

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This study was designed to analyze the argumentative patterns written by the fourth-year English Major students at Naresuan University. This chapter involved the definitions of argumentative and argumentative writing, Hyland's study. It also provided the cross-cultural rhetorical patterns by Kaplan (1966), the critiques on Kaplan's theory and its subsequent research. The review is divided into four sections as follows:

1. Definitions of Argumentation
2. The Studies of Argumentative Writing
3. Hyland's Study
4. Contrastive Rhetoric
5. Related Research

#### 1. Definitions of Argumentation

Traditionally, argumentation has been thought as the means we use to justify our opinions and express those opinions to others. As we come in the new century, we see a renewed interest in how everyone can use argumentation. European scholars are exploring how we use argumentation in our day-to-day activities. These scholars see argumentation as "a collaborative, constructive working out of disagreements by verbal interactions in order to resolve a conflict of opinions" (Walton, 1992. p. xi). In addition to the traditional perspective on using argumentation to prove opinions, scholars from many nations are beginning to think of argumentation as the means individuals, citizen groups, and scientists use to actually discover knowledge (Rowland, 1987).

There are many definitions of argumentation as follows:

Argumentation is a form of instrumental communication relying on reasoning and proof to influence belief or behavior through the use of spoken or written messages (Rybacki, 1996. p. 2).

Argumentation is a reasoned, logical way of convincing an audience of the soundness of a position, belief, or conclusion (Kirsznner & Stephen, 1989. p. 461)

One definition of argument is "argumentation is the art of influencing others, through the medium of reasoned discourse, to believe or act as we wish them to believe or act." (Rottenberg, 1997. p. 90)

## 2. The Studies of Argumentative Writing

For argumentative writing research, there are many researchers interested in these fields:

The study about argumentative pattern by Maccoun (citing in Hatch, 1992), in examining a series of articles and news reports identified several patterns for organizing argumentative discourse in written prose. She calls one such pattern a "zig-zag" solution. That is, if the author is a proponent of a position, the outline would be pro, con, pro, con, pro. If the author is an opponent, the pattern would be con, pro, con, pro, con.

A second pattern found by Maccoun (citing in Hatch, 1992) consists of the problem and refutation of the opposition's argument, followed by a solution. The solution, if not the problem, suggests the author's bias. Like the zig-zag pattern, it requires refutation of the opposition's argument. The author must show that alternative solutions are unacceptable.

A third pattern is the "one-sided argument," where one point of view is presented and no refutation is given.

A fourth pattern is an "eclectic approach," where the author may choose to reject some points of view and accept another or some combination of them all.

A fifth pattern contains the opposition's arguments first, followed by the author's argument of the opposition. "Conventional wisdom," "A common prescription," "Traditionally, it has been believed" are examples of such pointers.

A six pattern is the "other side questioned" pattern. This involves the questioning, but not direct refutation, of the opposition's argument.

A seventh pattern discussed by Maccoun is one that does not contain a refutation, but it does show disagreement from within the same camp. In other words, there are two points of view expressed and, while one is favored, both are within the same general point of view regarding the argument.

Another study of the argumentative pattern in Connor (citing in Connor and Kaplan, 1987) involved contrastive rhetoric in the argumentative patterns in student essays. He analyzed the essays written in L1 on an argumentative task by students from England, Finland, Germany, and the United States. The results of the study suggest the usefulness of knowledge-based, process-oriented text analyses in the study of student writing.

The text analyses indicated that viewing these compositions as a process of argumentation and determining to what extent they contained a structure found in accomplished argumentative texts was useful in "explaining" the overall quality ratings. The high-rated essays conformed better to the typical argument process structure: situation + problem + solution + evaluation, with speech acts sequence of claim, justification, and induction. In addition, some cross-cultural variation was discovered. The situation + problem + solution + evaluation structure was not used as consistently in the Finnish and German student compositions as it was in the English and U.S. student compositions.

Another interesting study of argumentation was conducted by Wong (1997). She investigated texts in two different languages, English and Chinese, to see what effects on writing instruction in students' L1 and L2 had on the writing performance of student writers. Argumentative texts were studied and it was found that English and Chinese argumentative texts differed in the use of features such as rhetorical questions,

references, and negatives. Chinese texts seemed to be more interactive than English texts since the former employed personalizing pronouns in greater frequency than the latter. Chinese texts tended to employ balanced argumentation, via the use of contrastive and parallel structures. English texts on the other hand, used suppositional reasoning. It has also been found that while English texts displayed a three-part structure in the argumentation, a four-part structure seemed to be the norm for Chinese texts. The major difference seemed to be in the way background information is laid out in texts. While the English writers tended to be brief, the Chinese writers tended to be elaborate.

In Zhili (2000) research, It was aimed at discovering the similarities and differences between the thematic structures in the Chinese and English compositions of the argumentative and narrative genres by undergraduates from three Chinese universities.

The data for the research, collected in China, consisted of four compositions, one translation and one questionnaire. Two of them were on a topic of the argumentative genre in both Chinese and English. The other two were on a narrative topic. They were collected to compare the thematic structures in the compositions and discovered possible influence from both languages on the writers. The translation and the questionnaire were projected to achieve a more comprehensive picture of the facts.

The analysis showed that the thematic development in both Chinese and English compositions of both genres are not very much different. Although a three-move structure of introduction, discussion/narration and conclusion is common in both languages, the slight difference resulted from the over emphasis of such organization in the teaching of English writing.

The findings were pedagogically important. It was hoped that the research would foreground the similarities and difficulties so that the Chinese learners of English would benefit from knowing them and write English compositions and do translation that were not only correct in grammatical structures, but also conveyed ideas faithfully.

### 3. Hyland's Study

The preliminary categories that Hyland proposed are based on a detailed study of the top 10% of essay scripts submitted for the Papua New Guinea High School (PNG) matriculation in English in 1988 (65 papers). The topic required candidates to choose one sector of the PNG education system and argue a case for giving it more resources. The data was supplemented by an informal sample of journalistic material from the British and American press, partly to ascertain if the model could be generalized beyond L2 school essays. Although the findings which follow were preliminary, the model represented all the examples examined in the study.

#### The description of Hyland's Study (1990, p. 66-77)

In the model the text is the highest unit of description, having nice tidy boundaries and a clearly describable function. Thus the argumentative essay is defined by its purpose which is to persuade the reader of the correctness of a central statement. The text type is characterized by a three- stage structure which represents the organizing principles of the genre: Thesis, Argument and Conclusion. In turn, each stage has a structure expressed in terms of moves.

#### 1. The Thesis Stage

This stage introduces the discourse topic and advances the writer's proposition or central statement. Frequently coterminous with the paragraph in the exam data, its potential structure is identified as consisting of five moves, only one of which, the proposition, is obligatory:

1. The gambit is distinguished primarily by its arresting effect. The function of the move is to capture the reader's attention, rather than inform. The move is frequently found in editorials and requires a certain skill and authority to impress rather than aggravate the uncommitted reader.

2. Informing moves, on the other hand, are almost universal features of this type of writing.

3. The proposition is the central move in the thesis stage and its only indispensable component. This functions to furnish a specific statement of position which defines the topic and gives a focus to the entire composition.

4. An evaluation may follow the proposition. This provides a positive comment on it.

5. The marker structures the discourse by signposting its subsequent direction. It occurs more frequently in the examination scripts and is often confined to a restricted class of formulae.

## 2. The Argument Stage

This stage presents the infrastructure of reasons which characterize the genre. The argument stage of a possible four move cycle repeated indefinitely in a specific order.

1. The marker frames the sequence and connects it to both the steps in the argument and to the proposition. The shift to a new sequence may be implicit in a topic change, being embedded in the claim, but writers often wish to explicitly guide the reader through the argument stage. There are two main devices for accomplishing this:

a. Listing signals such as "first(ly)", "second(ly)", etc. A closed class of formulaic elements, loved by students, which provide an inventory of items but require interpretive work by the reader to discover the relationships between them.

b. Transition signals to indicate the step to another sequence, marking addition, contrast, condition, specificity, etc. by adverbial connectives, conjunctions and comments indicating changes in the discussion.

2. A restatement of the proposition in some form is common here, particularly in the exam data where foregrounding the proposition provides a reminder of the subject.

3. The central move in the argument sequence is the claim. This is a reason endorsing the validity of the proposition. Typically three tactics of persuasion are used.

(1) A statement appealing to the potency of "shared" presuppositions or

expectations about topic background. This is an invitation to agree with the writer's assumptions and thereby accept the reasonableness of the position. Here, for example, we are obviously expected to understand events the same way as the writer accepting the argument as relevant and the interpretation as favorable to his support for community education.

(2) Alternatively, the writer may approach his audience by presenting a generalization based on factual evidence or expert opinion.

(3) The third tactic is a declaration of opinion aiming for maximum effect with minimum regard for opposing views.

4. The support move is an indispensable second part to the claim in a tied pair of moves. It furnishes explicit reinforcement for the claim and can comprise several paragraphs appealing to several sources of evidence. The support move is therefore both directly relevant to the claim and seeks to demonstrate the relevance of the claim to the proposition. The successful accomplishment of the claim-support pair depends on explicitly establishing this relevance.

### 3. The Conclusion Stage

Rather than a summary or review, the conclusion is a fusion of constituents in this genre. It functions to consolidate the discourse and retrospectively affirm what has been communicated. There is a possible four-move sequence to this stage.

1. There are many of the essay samples included a marker from a restricted class, normally "thus", "therefore", "to conclude", "the lesson to be drawn is", and so on.

2. The consolidation move refers back to the content of the argument section to relate the themes of the argument stage with the proposition. It is the central part of the conclusion.

3. The affirmation is an optional restatement of the proposition; rare in journalism, its omission is unusual in the exam data

4. In contrast to the retrospective function of the consolidating move, the close,

provides a prospective focus. It looks forward to unstated aspects of the discussion by widening the context.

#### 4. Contrastive Rhetoric

The study of cross-cultural rhetorical patterns in written texts has been an area of growing interest over the last decade. Kaplan (1966) is credited as having originated the contrastive rhetoric theory in the early 1960s. He pointed that the organization of paragraphs written in any language by individuals who were not native speakers of that language was influenced by the rhetorical preference in the native language. However, he stated, "Rhetorical differences do not necessarily reflect different patterns of thinking," but "may reflect different writing conventions that have been learned" (citing in Connor, 1996. p. 146).

Figure 1. Kaplan's cultural thought patterns



In his diagrams, Kaplan (1966) argued that Anglo-European languages follow a linear development; that Oriental languages tend to take a more direct approach, coming to the point at the end of the discourse; that paragraph development in Semitic languages is based on a series of parallel organizations of coordinated, rather than subordinate clauses; and the Romance and Russian languages tend to produce discourses that contain digression and extraneous materials (Connor, 1996).

Kaplan's diagrams of rhetorical patterns have been widely reprinted. His initial assertion has had considerable influence on most of the research on the contrastive rhetoric theory which states, "Different languages and cultures prefer different writing



styles" (Connor, 1996, p.146). However, Kaplan (1966) is aware of the 'reality' of these patterns. He stated that a meaningful system could be elaborated after the requirement of much more detail and accurate descriptions. Kaplan (1967) continued to rely on style manuals from the 1960s and instructed students how to write proper paragraph:

### **Critiques on Kaplan's (1966) Theory**

Kaplan's "traditional" contrastive rhetoric has been criticized for several reasons. Modern contrastive rhetoric researchers hope to reconcile contrastive rhetoric composition. Condon and Yousef (1975, p. 243) stated that Kaplan's diagrams are helpful as they reflect not only the 'logic' of the area identified but also something of the languages and cultural values as well. The diagrams have been used to justify prescriptive approaches to teaching writing.

Some research supports the theory that different cultures have different rhetorical patterns. For example, Bandar (1978, p. 3) stated that English and oriental paragraphs were definitely different. He also said that foreign language rhetorical patterns could really be discovered by having a student write a composition for an audience who read that language.

Pandharapande (1984) who described English writing referred it to the straight line pattern. He explained texts in Marathi, a language, with a diagram of small spiral within a circle. He discussed that Marathi rhetorical pattern was not similar to the English patterns of paragraph but rather probably used the tarka, a traditional Sanskrit unit of organization which consisted of "a logical hypothesis which is examined by providing evidence to support or reject the hypothesis. Thus, this kind of paragraph accepted opposing points of view in the same paragraph or unit of discourse. The author accounted for this approach that it was not an English characteristic which required only oneself consistent idea to develop within a paragraph.

Jones and Tetroe's (1987) Study revealed the result from a study of Spanish speaking writers writing in English and Spanish that L1 writing strategies were culturally transferred to L2 writing situations. Carson, Carrell, Silberstein, and the others (1990) studied both Chinese and Japanese students who produced a complex pattern of

interactions between L1 and L2 reading and writing skills. It seemed reasonable to assume that different cultures would orient their discourse in different ways.

However, some researcher did not support Kaplan's diagrams. For example, Braddock (1974) stated that professional native-speaking English writers did not write a straight line beginning with a topic sentence and come up directly to support, and so on. Instead there were different variations apparent in general English texts. For example, the topic sentence may appear at the beginnings, in the middle or at the end of a paragraph.

Hinds (1982) questions what criteria Kaplan (1966) used to typify languages. He opposed the grouping of Korean and Chinese by exclusion of Japanese because Chinese's basic sentence pattern which consisted of SVO (subject, verb, and object) was definitely different from Japanese and Korean's, which consisted of SOV (subject, object, verb). Moreover, the term 'Oriental' in Kaplan's (1966) opinion, included members of four language families: Sino-Tibetan (Mandarin), Austro-Asiatic (Cambodian and Vietnamese) Austro Tai (Thai, Lao), Altaic (Japanese and Korean). That meant he had to be more confident, accurate and reasonable in present his challenging ideas.

Cheng (citing in Hinds, 1982) analyzed the differences in English and Mandarin expository styles and concluded that English writing was described by a series of concentric circles examination from a base theme. This study revealed that English essays could be illustrated by an oriental diagram.

Kaplan himself has modified his original stance somewhat; what he initially explained as cultural patterns he now identifies as "preferential tendencies" (1982, 1983, 1988a, 1988b). Furthermore, he has become increasingly interested in the influences of oral culture and social values on written discourse, and on the distinctions among different types of written discourse, Kaplan has, however, remained committed to the pedagogical impact of contrastive rhetoric studies. Since he first began writing on the subject, his primary focus has been to describe rhetorical differences for the purpose of applying that knowledge to the ESL writing classroom (citing in Reid, 1993. p. 61)

## 5. Related Research

For decades, the development of text linguistics or discourse analysis might have gradually given contrastive rhetoric a more specific base. In 1970s discourse analysis focused on spoken rather than written discourse. Then in 1980s, de Beaugrand (citing in Connor & Kaplan, 1987) sparked renewed interest in contrastive rhetoric. Most studies have continued to explore different languages. From different opinions influenced by Kaplan's cultural thought pattern, one common thing is a belief of the variation in writing strategies. During the process of composing an essay, a second-language writer tends to create a text, and inadvertently mix the first language style through that text. Therefore, the writing style may affect the English rhetorical pattern.

In recent research on contrastive rhetoric, different methods have been employed. Most research results confirm that rhetorical styles and patterns differ from one culture to another. For examples, Oi (1984) studied contrastive rhetoric in English and Japanese expository prose according to the hypothesis that there was a preference for certain discourse patterns in each culture and that students from different linguistic-cultural backgrounds transferred their preferred discourse patterns when they wrote in English. The micro-structure and the macro-structure of the discourse were investigated. Rhetorical differences which were contributed by linguist properties were studied on the micro-structure level. On the macro-structure level, the exploration was based on the organization of ideas or arguments. The subjects consisted of three groups. They were Japanese college students writing in Japanese, Japanese college students writing in English, and as a control group, American college students writing in English. Cohesive devices (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), overall organization, and cultural rhetorical tendencies were analyzed, and were proved to be effective tools to be used of logic were effectively explained by the scheme of internal argumentation. The main findings of this study were many. First, more connectives were used with Americans writing in English than with Japanese writing in either English or Japanese. Second, more frequency of repetition was made by Japanese students writing in both English and Japanese while synonyms were produced by Americans writing in English.

Kobayashi (1984) investigated differences in Japanese and American students' use of rhetorical patterns in their first language writing and also examined the degree to which Japanese students used these patterns in their English writing by obtaining 676 writing samples from 226 students. They were separated into four groups: American college students, Japanese advanced ESL students in America, and two groups of Japanese college students in Japan (one writing in English and the other in Japanese). The informants were assigned to write three compositions each-two based on picture-elicitation and one on a given topic in either the narrative or expository mode. The writings were grouped according to subjects and coded in four rhetorical patterns:

- 1) general-to-specific(GS)
- 2) specific-to-general(SG)
- 3) a middle general statement(MG)
- 4) omission of a general statement(OM)

The results revealed that rhetorical patterns and kinds of general statements were used differently by the four groups of students. A SG pattern was used by Japanese students writing in Japanese. They also related the text information to their own experience. American students intentionally used a GS pattern and restated the text information. The two Japanese groups writing in English differed from each other: the group in Japan was close to one writing in Japanese while the group in America was relatively close to the American group. These findings indicated that cultural preferences for certain rhetorical patterns clearly exist, and second language learners certainly used first language rhetorical patterns when writing in English.

In Eggington's work (1987), with academic Korean writing, the study illustrated the difficulty in selecting appropriate texts across cultures for comparison. He found that Korean academic texts' styles depended on whether or not the Korean author of each text had been trained in an English-speaking country. He indicated that a Korean expository pattern looked like the typical English introduction-body-conclusion pattern; however, the content and function of those three parts were obviously different in Korean rhetoric.

Some researchers, Ostler and Santana- Seda (citing in Connor & Kaplan, 1987) examined Kaplan's approach (1966). The research focused on examining the English composition of non-native English-speaking students to investigate systematic textual differences in their written English style against those of the native speakers. These studies normally took the position that L1 writing skills are transferable and are transferred to L2 writing tasks.

Thai ESL students' rhetoric was studied by Indrasuta (1988), who found both similarities and differences of narrative written discourse between Thais and Americans. Thirty American students from a high school in Urbana, Illinois and sixty Thai students from a Thai secondary school in Bangkok were selected for the subjects of this study. In this case, American students were supposed to write in English while Thai students wrote in Thai and English respectively. Two methods were used for specific purposes. First, the interviews of students, teachers, and experts in writing in the two cultures were managed to investigate the functions and models of narrative in the two cultures. The other method was the students were asked to write narrative compositions during 40 minutes of their usual class work. The data collected for this study consisted of one narrative composition from the American students and two narrative compositions from the Thai students, one in Thai and the other in English. Each group had to write a narrative composition on the topic "I Succeeded, at Last", and "I Made a Hard Decision." The 90 students' compositions were analyzed using the categories of narrative components. The judgment in the analysis depended on the presence or absence of certain features of the categories of cohesion from Halliday and Hasan's *Cohesion in English* (1976). The three methods of analysis used in this study revealed both similarities and differences of narrative written discourse of the two cultures, and the study claimed that the factors that influenced the differences seemed to be cultural rather than linguistic factors. In the linguistic analysis, it was found that differences in linguistic systems were not the only factors that caused the differences in written discourse of the two cultures. The American group used more references than the Thai group. This indicated that the article "the" does not exist in Thai. Moreover, the Thai

preferred to use noun instead of pronominal reference, according to the Thai rules of language. In discourse analysis, the cultural factors seemed to be conspicuous. The American students planned their compositions to enhance the reader's interest. They also selected specific lexical items and had certain kinds of narrative components to serve the narrative functions purposely. The Thai students had to choose appropriate content, follow the conventional rhetorical structure, and apply the appropriate choice of lexical items in order to fulfill the expectation of the teachers. The similarities of the Thai writing in English and the Thai writing in Thai group in many ways implied that as the Thai students wrote in L2, they brought with them the appropriateness of language use and the conventional rhetorical style in their first language.

Moreover, a descriptive study reflecting writing in English and Thai conducted by Bickner and Peyasantiwong (1988) also provided interacting results for rhetorical researchers. A total of 90 essays were provided for the study, 40 from the United States written in English and 50 from Thailand written in Thai by high school students on the same topic which was selected from seven alternative topics provided for them to write in their classroom.

From the results, the essays suggested several interesting points of contrast between native speakers of Thai and native speakers of American English in their attitudes toward language use, their concepts of essay structure, and their analytical styles. That is, the Thai compositions tended to be impersonal and formal, with a conversational tone and much vocabulary that was normally associated with speech rather than with writing while many of English essays written by American students mixed more formal written vocabulary. This may be that the Thai speakers' language had been adjusted to levels of usage by the sociolinguistic constraints with which they lived, and they were aware of the distinction between spoken and written forms.

Ricento (1989) studied 53 informants: 30 bilingual native Japanese speakers and 23 native English speakers who were all UCLA graduate students from a variety of disciplines. He examined differences in the rhetorical structure of English and Japanese newspaper editorials by using the approaches to characterize rhetorical differences.

The informants reordered the scrambled paragraphs of editorials then entitled and summarized each of them. It was evident that both English and Japanese texts contained their rhetorical patterns. Apparently, it was also found that in English editorials, writing styles and communicative goals were different. This resulted in variable distributions of coherence constructs and rhetorical patterns.

In conclusion, many researches are still interested in conducting contrastive rhetoric by focusing on either L2 student writing or L1 texts from different cultures.

In fact, Kaplan's (1966) aim is to help ESL students better understand the typical patterning of English rhetoric through its comparison to the rhetorical patterning of their culture (Piper, 1985). If the ESL students see the difference, they should be able to write an essay according to the preferred English rhetorical pattern.

Therefore, it is crucial to know the rhetoric pattern, especially the argumentative pattern of ESL/EFL students because one of the problems found in most EFL learners writing is the organization of ideas, which is a very important criterion in assessing the quality of the writing.

For this present study, it was conducted to see if Thai students in a Thai university can write an argumentative essay in a pattern expected by an English native speaking audience as well as if the characteristics of the argumentative essays correspond to the framework proposed by Hyland (1990).