TÍTULO: La cohesión en la escritura argumentativa: un estudio de caso de escritores de ensayos Pakistaníes.

AUTORES:

1. PhD. Muhammad Ahmad.

2. PhD. Syed Kazim Shah.

3. PhD. Muhammad Mushtaq.

RESUMEN: El estudio investiga el uso de elementos cohesivos y sus funciones en los ensayos argumentativos escritos por estudiantes pakistaníes. Los datos comprenden 400 ensayos argumentativos recuperados del sitio web ICNALE, analizados a través de AntConc 3.4.4.0 e interpretados a través de un modelo comunicativo integral. Los resultados revelan que dichos sujetos utilizan diferentes elementos cohesivos para establecer coherencia, cohesion y organizar la información de sus ensayos; el uso de elementos de referencia es más frecuente en comparación con el uso de conjunciones, conexiones lógicas y sustituciones. El estudio concluye que los sujetos utilizan con frecuencia elementos de referencia, implicando que las directivas y el significado referencial son las funciones comunes en los ensayos argumentativos paquistaníes.

PALABRAS CLAVES: ensayos argumentativos, coherencia, cohesion, dispositivos cohesivos, organización de la información.

TITLE: Cohesion in Argumentative Writing: A Case Study of Pakistani Essay Writers.

AUTHORS:

1. PhD. Muhammad Ahmad.

2. PhD. Syed Kazim Shah.

3. PhD. Muhammad Mushtaq.

ABSTRACT: This study aims to investigate the use of cohesive devices and their functions in the argumentative essays written by Pakistani students. The data, comprising of 400 argumentative essays, has been retrieved from ICNALE website, analyzed through AntConc 3.4.4.0 and interpreted in the light of comprehensive communicative model. The results reveal that the said writers use different cohesive devices to establish coherence and cohesion, and thereby, organize the information in their essays. The use of reference items is observed to be more frequent as compared to the use of conjunctions, logical connections and substitutions. The study concludes that Pakistani student essay writers frequently use reference items which implies that directives and referential meanings are the common functions in Pakistani argumentative essays.

KEY WORDS: argumentative essays, coherence, cohesion, cohesive devices, information organization.

INTRODUCTION.

Writing.

Halliday (1974) sees writing as an instrument that clarifies and extends thought in the content. In the view of Nunan (1988) writing is a sophisticated skill which combines various linguistic elements. Kuo (1995) regards writing as a dynamic process of text construction involving grammatical, lexical, and organizational links. Kellogg (2001) calls writing a 'cognitive process'

that can test thinking ability, memory, and verbal command to express the ideas successfully. For, according to Kellogg, skillful composition of the texts reflects successful learning of an L2. A number of studies (e.g. Hyland, 2003; Nickerson, Perkins & Smith, 2014) have validated Kellogg's view about writing.

Sokolik (2003), however, has tried to define writing differently i.e. by a number of contrasts e.g.: (1) she calls it both mental as well as a physical act. She calls it a mental work because it involves invention of ideas, thinking process about how to convey the ideas, and how to organize the ideas into statements or paragraphs to be presented to the readers. At the same time, writing also appears as a physical act of putting words or ideas to some medium e.g. email messages typed through computers or hieroglyphics inked onto the parchments; (2) basic purpose of writing is to express and impress. Typically, a writer serves two masters: (i) himself, and (ii) his own desire to communicate feelings, or ideas to a reader, who needs to have ideas conveyed in a specific way. Therefore, a writer has to choose the best form for his writing i.e. novels, poems, academic writing, shopping lists, meeting minutes and so on. Every type of writing has a different complexity level which depends on its purpose and (3) writing is a process as well a product. The writers imagine, organize, draft, edit, read, and reread. Writing process is sometimes disorderly and often cyclical. Ultimately, what the readers see (e.g. letters, essays, stories, research articles) is a product. Such contrasts, as given above, may seem like convenient or clever ways to split the larger concepts. In reality, they point to the sources of conflict as well as misunderstanding about writing and its teaching.

Essay Writing.

An essay is defined as a response to the particular question in the form of a continuous prose, for which the learners are given an advance notice and which the student is required to prepare in his own time and is subjected to evaluation. Genre of essays is the formation, within a content area,

which satisfactorily fulfills the criteria of a certain type of questions e.g. as 'explain the causes of', or 'compare and contrast' and so on (Biggs, 1988).

Argumentative essay is the most familiar essay type that the learners are required to write (Wu, 2006), particularly in social science subjects (Hewings, 2010). Essay writing, according to Lea and Street, differs significantly within and across disciplines; argument building is considered as a key element for a good essay across the disciplines (1998). In a survey on writing in 20 academic disciplines, Nesi and Gardner observe that a high value of a composition lies in its ability to demonstrate critical thinking as well as development of arguments within the curriculum contexts (2006). While struggling with argumentation in their essay, the students are either unaware of the fact that they are supposed to develop an argument or most of the time, they face difficulty in developing it (Bacha, 2010), because, in the view of Andrews, they have learned diverse concepts about argumentation at secondary school (1995).

At university level, say Mitchell and Riddle, the students get little assistance. The reason lies behind it that the argumentation is not overtly taught to the students in most of the undergraduate programmes (2000). However, general instructions on academic writing are provided in the form of guidelines or principles from books and instructors' feedback comments on the essays. These methods, however, have certain limitations. The students face difficulties while applying writing guidelines to a particular writing context (Lea & Street, 1998).

Feedback comments from tutors are taken, most of the times, as a categorical type of an imperative argument which is written in the margins of a composition (Mutch, 2003). The tutor uses these comments vaguely when he feels that the student has violated the conventions of writing expected in a particular field or discipline, to signify the deficiencies from reasoning to the referencing, from referencing to structure and finally from structure to style (Mitchell & Riddle, 2000). Mitchell and Riddle add further claiming that the ambiguous use of the term mirrors the tutor's own uncertainty

about the notion of argument (2000). It may also depict, in the view of Jacobs (2005), a broader uncertainty about the essay requirements, about which the tutor tends to have only 'tacit knowledge'.

Coherence and Cohesion.

Coherence refers to the links among such textual elements as are mainly based on the links developed from communicative purpose, organization of the information, or thematic development of a certain discourse. Widdowson (1983), in his discussion about the link between new or existing information and the interpretation, emphasizes that there is a possibility to have such paragraphs as might be perfectly cohesive but in-coherent. For, they might not be the indexical of such frames as signify the constructs of some possible as well as recognizable worlds. In fact, contextual links have greater significance for coherence in the texts. Additionally, these links generally depend on the 'shared knowledge' between writers and readers (Kuo, 1995).

Cohesion, in the view of Richard, Platt and Weber, refers to the lexical and grammatical links lying between different textual elements (1985). This type of links involves: (a) inter-sentence relationships; (b) within-sentence relationships; and (c) cross-section structural or lexical inter-dependency. But it is also important to note that the concept of cohesion is not only semantic but also syntactic in nature. In the view of Halliday and Hasan, a semantic link between the textual elements is essential for its interpretation (1976). For, grammatical structures and lexical items determine the ways cohesion is expressed. Conjunction, ellipsis, reference, and substitution are common cohesive devices in English (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Coherence and Cohesion in Writing.

Writing is a process of thinking in which the writers tend to make decisions about lexical and structural choices and organization of ideas and information. They are always goal- and purpose-

guided as they are advancing and planning the written discourses. Therefore, words as well as sentences are cautiously chosen and organized so that coherence and cohesion can be obtained through different contextual, semantic and syntactic links. Furthermore, structural and lexical changes help the writers develop effective patterns of organization of ideas and achieve communicative purpose of a certain discourse (Kuo, 1995).

Current writing researchers have tried to determine how a writer actually writes, and what type of problems he frequently faces while writing. In addition to it, communicative purposes of coherence in writing and written discourses were specifically focused (Connor & Johns, 1990). Writing, in simple words, is viewed as a dynamic activity and the text construction involves relationships at different levels i.e. grammar lexicon, and organization (Kuo, 1995). Therefore, a meaningful writing is possible only with the help of coherence and cohesion (cf. Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Kuo, 1995).

DEVELOPMENT.

Research Aims.

This research aims to explore:

1. The most frequently used cohesive items in the argumentative essays written by Pakistani student-writers; and

2. The functions performed by cohesive items in the essays written by Pakistani student-writers.

Research Questions.

1. What are the most frequently used cohesive items in the essays written by Pakistani student-writers?

2. Which functions do the cohesive items perform in the essays written by Pakistani student-writers?

Previous Studies on Writing.

Many studies have been conducted in the world to highlight the significance of coherence as well as cohesion in writing. One of these studies was conducted by Kuo (1995). He studied cohesion and coherence from the viewpoint of writing process focusing particularly on how explicit or surface relations add to communicative as well as interpretation purposes of the texts. In this regard, he explored coherence and cohesion at different levels of an academic text i.e. lexicon, organization of ideas or information, and sentence structure.

According to lexical cohesive analysis viewpoint, as described by Kuo, such sentences are functionally more significant for thematic development of the texts. At sentence level, grammatical sentences may contain diverse communicative values in the given texts. Additionally, patterns of new as well as given information in different paragraphs of several rhetoric functions were also noticed. He suggested the learners' pragmatic competence for the purpose of information organization.

Hirose (2003) compared organizational patterns of Japanese as an L1 to those of English as an L2 in the compositions written by Japanese foreign language learners of English. He carried "within the subject" L1 and L2 comparisons on essays with respect to overall quality, organizational scores and patterns. In addition, learners' insights about L1 and L2 organization were also studied by comparing learners' own L1 and L2 written essays. Results showed that: (1) the majority of learners used deductive type of patterns of organization in L1 and L2; (2) regardless of the similarities lying between the L1 and L2 organizational structures, the L2 organizational results were not found to be significantly correlated with an L1 organizational results; (3) total scores of L2 organization and composition were observed to significantly differ from L1; and (4) some of the learners were observed to face problems in organizing L1 as well as L2 texts. Dispelling the stereotypes about English and Japanese rhetoric and pedagogy were discussed as the result implications.

Liu and Braine (2005) examined the usage of cohesive devices in 50 essays written by Chinese undergraduate EFL student writers and observed that the students could use different cohesive devices in their essays. Among these cohesive devices, lexical devices were found in maximum use of the said students followed by the use of references and conjunctives. Quality of essay writing was also found to significantly co-vary with the total number of cohesive devices used by the said writers. In addition, some problems were also identified in their compositions which were concerned with the use of lexical and reference devices.

Todd, Khongput and Daraswang (2007) investigated the relation between in-text tutors' comments on postgraduate essays and connectedness in discourse at a Thai university. They divided connectedness into interactional coherence, propositional coherence and cohesion which were analyzed through Hoey's (1991) topical structure analysis, lexical analysis, and genre analysis. As a result, text level connectedness features and points in students' assignments, which appeared as potentially problematic, were identified and compared against tutors' comments. Results revealed a little bit of relationship between the tutors' comments and connectedness analyses. The non-results, according to researchers, might be because of the connectedness constructs, the data, analysis methods, or lack of clear relationships between textual quality and tutors' comments.

Nilopa (2017) conducted a research to describe different types of coherence and cohesive devices in English essay writing using qualitative method with descriptive design. Results of the study showed that: (a) cohesive devices used in the written compositions were lexical cohesion (23.01%), reference (33.73%) and conjunction (43.25%). However, most of the student-writers could not use cohesive devices successfully in their essays. Therefore, the essays written by them were not cohesive; (b) among coherent devices, the said students only used transition signals. Thus, their essays were not coherent; (c) since being neither coherent nor cohesive, their compositions failed to meet the prerequisite of quality of essays; and (d) other findings showed that only two, out of 13

students, had the ability to write good essays (involving general statement, topic sentences, thesis statement, and concluding sentence).

METHODOLOGY.

Model of the study.

For the interpretation of data, the study relies on a comprehensive communicative competence model proposed by Bachman (1990) as well as Bachman and Palmer (1996).This model was actually presented by Bachman in late 1980s as a new communicative competence model or, more specifically, a model of communicative-language ability. Later on, this model was changed by Bachman and Palmer in mid 1990s. A key attribute of this model is an ability of language use which comprises of two wide ranging areas i.e. (1) strategic competence and (2) linguistic knowledge.

Linguistic knowledge further involves two major components i.e. (i) pragmatic knowledge and (ii) organizational knowledge. Both of these components harmonize each other for a communicatively effective use of language. Sub-components of the said components are given in Table 1 as: (a) grammatical knowledge which involves different and independent aspects of knowledge i.e. graphology, morphology, phonology, syntax, vocabulary, and; (b) textual-knowledge which facilitates production and comprehension of spoken or written texts; (c) pragmatic knowledge which refers to the capability for creation as well as interpretation of discourse. It entails two aspects of knowledge i.e.: (i) knowledge of the pragmatic conventions and (ii) knowledge of sociolinguistic conventions. The knowledge of pragmatic conventions is used to express suitable linguistic functions and also to interpret illocutionary force of a discourse or an utterance (a.k.a. functional knowledge). In addition, knowledge of sociolinguistics' conventions is used to create as well as interpret such linguistic utterances as are suitable to a particular linguistic context (sociolinguistic knowledge).

Similarly, Strategic knowledge has also been envisaged in the model as a set of such meta-cognitive constituents as develop the language users' interest in evaluation process of communicative sources, goal setting, and planning. Evaluation serves as a means which relates the context of a language use to communicative-language ability such as; affective schemata and topical knowledge. Goal setting involves the identification of possible tasks, selecting one or more of the tasks selected and making a decision on whether those tasks are to be completed or not. Similarly, planning process entails deciding about how to use linguistic knowledge as well as other constituents involved in language use.

Table 1. Areas of Language Knowledge.

Language Knowledge			
Organizational Knowledge		Pragmatic Knowledge	
Grammatical Knowledge	Textual Knowledge	Functional Knowledge	Sociolinguistic Knowledge
Vocabulary	Cohesion	Ideational Functions	Dialects and language varieties
Syntax	Rhetorical & Conversational Organization	Manipulative functions	Registers
Phonology/Graphology	Imaginative Functions	Heuristic Functions	Natural and Idiomatic expressions
		Cultural references and Figure of Speech	

Source: Bachman and Palmer (1996: 68).

However, all of the above-mentioned features of the said model, i.e. organizational as well as pragmatic knowledge are not the part of this study. The reason is that this study aims to check organizational skills of the said writers. Therefore, this study focuses only on the organizational knowledge.

Organizational knowledge, as is evident from table 1, comprises of two sub parts i.e. grammatical knowledge and textual knowledge which have further sub steps. This study utilizes vocabulary from grammatical knowledge and cohesion from textual knowledge. The reason for selecting the said steps and leaving the rest is that the coherence and cohesion are the main concern of this research.

Therefore, the rest of the constituents are not relevant in here. For divisions as well as types of cohesion, the study refers to Halliday and Hasan (1976). See Table 2.

Table 2. Categories of Cohesion.

COHESION				
Lexical Categories	Repetition	**Grammatical Categories**		
		Reference	Exophoric Reference (Situational)	
	Synonyms		Endophoric Reference (Textual)	Cataphoric (follows in the texts)
	Superordinate			Anaphoric (Precedes in the texts)
	General words	**Conjunction**		
Collocation		**Ellipsis**		
		Substitution		

Source: Halliday and Hasan (1976).

Grammatical categories i.e. conjunction, reference, and substitution have further been divided. See table 3.

Table 3. Categories of Grammatical Cohesion.

GRAMMATICAL COHESION			
Reference		**Substitution**	**Conjunctions**
Personal		**Nominal**	**Additive**
Possessive.	Existential.	one, ones, same.	or, and, nor, and also, furthermore, likewise, in other words, or else, by the way, thus, in addition, besides, that is, moreover, likewise, similarly, in the same way, in contrast, alternatively, on the other hand, for example.

Mine or my, yours or your, ours or our, his, hers or her, its, theirs, their, its, and one's	I/me, we/us, he/him, she/her, it, one, they/ them, you,		
Demonstratives		**Verbal**	**Adversatives**
This or that, here or there those or these and definite article: the			yet, but, though, instead, only, at last, at any rate, anyhow, in fact, rather, on the contrary, however, in any case, I mean, although, despite this, nevertheless, on the other hand
		Clausal	**Clausal**
		so, not	consequently, then, therefore, because, otherwise, it follows, apart from this, hence, on this basis, for this reason, so, to this end
Comparatives			**Temporal**
other, same, so many, identical, else more, similar, such, different, similarly, better			after, an hour later, at once, at the same time, at last, at this moment, before, before that, during, finally, first, formerly, in conclusion, next, next day, meanwhile, previously, second, soon, to sum up, then, third, up to now, when.

Source: Abdelreheim (2014) and Tsareva (2010).

Degaetano-Ortlieb (2015) introduced another category 'logical connections' as a coherence marker in the texts which could be realized through different relations enlisted by Thomson and Zhou i.e.: (1) concessive relations (using words like certainly, plainly); (2) expectancy relations (unfortunately); (3) alternative relations (perhaps, may be); and (4) enumeratives (first, second, third) (2001).

Thus, by combining all of the above-mentioned constituents taken from different studies, discussed above, this study forms a new model as is shown in table 4.

Data Collection.

The data for this study comprises of 400 argumentative essays written by Pakistani ESL learners of grade 14 and has been retrieved from ICNALE, an online data source.

Tuning Procedure.

The tuning procedure for data processing is given in the table 4.

Table 4. Tuning Procedure.

GRAMMATICAL COHESION								
Reference		Substitution	Ellipsis	Conjunction	Logical connections			
Personal								
Possessive	Existential	Nominal	Nominal	Additive	concessive relations	expectancy relations	alternative relations	Enumeratives
my|mine| your|yours| our|ours|his|her|hers|its|their|theirs|one's	I|me|you|we|us|he|him|she|her|it|they|them|one	one|ones|same		and|nor|or|furthermore|likewise|thus|besides|moreover|likewise|similarly|alternatively	Certainly|plainly	unfortunately	perhaps|may be	first|second|third|fourth
				and also|or else|in addition|thatis| in contrast				
				in other words| by the way				
				on the other hand|for example				
				in the same way|on the other hand				

Demonstratives	Verbal	Verbal	Adversative				
this|that|these|those|here|there|the			yet|though|only|but|however|rather|				
			although|though|				
			only|nevertheless|				
			anyhow|instead				
			At last|infact|I mean|				
			despite this				
			on the contrary|in any case|at any rate				
			on the other hand.				
	Clausal	**Clausal**	**Clausal**				
	so|not		so|then|therefore|				
			because|otherwise|hence|consequently|because				
			it follows				
			apart from this|for this reason| to this end|on this basis				
Comparatives			**Temporal**				
same|identical|similar|			then|next|first|formerly|finally|soon|before|after|during|when|previously|finally|soon|first|second|third|meanwhile				
similarly|such|different|other|better							
else more|so many			before that|at once|				
			inconclusion|atlast|				
			nextday|in conclusion				
			to sum up|an hour later|at this moment|up to now				
			at the same time				

Source: author's own compilation.

Distribution and Size of Data.

The size of data and its distribution in corpus is given table 5.

Table 5. Distribution and Size of Pakistani English Language Learners' Essays.

Number of Essays	Word types	Word token
400	4792	94523

Source: author's own work.

Procedure of Data Collection.

As mentioned earlier, 400 argumentative essays written by Pakistani English language learners were retrieved from an online source called ICNALE. After retrieval from the said source, the data was unlocked using a key provided by the website. Then, the data was developed into corpus for analysis purpose.

Sources of Tagging and Analysis Tools.

The developed corpora were tagged through Parts of Speech (POS) tagger. After that an 'AntConc.3.4.4.0' tool was used for analysis purpose.

Procedure of Corpus Analysis.

Procedure of analysis involves a number of steps such as: (1) development of linguistic feature, 'cohesive devices'; (2) conversion of the proposed list of cohesive devices into corpus expression which made it helpful in exploring all features at once; (3) the developed corpus expression of cohesive devices was searched/processed through AntConc.3.4.4.0; (4) the occurrences as results were recorded in the form of frequencies; and (5) all of the recorded occurrences were functionally interpreted with respect to theoretical background.

Results.

Results, as given in table 6, show that Pakistani argumentative essay writers have used all types of cohesive items but with different frequencies i.e. reference items have been used 14880 times whereas substitutions, conjunctions, and logical connections have been used 2829, 2829, 6327 and 130 times respectively.

Total frequencies of cohesive items, as found in the corpus, are 26995 out which reference and logical items have been found in maximum and minimum frequencies respectively while substitutions have been found in equal frequencies. These results indicate that Pakistani writers frequently use reference items to create cohesion in their essays as compared to other items i.e. conjunction, logical connections and substitution.

Table 6. Results of the study.

Grammatical Cohesion		Type Words	Token Words
References	Personal (Possessive)	10	2829
	Personal (Existential)	13	5032
	Demonstratives	7	6295
	Comparatives	7	724
	Total	**37**	**14880**
Substitution	Nominal	0	0
	Verbal	0	0
	clausal	2	2829
	Total	**2**	**2829**
Conjunctions	Additive	15	3284
	Adversative	15	1049
	Clausal	8	1243
	Temporal	15	751
	Total	**53**	**6327**
Logical Connections	Concessive Relations	1	1
	Expectancy Relations	1	9
	Alternative Relations	2	5
	Enumeratives	4	115
	Total	**8**	**130**
GRAND TOTAL		**100**	**24166**

Source: author's own work.

Discussion.

The first question of the study was concerned with the exploration of the most frequently used cohesive items in the argumentative essays written by Pakistani student writers. In this concern, it has come to know that the said writers use reference items more frequently as compared to the other items i.e. substitutions, conjunctions, and logical connections (see table 6 for details). These results, however, differ from the results of the studies by Liu and Braine (2005) and Nilopa (2017). The former reports frequent use of lexical devices followed by reference and conjunction items in Chinese EFL essay writings whereas, the later reports the subjects using conjunctions more frequently (i.e. 43.25%) as compared to the other devices i.e. lexical cohesion and reference being 23.1 and 33.73 percent in use respectively.

According to Halliday and Hasan, the term 'reference' stands specifically for such items within the discourse or texts as are not possible to be "interpreted semantically in their own right". Instead, reference items "make reference to something else", i.e. they refer to the other items within the discourses or the texts for the purpose of interpretation (1994, p. 31).

Reference items referring to something else are termed as directives which show that the "information is to be retrieved from elsewhere" (1994: 31). Moreover, "the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning", which identifies the particular things or the classes of things that are being referred to (1994: 31). This aspect i.e. referring to specific items within a text, to which Halliday and Hasan (1994) called directives and which identify things, or the classes of things being referred to, is frequent in the use of Pakistani argumentative essay writers. This implies that Pakistani essay writers establish cohesion using reference items in their essays which further means that they organize the arguments in their essays by frequently using reference items.

Substitutions and conjunctions are as much important as are the reference items. In fact, substitution is the process which replaces certain items within the discourses or the texts by the other items

(Halliday & Hasan, 1994). Substitution, Halliday and Hasan (1994) add, is a relation found on lexico-grammatical level (the level of vocabulary and grammar) i.e. "between linguistic items, such as words or phrases" (p. 89). Halliday and Hasan (1994) further see substitution as "a sort of counter which is used in place of the repetition of a particular item" (p. 89). Similarly, Conjunction also involves lexical features therefore; it forms a borderline to the fields of lexical cohesion. Being dissimilar to other cohesive relations, in the view of Halliday and Hasan: "conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse" (1994, p. 226).

Therefore, it is very difficult for a person to explain precisely the means by which the conjunctions create cohesion in the discourses or texts. Conjunctions, in fact, are neither semantic relations which refer to 'something else' in the texts or discourses, nor they form grammatical relationships which indicate that 'something is replaced by something else or is simply left out'. Halliday and Hasan regard conjunctions as different items on the ground that the conjunctions are "a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before" (1994: 227). In addition, conjunctions have the capacity to relate the linguistic elements to each other which "occur in succession but are not related by other, structural means" (1994, p. 227). By function, the conjunctions structure the texts or discourses in a precise way and arrange the presented components in a logical order.

Above definitions and explanations of substitutions and conjunction show that conjunctions and substitutions are also as much important as are the reference items for the organization of a text. So far as the use of substitutions and conjunctions by essay writers is concerned, the results in table 6 show that they have used the said items with different frequencies to organize the information in the essays. For, in the view of Halliday and Hasan, different cohesive devices e.g. conjunction,

reference and substitution help create the cohesive relations or bonds in the texts (1976). Richard, Platt and Weber, refer to the cohesion in terms of lexical and grammatical links between different textual elements which involve: (a) inter-sentence relationships; (b) within-sentence relationships; and (c) cross-section structural or lexical inter-dependency (1985). Kuo (1995) adds that these bonds, links or relations work like glue which holds the texts together and makes the difference between the unified and un-unified sets of sentences these bonds/relations involve; inter-sentence or intra-sentence relations as well as structural and lexical inter-dependency.

Pakistani essay writers have been found to be successful in creating cohesive relations with the help of cohesive items with different frequencies, among which the use of reference items has been found to be first more frequent, the use of conjunctions has been found to be second more frequent and similarly, the use of substitutions has been found to be third more frequent in the essays written by Pakistani student writers. Therefore, it can be said that Pakistani argumentative writers establish cohesion using reference items more frequently than the other items i.e. conjunctions, logical connections and substitutions and thereby organize information in the essays.

The second question of the study was raised to investigate the function of the use of cohesive items in the essays written by Pakistani student writers. In this concern, the said writers have been found to use reference items most frequently, which in the view of Halliday and Hasan (1994) function as directives and show that the "information is to be retrieved from elsewhere" (p. 31). In addition, "the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to" (p. 31). For example:

1. The students are bound to do these jobs because they have no **other** way and their parents are poor so they cannot afford their children dues. (Comparative Reference: W_PAK_PTJ0_016_B1_1.txt)

2. **These** jobs provide an opportunity to the people to earn extra income and improve their lifestyle. (Demonstrative Reference: W_PAK_PTJ0_008_B1_1.txt)

3. **I** am a big brother all of us. (Personal Existential Reference: W_PAK_PTJ0_001_B1_1.txt)

4. This is **my** first year is education subject. (Personal Possessive Reference: W_PAK_PTJ0_001_B1_1.txt)

Pakistani argumentative essay writers are making the use of these functions most frequently.

Similarly, Conjunctions usually function to structure the texts or discourses precisely and order the presented elements logically. Pakistani argumentative essay writers have used these functions in their essays to present different elements in a logical order. Some of the examples have been given below:

1. The addicted people in one way destroy their life but **on the other hand,** surrounding people are also affected by them (Additive Conjunction: W_PAK_SMK0_162_A2_0.txt).

2. A student wants that type of job, where he spends little time on job and gets the handsome income I the return of his work, **but** it is not possible for him (Adversative Conjunction: W_PAK_PTJ0_002_B1_1.txt).

3. Gradually as the time pass by he become dull and bored **because** he has a huge burden of studies on his head as he does not get only time to relax and enjoy (Clausal Conjunction: W_PAK_PTJ0_008_B1_1.txt).

4. **At the same time,** if someone is smoking then its smoke causes to pollute the environment (Temporal Conjunction: W_PAK_SMK0_186_B1_2.txt).

The writers have used these functions in second highest frequency.

Similarly, according to Halliday and Hasan (1994), substitution items have same structural functions as for which they substitute. Different substitution types include: (a) clausal (it replaces a sentence clause by 'not' or 'so'); (b) nominal (it replaces nouns by 'same' 'one', or 'ones') and (c)

verbal (it replaces the verbs by 'do') (p. 90). Examples from the corpus of the study are given below:

1. A student is the future of the nation, if we do **not** pay attention on this problem, we will lost our future (Clausal Substitution: W_PAK_PTJ0_002_B1_1.txt).

2. And they also studied **same** time because of burden they lose their health or not able to do one thing properly (Nominal Substitution: W_PAK_PTJ0_025_B1_2.txt).

Logical connections, in the view of Degaetano-Ortlieb (2015), connect the preceding and subsequent discourse in a logical sense while creating coherence in the texts as well as maintaining their evaluative meaning. There may be different relation types of logical connections. Thompson and Zhou (2001) consider, e.g. alternative relations (realized by perhaps and maybe etc.), concessive relations (realized by certainly and plainly etc.) and expectancy relations (realized by unfortunately etc.). Some examples extracted from the corpus are given below:

1. **Perhaps,** it has its own advantages and disadvantages, but they vary from person to person and their purpose of doing so (Alternative Logical Connection: W_PAK_PTJ0_069_B1_2.txt).

2. **Certainly,** they can't achieve their goals because if they want to live independently, they should have enough money and they can earn money only through education (Concessive Logical Connection: W_PAK_PTJ0_077_B1_2.txt).

3. And the **third** way is that the part job holder can face the whole problem of life before to happen such sort of circumstance (Enumerative Logical Connection: W_PAK_PTJ0_066_B1_1.txt).

4. **Unfortunately,** in most cases finical aide and scholarships are offered on a need and or merit basis, that's why a vast majority of College students do not necessarily fall in those categories (Logical Connection of Expectancy: W_PAK_PTJ0_021_B1_2.txt).

Pakistani student argumentative essay writers have used these items in minimum frequency as compared to above mentioned ones.

In the view of Halliday (1974), writing is an instrument that clarifies and extends thought in the content. Nunan (1988) calls it a sophisticated skill which combines various linguistic elements. Kuo views writing as a dynamic process of text construction involving grammatical, lexical, and organizational links (1995). Essay is a particular genre, within a content area, which satisfactorily fulfills the criteria of a certain type of questions e.g. as 'explain the causes of', or 'compare and contrast' and so on (Biggs, 1988) and argumentative essay is the most familiar essay type that the learners are required to write (Wu, 2006). Skillful essay writing reflects successful learning of an L2 (cf. Kellogg, 2001) which is an organization of information in the texts. The organization is achieved with the help of different cohesive links or relations (cf. Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 1994; Kuo, 1995; Richard, Platt & Weber, 1985). Cohesive links or relations are achieved with the help of different cohesive devices i.e. conjunction, ellipsis, reference, and substitution (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The writers of argumentative essays in particular and other genres in general should make use of cohesive devices to organize the information in the texts.

CONCLUSIONS.

In the light of above results and discussions, this study concludes that Pakistani argumentative essay writers use conjunction, logical connection, reference, and substitution items to establish coherence and cohesion, and thereby, organize the information in their essays. However, the use of reference items is more frequent as compared to the use of substitutions, conjunctions and logical connections. It means that Pakistani argumentative essay writers are more concerned with the use of 'directives' which indicates that the 'information is to be retrieved from elsewhere'. In addition, the said writers are also concerned with the use of 'referential meaning' i.e. the 'identification of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to'.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Abdelreheim, H. M. H. (2014). A Corpus-based discourse analysis of grammatical cohesive devices used in expository essays written by Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali school, Abu Dhabi (Doctoral dissertation), The British University in Dubai (BUiD).

2. Andrews, R. (1995). Teaching and learning argument. London, NY: Cassell.

3. Bacha, N. (2010). Teaching the academic argument in a university EFL environment. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9(3), 229–241.

4. Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

5. Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

6. Biggs, J. (1988). Approaches to learning and to essay writing. In Learning Strategies and Learning Styles (pp. 185-228). Boston: Springer.

7. Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (1990). Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Inc., 1600 Cameron Street, Suite 300, Alexandria, VA 22314.

8. Degaetano-Ortlieb, S. (2015). Evaluative meaning and cohesion: The structuring function of evaluative meaning in scientific writing. Discours. Revue de linguistique, psycholinguistique et informatique. A journal of linguistics, psycholinguistics and computational linguistics, 16, 1-24.

9. Halliday, M. A. (1974). The place of 'functional sentence perspective' in the system of linguistic description. Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective, 43-53.

10. Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

11. Hewings, M. (2010). Materials for university essay writing. In N. Harwood (Ed.), English Language Teaching Materials (pp. 251–278). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

12. Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12(2), 181-209.

13. Hoey, M. (1991). Patterns of lexis in text. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

14. Hyland, K. (2003). Second language writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..

15. ICNALE: The International Corpus Network of Asian Learners of English. Accessed on March, 15, 2019 from http://language.sakura.ne.jp/icnale/download.html

16. Jacobs, C. (2005). On being an insider on the outside: New spaces for integrating academic literacies. Teaching in Higher Education, 10(4), 475–487.

17. Kellogg, R. T. (2001). Long-term working memory in text production. Memory & Cognition, 29(1), 43–52.

18. Kuo, C. H. (1995). Cohesion and coherence in academic writing: From lexical choice to organization. RELC Journal, 26(1), 47-62.

19. Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. Studies in Higher Education, 23(2), 157–172.

20. Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. System, 33(4), 623-636.

21. Mitchell, S., & Riddle, M. (2000). Improving the quality of argument in higher education. Final Report. School of Lifelong Learning and Education: Middlesex University.

22. Mutch, A. (2003). Exploring the practice of feedback to students. Active Learning in Higher Education, 4(2), 24–38.

23. Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2006). Variation in disciplinary culture: University tutors' views on assessed writing tasks. In R. Kiely, P. Rea-Dickins, H. Woodfield, & G. Clibbon (Eds.), Language, culture and identity in applied linguistics (pp. 99–117). London: BAAL/Equinox

24. Nickerson, R. S., Perkins, D. N., & Smith, E. E. (2014). The teaching of thinking. UK: Routledge.

25. Nilopa, L. M. (2017). Cohesive and Coherent devices on the students' essay of English Department of IAIN Palangka Raya (Doctoral dissertation, IAIN Palangka Raya).

26. Nunan, D. (1988). The learner-centred curriculum: A study in second language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

27. Richard, J., Platt, J. & Weber, H. (1985). Longman dictionary of applied linguistics. London: Longman.

28. Sokolik, M. (2003). Writing. In Practical English Language Teaching. (pp. 87-108). New York: McGraw Hills.

29. Thompson, G. & Zhou, J. 2001. Evaluation and organization in text: The structuring role of evaluative disjuncts. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (eds.), Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse (pp. 121-141). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

30. Todd, R. W., Khongput, S., & Darasawang, P. (2007). Coherence, cohesion and comments on students' academic essays. Assessing Writing, 12(1), 10-25.

31. Tsareva, A. (2010). Grammatical cohesion in argumentative essays by Norwegean and Russian learners (Master Thesis). The University of Oslo.

32. Widdowson, H. G. (1983). Learning purpose and language use. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

33. Wu, S. M. (2006). Creating a contrastive rhetorical stance: Investigating the strategy of problematization in students' argumentation. RELC Journal, 37(3), 329–353.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. **Muhammad Ahmad.** SSE English, Government High School, Hujra Shah Muqeem, Okara, Pakistan. He is also a PhD Candidate at the Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan. E-mail: ahmad453@yandex.com

2. **Syed Kazim Shah.** Assistant Professor in English, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan. He got his Doctoral Degree in Applied Linguistics from International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: kazim.shah@gcuf.edu.pk

3. **Muhammad Mushtaq.** Lecturer in English, Government Imamia College, Sahiwal, Pakistan. He is also a PhD Candidate at the Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan. Email: mushi121@hotmail.com