST)**

Definition: in ST the writer states that the issue has both positive and negative aspects without specifying which are more important and without choosing one of them. This kind of thesis statement is presented in a rather neutral way. The proposition is not accompanied by signals of opinion such as “I think” or “from my point of view”, as it happens in the opinion essays, because it is not an opinion. This is the central and only obligatory step of this move. The analytical proposition may be explicit, implicit or partly implicit.

[5] [These restaurants...**have advantages and disadvantages**]<sub>3</sub> (NPW) (GC\_ST) Explicit.

[6] [Security cameras have become very common in schools...]<sub>1</sub> (PG\_PB) [is this the right way to increase school safety?]<sub>2</sub> (PG\_AA) (L1S) Implicit.

[7] [because it is both quick and easy. Nevertheless, Internet shopping **has some disadvantages**]<sub>2</sub> (GC\_ST) (T2S) Partly implicit.

○ **Restating the analytical thesis (RT)**

Definition: in RT the writer repeats the analytical thesis in order to link the final part of the essay to the beginning. This function appears in the closing paragraph and it offers the reader a “balanced” conclusion, that is, after the analysis of the advantages and disadvantages the writer does not choose the advantages or the disadvantages.

[8] [**To sum up**, owning a business **has both advantages and disadvantages**.]<sub>19</sub> (GC\_RT) (NUS).

○ **Reformulating the analytical thesis (RF)**

Definition: in RF the author reformulates the proposition as the result of his/her analysis. Therefore, he/she repeats the analytical thesis but makes some changes in the proposition in order to express that he/she has chosen or gives more importance to the advantages or the disadvantages. This function appears in the closing paragraph and links the thesis statement to the conclusion but also makes reference to the mentioned negative and positive aspects as a whole.

[9] [**In conclusion**, I believe that **the advantages of** giving pocket money **are greater than** the disadvantages]<sub>9</sub> (GC\_RF) (TR1S).

[10] [**Overall**, however, to my mind **the pros of** email **easily outweigh the cons**]<sub>32</sub> (GC\_RF) (HUS).

- **Announcing a claim (AC)**

Definition: in AC the author announces which part of the proposition s/he will discuss in order to guide the reader. This announcement may introduce the pros or the cons. This corresponds with Hyland's (1990) "marker" move. As explained in Moreno and Swales (2018), it is not a step but it is still a communicative function.

[11] [**There are** three main **advantages**]<sub>3</sub> (AC) (CF).

[12] [On the other hand, **there are disadvantages**]<sub>7</sub> (AC) (NPS).

- **Announcing a positive aspect of the issue (AP)**

Definition: in AP the exposition of the advantages or pros of the issue is announced. Therefore, the part of the proposition which makes reference to the positive aspects is repeated. This function appears at the beginning of the paragraph in which the advantages are presented.

[13] [Being your own boss **has many obvious advantages**]<sub>3</sub> (AC\_AP) (NUS).

- **Announcing a negative aspect of the issue (NP)**

Definition: in NP the exposition of the disadvantages or cons of the issue is announced. Therefore, the part of the proposition which makes reference to the negative aspects is repeated. This function appears at the beginning of the paragraph in which the disadvantages are presented.

[14] [On the other hand, fame brings disadvantages for actors too]<sub>9</sub> (AC\_NP) (CF).

- **Making a specific analytical claim on the issue (SC)**

Definition: SC presents the statements referring to positive or negative aspects of the issue. This is the central part of the essay. Here, the claims presented are part of the analysis that the author does on the issue.

[15] [**On the one hand**, you will start university a year behind the other students]<sub>3</sub> (SC\_PA) (T1SA).

[16] [**On the other hand**, a gap year provides valuable experience in the real world.]<sub>7</sub> (SC\_NA) (T1SA).

- **Presenting a positive aspect of the issue (PA)**

Definition: PA presents a statement which expresses a positive aspect of the issue. Positive claims are related to one of the two parts of the analytical proposition, specifically to the advantages or pros. It is an obligatory step.

[17] [They provide fast and convenient travel to destinations where public transport may be unavailable]<sub>5</sub> (SC\_PA) (S2SA).

- **Presenting a negative aspect of the issue (NA)**

Definition: NA presents a statement which expresses a negative aspect of the issue. Negative claims are related to one of the two parts of the analytical proposition, specifically to the disadvantages or cons. It is an obligatory step.

[18] [**On the other hand**, the device could make some young drivers so nervous that they would actually drive worse, not better]<sub>7</sub> (SC\_NA) (L1W).

- **Presenting a counterclaim (PC)**

Definition: PC creates a contrast by presenting a counter-argument or rebuttal to a previous claim. The opposition gives emphasis to the counterclaim.

[19] [Computers have also revolutionized communication.]<sub>8</sub> (SC\_PA)/ [Consequently, we can learn more and exchange ideas more easily.]<sub>9</sub> (EM\_CC)/ [**However**, this also means that people are more isolated.]<sub>10</sub> (SC\_PC) (S2S).

[20] [Shopping online has made it easy to buy anything that you want.]<sub>10</sub> (SC\_PA)/ [This means that some people use their credit cards too much]<sub>11</sub> (SC\_PC) (S2WA).

- **Reformulating a claim (RC)**

Definition: in RC the author repeats one or more of the mentioned claims but makes some changes in the claims in order to express that those are the advantages or disadvantages to which he/she gives more importance and which made the author think that the pros outweigh the cons or the other way round. This function appears in the closing paragraph and links the negative or positive aspects to the concluding paragraph.

[21] [**In conclusion**, though fast food may be cheaper and quicker than traditional food]<sub>12</sub> (SC\_RC) (NPW).

- **Substantiating the analytical claim (SP)**

Definition: SU is the group of statements that reinforces a claim. The steps in this move aim at explicating and strengthening the information contained in the claim by providing further explanations or evidence.

[22] [The problem is that young children usually don't understand the value of money]<sub>6</sub> (SU\_EC) (TR1S).

- **Explicating the analytical claim (EC)**

Definition: in EC the author provides reinforcement to the claim by providing further information that explains what has been said in the claim. This step can have different realizations: explaining the implications, explaining the causes or explaining general information.

[23] [Students are far less likely to misbehave when they know they are being monitored]<sub>9</sub> (SP\_EC) (L1S).

- **Offering evidence (OE)**

Definition: in OE the author provides an instantiation of the claim in which a positive or negative aspect of the issue is demonstrated in order to reinforce a claim or to reinforce the explanations that support a claim.

[24] [**For example\***, people are living longer than in the past and we are able to communicate with each other more cheaply and more easily.]<sub>4</sub> (SP\_OE) (K1S).

- **Making a specific evaluative comment in relation to the propositional content of a step (SE)**

Definition: in SE the author makes a comment which is related to the content of a step or a group of steps. This comment usually appears in the body of the essay, after the step to which it makes reference. It is usually employed as a reinforcement of that step.

[25][This is often very stressful]<sub>14</sub> (SP\_SE) (NUS) referring to a step.

[26] [How primitive!]<sub>11</sub> (SP\_SE) (HUS) referring to a step.

[27] [This all seems very tempting]<sub>10</sub> (SP\_SE) (NUS) referring to a group of steps.



- **Making a general evaluative comment about the topic (GE)**

Definition: in GE the author makes a general comment in relation to the issue that has been analysed. This comment usually appears in the concluding paragraph as a personal opinion which is the result of the analysis of the advantages and disadvantages.

[28] **[I don't believe that** tracking devices are the correct way to encourage good driving.]<sub>9</sub> (GE) /**[In my opinion,** they provide more information than necessary]<sub>10</sub> (GE) (L1W).

- **Drawing implications (DI)**

Definition: in DI the author goes forward by making a statement referring to the possible negative or positive aspects of the issue in the future. Here the author takes a prospective look in relation to the issue and the possible aspects involved in its future development.

[29] [However, you need to decide whether or not you can afford to spend the money and the time it takes to buy it.]<sub>14</sub> (DI\_RE) (V1SA).

- **Recommending (RE)**

Definition: in RE the author makes general recommendations to the reader in relation to the issue or makes suggestions about things, related to the topic, that are still to be done or to occur.

[30] [Nevertheless, parents **should** only give pocket money to children who are old enough to understand the concept of money and its worth.]<sub>11</sub> (DI\_RE) (TR1S).

- **Predicting (PR)**

Definition: in PR the author makes a general statement about the future development of something related to the topic of the essay.

[31] [I believe that if you follow these rules, the world is at your fingertips!]<sub>15</sub> (DI\_PR) (T2S).

- **Elaborating a step (ES)**

Definition: as explained in Moreno and Swales (2018), ES amplifies the content of the step on which it depends by providing further explanations which do not contain

new propositional content (it is a reformulation of the same idea) and, as a result, does not move the text forward. As these authors mention, elaborating functions include illustrations and clarifications, but also consequences.

[32] [Thousands of people pay for flights, buy books and CDs, and even shop clothes online]<sub>2</sub> (ES\_IL) (S2WA).

[33] [However, this also means that people are more isolated.]<sub>10</sub> (SC\_PC)/ [They spend more time in front of computer screens and less time talking to each other] (ES\_CL) (S2S).

[34] [In addition, it's very expensive,]<sub>7</sub> (SC\_NA)/ [so it's not practical for many families]<sub>8</sub> (ES\_CC) (V1SA)

#### ○ **Illustrating (IL)**

Definition: in IL the author presents possible cases or instances of what has been mentioned in a previous step. IL does not add new information but offers an illustration of what has already been said.

[35] [For example, offering new product or providing a new service]<sub>6</sub> (ES\_IL) (NUS).

#### ○ **Clarifying (CL)**

Definition: in CL the author provides an explanation of something that has been said so that it is clearer. No new propositional content is added but only extra information is provided.

[36] [A second point is that email is fast]<sub>8</sub> (SC\_PA)/ [No matter where you're sending your message, it takes only seconds to reach its destination.]<sub>9</sub> (ES\_CL) (HUS).

#### ○ **Commenting on the consequences (CC)**

Definition: in CC the author introduces a consequence or effect that confirms the claim and shows the relationship between the evidence and the claim more clearly, so that it is easier for the reader to understand. However, it is not an essential step for creating a strong argument.

[37] [Every time famous people go out they are surrounded by fans and photographers.]<sub>8</sub> (SC\_NA) / [As a result, it is very difficult for them to have a normal private life.]<sub>9</sub> (ES\_CC).

**Appendix 3. Initial text selection**

This appendix contains a table (table 6.) with data resulting from the initial analysis mentioned in section 3.2. Since this table contains many abbreviations and colours which need to be understood in order to correctly interpret the table, another table (table 5.) explaining them is included. Additionally, the most important data from table 6, which were discussed section 4.1., are presented in table 7.

*Table 5. Signs used to interpret table 6*

Sign	Meaning				
1,2,3...	Each of the texts				
Colour	Text selected for the corpus	Not selected	No signs of confusion (PCE)	No signs of confusion (for and against)	
Ts (Title of the section)	F (For and against essay)	Di (discussion essay)	De (debate essay)	E (essay)	
Tt (Title of the model text)	- (No title or title not signaling any genre)		A (Title containing the words “advantages and disadvantages of...”)	F (Title signaling for and against essay, e.g. “fox hunting- good or bad?”)	
E/G (guide or explanation)	A(The author provides explanations for writing PCEs)	F (The author provides explanations for writing for and against essays)	- (There are no explanations or guides)	C (Confusion: The author presents expressions and strategies for both genres)	Cc (The apparent confusion between both is notable)
Te (Genre of the model text)	F (For and against essay)		A (PCE)		

*Table 6. Initial selection of texts*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	
Ts	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	E	E	E	E	E	E
Tt	F	-	-	A	F	-	A	-	-	-	F	-	A	F	A	F	F	A	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	A	-	F	F	F	F	F	F	-	-	-	F	F	F	
E/G	F	C	C	F	C	C	A	F	F	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	A	F	C	C	F	F	C	-	C	A	C	C	F	C	C	C	C	C	C	-	C	F	-	-
Te	A	F	F	A	F	A	A	A	A	A	F	A	F	F	A	F	F	A	A	A	F	F	A	F	A	A	A	A	F	F	F	F	F	F	A	A	A	F	F	F
	VISA			TISA		T2SA	T2S	LISA	LIS	L1W	L2SA		TRIS		S2WA	S2SA	S2S		KIS		NPW	NPS	NUS	HUS									GE	CPFA	CPF					

**Table 7. Key aspects of table 6 (discussed in section 4.1)**

Title	F 24/39		Di 8/39		E 6/39				
Text	F 11/24	A 13/24	F 5/8	A 3/8	F 3/6	A 3/6	E/G	C 20/39	No C 19/39
Text	A 20/39		F 19/39						
No signs of confusion									
A		F							
1**/39		2*/39							

\*In the page of text 29 there are no signs that indicate that the writer confuses the two terms but there is confusion in the appendix of that book, which is supposed to have been written by the same author. Also, in the page of text 11 and the page following it there are no signs of confusion although the appendix has the title of FAE and the text is a PCE.

\*\* In the page of the text 18 there are no signs indicating confusion although this does not mean that the author has a clear idea of the genre since in the corresponding student's book, and in the student's book and workbook for the first course of *Bachillerato* there is confusion.

## Appendix 4. An example of confusion

This appendix contains the image of a page (Gormley & Storton, 2014) with one of the texts which were initially selected. Almost of all the textbooks, as commented on in section 4.1., had signs which made me think that the author confused FAEs and PCEs. On this page, it is important to look at the title, the definition, the expressions used and those suggested to the reader, the two tables and the outline attached to the model. It is important to have the mentioned terminological and conceptual differences between FAEs and PCEs in mind while looking at these aspects.

### A discussion essay

In a discussion essay you consider a topic or statement from opposite points of view, before giving your own opinion.

**Example task:** 'The internet is making people better informed.' Discuss.

**A Get ideas**

- What do you already know about the statement or topic?
- List as many arguments as you can *for* and *against*.

For <i>help to learn language</i>	Against <i>freedom to choose?</i>
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

- Now choose your *two* strongest arguments in each category.
- Decide what your own opinion is.

**B Plan**

- Organize your ideas into paragraphs.

Paragraph 1	Introduction to the topic
Paragraph 2	Arguments <i>for</i> / advantages
Paragraph 3	Arguments <i>against</i> / disadvantages
Paragraph 4	Your own opinion

**C Write**

give a general introduction

use linkers of contrast

separate arguments for and against into two paragraphs

give your own opinion at the end

use modals to make suggestions and recommendations

qualify your opinion if necessary

Many people believe that thanks to the internet, people are better informed than they used to be. Others, however, argue that the opposite is true.

On the one hand, by surfing the internet, we have access to information and the latest news at the push of a button. As a result, people no longer have to spend a great deal of time researching a specific subject. As a result, they can be fully informed about it promptly.

On the other hand, some people say that many websites publish information so quickly that they do not have time to edit it properly. The result of this is that some of the information we have access to is inaccurate.

In my opinion, we must be careful when using the internet as a source of factual information. Only by double-checking information on various sites can we be properly informed about an issue.

**Useful language**

**Introducing the topic**  
Some / Many people think / believe / consider (*that*) ... However, others ...

There are (*strong*) arguments for and against this idea.  
There are both advantages and disadvantages to this idea.

**Adding ideas**  
Furthermore, / Moreover, / What is more, / In addition (*to this*), ...

**Giving reasons and results**  
... , because / as ...  
Because of / As a result of this, ...  
One *result* / *effect* of this is that ...

**Introducing contrasting ideas**  
On the one hand, ... . On the other hand ...  
However, / Nevertheless, it can also be argued that ...  
One (*dis*)advantage of ... is ...  
An(*other*) argument for / against ... is ...  
A(n)(*other*) (*dis*)advantage is (*that*) ...

**Giving evidence**  
According to ...  
It is clear that ...  
It has been proven that ...  
We do not have any evidence that ... (*Research*) has shown that ...

**Making suggestions or recommendations**  
... should (*not*) / ought (*not*) to ...  
Shouldn't we / people (*be able to*, etc.) ... ?  
Would (noun / + *-ing*) be a better solution / alternative?

**Expressing your own opinion**  
(*Personally*,) I think / believe / feel / am of the opinion (*that*) ...  
I (*strongly*) agree / disagree that ... / with the statement that ...  
In my opinion / view, ...  
Although I partly agree that ... , overall, I think ...

**Tips for ... discussion essays**

- Do not give your opinion in the first paragraph, just give a general introduction to the topic.
- Do not mix up arguments for and against in the same paragraph.
- Try to write a similar amount for both your for and against paragraphs to show you are giving a balanced view.
- Support your arguments by giving evidence or thinking about the possible consequences of any changes.
- Only give your own opinion in the final paragraph.

116 Writing reference

## Appendix 5. Analysis of a prototypical text

The following text (NUS) has been selected as a prototypical text because it contains all the moves and all the obligatory steps, but also some of the conventional and optional steps, and even one step which is rare. Also, there is no confusion between FAE and PCE and it is better than other texts from the corpus in terms of cohesion, grammatical correctness and it has a clearer structure.

### Segmentation and functional interpretation

[Which is better, working for someone else or being your own boss?]<sub>1</sub> (This is raising a question, PG\_AA)/ [**More and more people** are choosing to give up their jobs and follow their dream of setting up their own company.]<sub>2</sub> (This is providing background information in relation to the topic of the essay, PG\_PB)/

[Being your own boss **has many obvious advantages**.]<sub>3</sub> (This statement is announcing the positive aspects, AC\_AP) / [**The main advantage is** that you are in charge.]<sub>4</sub> (This claim is presenting a positive aspect of the issue, SC\_PA)/ [You have the opportunity to do something you really believe in]<sub>5</sub> (This is explaining an implication of what is said in the previous step, SP\_EC)/ [**such as** offering a new product or providing a new service.]<sub>6</sub> (This is offering an example of what has been said in the previous step and further reinforcing it, ES\_IL)/ [**Another advantage is** that you do not have a boss watching over you,]<sub>7</sub> (This is introducing a positive aspect of the issue, SC\_PA)/ [which gives you more freedom to do things your way.]<sub>8</sub> (This is stating a consequence of the positive issue, ES\_CC)/ [Finally, **the greatest advantage of all** for some people, you could **also** become extremely rich if your company becomes successful]<sub>9</sub> (This introduces another reason for evaluating the issue positively, SC\_PA)/

[This all seems very tempting,]<sub>10</sub> (This is an evaluative comment referring to all the advantages, SP\_SE)/ [**but on the other hand, there are a number of disadvantages**.]<sub>11</sub> (This is announcing the negative aspects, AC\_AN)/ [You have to make a lot of big decisions,]<sub>12</sub> (This claim is presenting a negative aspect, SC\_NA)/ [**for example** whether to expand, or whether to employ new staff.]<sub>13</sub> (This are examples in relation to the previous claim, ES\_IL)/ [This is often very stressful.]<sub>14</sub> (This is an evaluative comment making reference to the mentioned negative aspect, thus

reinforcing it, SP\_SE)/ [**Although** you are the boss and in theory can decide what time to finish work,]<sub>15</sub> (This is presenting a positive aspect, SC\_PA)/ [you might find that **instead** of finishing early, you have to work all night because of an important deadline.]<sub>16</sub> (This provides a counterclaim that rebuts an already mentioned claim, SC\_PC)/ [**Finally**, there is an element of risk.]<sub>17</sub> (This is another negative aspect, SC\_NA)/ [If the company fails, you could lose not only your job, but also your home and your life savings.]<sub>18</sub> (This fragment offers supporting details in relation to the negative aspects, SP\_OE)/

[**To sum up**, owning a business **has both advantages and disadvantages**.]<sub>19</sub> (This fragment restates the thesis statement, GC\_RT)/ [Whether it would suit you or not depends on your skills, your personality and your family circumstances.]<sub>20</sub> (This is making reference to future possibilities, DI\_PR).

<i>Table 8. Generic structure of a prototypical PCE</i>	
<b>Preparing the ground (PG)</b>	
Presenting background information (PB)	[ <b>More and more people</b> are choosing to give up their jobs and follow their dream of setting up their own company] <sub>2</sub>
Presenting general information in relation to a positive/negative aspect (PG)	-
Attracting reader's attention (AA)	[Which is better, working for someone else or being your own boss?] <sub>1</sub>
<b>Making a general analytical claim on the issue (GC)</b>	
Stating the analytical thesis (ST)	(Implicit: Being your own boss has both advantages and disadvantages) <sub>14</sub>
Restating the analytical thesis (RT)	[ <b>To sum up</b> , owning a business has both advantages and disadvantages.] <sub>19</sub>
Reformulating the analytical thesis (RF)	-
<b>Announcing a claim (AC)</b>	
Announcing a positive aspect of the issue (AP)	[Being your own boss has many obvious advantages.] <sub>3</sub>
Announcing a negative aspect of the issue (NP)	[ <b>but on the other hand</b> , there are a number of disadvantages.] <sub>11</sub>
<b>Making a specific analytical claim on the issue (SC)</b>	

Presenting a positive aspect of the issue (PA)	[ <b>The main advantage</b> is that you are in charge.] <sub>4</sub> / [ <b>Another advantage</b> is that you do not have a boss watching over you,] <sub>7</sub> / [Although you are the boss and in theory can decide what time to finish work,] <sub>15</sub> / [Finally, <b>the greatest advantage of all</b> for some people, you could <b>also</b> become extremely rich if your company becomes successful] <sub>9</sub>
Presenting a negative aspect of the issue (NA)	[You have to make a lot of big decisions,] <sub>12</sub> / [ <b>Finally</b> , there is an element of risk.] <sub>17</sub>
Presenting a counter-claim (CC)	[you might find that <b>instead</b> of finishing early, you have to work all night because of an important deadline.] <sub>16</sub>
Reformulating a claim (RC)	-
<b>Substantiating the analytical claim (SP)</b>	
Explicating the analytical claim (EC)	[You have the opportunity to do something you really believe in] <sub>5</sub>
Offering evidence (OE)	[If the company fails, you could lose not only your job, but also your home and your life savings.] <sub>18</sub>
Making a specific evaluative comment on a step (SE)	[This all seems very tempting,] <sub>10</sub> / [This is often very stressful.] <sub>14</sub>
<b>Making a general evaluative comment on the whole issue (GE)</b>	
Making a general... (GE)	-
<b>Drawing implications (DI)</b>	
Recommending (RE)	-
Predicting (PR)	[Whether it would suit you or not depends on your skills, your personality and your family circumstances.] <sub>20</sub>
<b>Elaborating a step (ES)</b>	
Illustrating (IL)	[ <b>such as</b> offering a new product or providing a new service.] <sub>6</sub> / [ <b>for example</b> whether to expand, or whether to employ new staff.] <sub>13</sub>
Clarifying (CL)	-
Commenting on the consequences (CC)	[which gives you more freedom to do things your way.] <sub>8</sub>



## Appendix 6. Obligatory and non-obligatory steps

In this appendix I have included all the steps forming the generic structure of PCEs and calculated the frequency of each step.

Table 9. Quantitative results. Frequency of each step.																						
	VISA	T1SA	T2SA	T2S	L1SA	L1S	L1W	L2SA	TR1S	S2W A	S2SA	S2S	K1S	NPW	NPS	NUS	HUS	CF	CPFA	CPF	Total n° of occurrences	Freq. steps (%)
PG_PB	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	19/20	95% O
PG_PG			X			X			X												3/20	15% R
PG_AA	X				X	X	X		X							X			X		7/20	35% Op
GC_ST	(X)	X	(X)	Xp	(X)	(X)	(X)	X	(X)	X	X	X	Xp	X	X	(X)	X	X	X	(X)	20/20 (8/20, 2/20)	100% O (40%, 10%)
GC_RT							X						X			X					3/20	15% R
GC_RF			X						X		X			X			X	X			6/20	30% Op
AC_AP	X									X	X	X				X		X	X		7/20	35% Op
AC_AN								X			X			X	X	X		X			6/20	30% Op
SC_PA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	20/20	100% O
SC_NA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	20/20	100% O
SC_PC								X		X		X		X		X	X		X	X	8/20	40% Op
SC_RC	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X			X				11/20	55% C
SP_EC	X			X		X			X						X	X		X	X		8/20	40% Op
SP_OE					X	X		X		X			X		X		X				7/20	35% Op
GE_GE					X	X	X					X	X	X	X		X		X		9/20	45% C
SP_SE																X		X	X		3/20	15% R
DI_RE	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X						X	X		11/20	55% C
DI_PR		X		X					X								X				4/20	20% Op
ES_IL									X		X	X			X	X	X				6/20	30% Op
ES_CL					X			X	X	X		X		X			X				7/20	35% Op
ES_CC	X				X				X	X	X				X						6/20	30% Op

## Appendix 7. Linguistic expressions associated to each step.

In the following table, the linguistic expressions that are commonly associated to each step are included. These expressions have been taken only from the texts in the corpus. A dash means that there are no common expressions for that step.

<i>Table 10. Linguistic expressions associated to each step</i>	
<b>Preparing the ground (PG)</b>	
Presenting background information (PB)	“In the last few decades”, “recently”, “many...”, “most...”, “more and more”, “these days”, “it seems that”, “has become”, “nowadays”, “are +ing”, “in recent years”.
Presenting general information in relation to a positive/negative aspect (PG)	–
Attracting reader’s attention (AA)	–
<b>Making a general analytical claim on the issue (GC)</b>	
Stating the analytical thesis (ST)	“Consider the pros and cons”, “has some disadvantages”, “has drawbacks as well as benefits”, “as many positive as negative aspects”, “has both positive and negative effects”, “have/there are advantages and disadvantages”.
Restating the analytical thesis (RT)	“Has both advantages and disadvantages”.
Reformulating the analytical thesis (RF)	“The advantages of...are greater than the disadvantages”, “despite the potential benefits”, “there are more advantages than disadvantages”, “the pros outweigh the cons”.
<b>Announcing a claim (AC)</b>	
Announcing a positive aspect of the issue (AP)	“On the one hand,...has/ there are many advantages”.
Announcing a negative aspect of the issue (NP)	“On the other hand,...may be quite inconvenient”, “on the other hand,...brings/ there are a number of disadvantages”.
<b>Making a specific analytical claim on the issue (SC)</b>	
“On the one hand,...”, “one of the reasons why”, “firstly”, “secondly”, “thirdly”, “first of all”, “also”, “on the other hand,...”, “moreover”, “in addition”, “also”, “furthermore”, “another point is that”.	
Presenting a positive aspect of the issue (PA)	“The greatest benefit is that”, “another advantage”.

Presenting a negative aspect of the issue (NA)	“Worst of all”, “another disadvantage”, “however”.
Presenting a counter-claim (CC)	“However”, “although”, “despite...”.
Reformulating a claim (RC)	“To sum up,...”, “to conclude,...”.
<b>Substantiating the analytical claim (SP)</b>	
Explicating the analytical claim (EC)	“Because”, “due to”.
Offering evidence (OE)	-
Making a specific evaluative comment on a step (SE)	-
<b>Making a general evaluative comment on the whole issue (GE)</b>	
Making a general... (GE)	“I feel that”, “I believe”, “I think”, “in my opinion”, “personally”, “from my point of view”.
<b>Drawing implications (DI)</b>	
Recommending (RE)	“Students/parents should...”, “it is important to”, “people must be more careful and...”, “we ought to...”, “you need to”.
Predicting (PR)	-
<b>Elaborating a step (ES)</b>	
Illustrating (IL)	“For example”, “such as”, “for instance”.
Clarifying (CL)	-
Commenting on the consequences (CC)	“So that”, “causing...”, “consequently”, “as a result”, “due to”, “so”, “therefore”.

In PB the expressions make reference to a general unspecified period or point in time that extends to the present, e.g. “In the last few decades”, “recently”, “nowadays”; to a change in the tendency of something or to the current state or development of events, e.g. “has become”, “more and more people”, “it seems that”, “are + ing verb”. This is because this step makes reference to the general temporal, spatial or social context, which establishes the frame for the topic to be discussed. As for AA, no specific linguistic expression is used although a rhetorical question is always used.

In ST we can find recurrent linguistic expressions when the analytical proposition is explicit or partly explicit. These simply mention the fact that the issue has

both positive and negative aspects. For example: “has drawbacks as well as benefits”, “there are advantages and disadvantages”, “has both positive and negative effects”. When it is partly explicit only the advantages or the disadvantages are mentioned. When the thesis statement is restated (RT) in the concluding paragraph, the same expressions as in ST are used “has both advantages and disadvantages”, but when it is reformulated (RF) the expressions used change since the author wants to express that one aspect (either the pros or the cons) is more important than the other: “the pros outweigh the cons”. The author employs the words “advantages” and “disadvantages” since he is making reference back to the claims mentioned in the body of the essay.

In AC (announcing the claim) announces one type of claim. The linguistic expressions are distributive: “on the one hand”, “on the other hand”. Also, existential propositions, used to announce the advantages or the disadvantages, appear in AP and AN: “there are a number of advantages”, “there are many disadvantages”. These distributive expressions appear in the steps PA and NA presenting the negative or positive aspects when there is no AC.

Before PA and PN authors usually employ ordinal numbers to clearly order and list each claim: “firstly”, “secondly”, “thirdly”. Sometimes one claim is highlighted over others as being more important or relevant for the discussion: “the greatest benefit is that” or “worst of all”. Also, when the claims are not introduced by using ordinal numbers the author uses expressions meaning addition in order to add more claims: “also”, “another advantage”, “another disadvantage”, “furthermore”, “moreover”, “in addition”. RC is not introduced by these linguistic expressions since the author directly mentions the most important advantage(s) and/or disadvantage(s). In the same move, PC is introduced by words expressing contrast since this claim establishes a contrast with a previous claim: “however”, “although”, “despite”. However, in other cases the contrast in this step is not signalled by any expression.

The claims are reinforced using a number of expressions. In EC, the linguistic expressions which provide support to the claims are those that make reference to causes and implications since the author explains the causes of what is said in the claim: “due to”, “because”. Other type of support is the evidence (OE), however, this step is usually

introduced by misleading expressions because they are used for examples (IL): “for example”, “such as”, etc.

In GE, the author introduces verbs of opinion such as “I think” and “I believe”, and evaluative expressions like “in my opinion”, “personally”, “from my point of view”. In this step, the first person (I) is used since it is something subjective but in the other parts of the essay the first person is not used since the author is making an objective analysis. Although the evaluation referred to the topic is signalled by these words, when the evaluation makes reference to the content of a step (SE) it does not use specific expressions.

Move DI is introduced by expressions which are used for closing and announcing the presentation of the conclusions: “in conclusion”, “to sum up”, “all in all”, “to conclude”. In RE, verbs such as “should” and “must”, are very frequent, especially the first one since it is used for making recommendations. Also, expressions such as “it is important to”, “you need to”, “we ought to” are employed here to suggest readers what they have to or could do.

As for the elaborating functions (ES), the expressions in IL introduce specific examples illustrating what has been said in the claim: “for example”, “such as”, “for instance”, and expressions in CC make reference to the commentary of the consequences derived from the claim to which it is related: “so that”, “causing...”, “consequently”, “as a result”, “due to”, “so”, “therefore”.

Some steps, however, are not associated to any specific expression or word. It is the case of AA, RC, GE, PR and CL since they are not obligatory steps and can take many different forms because they involve personal elaboration, especially PR.

## Appendix 8. Types of formal structure

In this appendix, the frequency of three formal structures of PCEs commented on in section 4.3. and the texts from the corpus which have those structures are presented. Also, an outline showing the organisation of the different stages in the three structures is included.

**Table 11. Type of formal structure and its frequency**

	VISA	TISA	T2SA	T2S	LISA	LIS	L1W	L2SA	TRIS	A	S2W	S2SA	S2S	KIS	NPW	NPS	NUS	HUS	CF	GPFA	GPF	Total number of occurrences	Frequency (%)	
<b>IADC</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X	X			15/20	75%
<b>+A+D</b>									X								X	X					3/20	15%
<b>I12C</b>										X	*	*										X	2/20	10%

\*Texts S2SA and S2S follow the IADC structure but the I12C type of structure is recommended in the explanation.

**Table 12. The different formal structures of PCEs and the organisation of stages**

