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Abstract
This paper reports on an analysis of Thai university students’ essays in a longitudinal genre based course at a Thai government university in 2007. While there are many approaches in analysing students’ written essays, this paper highlights the way in which we analysed selected students’ essays both qualitatively and quantitatively on the issue of clause complexity based on the perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). In detail, we demonstrate how selected students presented their clause complexity which is related to, for example, inter-clausal relations (logico-semantic relation), coordination (parataxis) and subordination (hypotaxis) as mainly outlined by Halliday (1994), Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) and Martin (1992). The results of the analyses indicate that the selected students show a positive trend of developments in the use of semantic relations in their later texts. They included rich conjunctive relations and lexical resources in their later texts compared to the pre-test texts. However, it would be more confident to conclude if a larger number of samples would have been supplied in the analysis. Some discussion and recommendations about semantic relations, clause complexes and application of genre pedagogy are addressed for further development.

Introduction
Clause complex is an English major topic that has received an attention from linguists and language researchers. It is argued that an ability to write complex clauses is required for language learners or EFL and ESL writers. In current context, there are many studies involved with this issue. As proposed by Halliday (1994: 216), a sentence can be interpreted as a clause complex: a Head clause together with other clauses that modify it. He further states that a combination of clauses related paratactically or hypotactically but not through embedding; the mode of combination is the mode of organization of the logical subtype of the ideational metafunction. In this regard, he attests that for example, clauses combined through coordination form a clause complex. He argues that the notion of ‘clause complex’ thus enables us to account in full for the functional organization of sentences (Halliday 1994: 216). Eggins (Eggins, 2004 pp.255-256) defines that the term “clause” itself is called clause complex. Setia et al (2009, p.1) state that clause or clause simplex equals simple sentence in formal grammar and clause complex equals complex sentences.

In Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), inter-clausal relations or logico-semantic relations consist of coordination (parataxis) and subordination (hypotaxis). Parataxis is the relation between two-like-elements of equal status, one initiating and the other continuing while hypotaxis is the relation between a dependent element and its dominant, the element on which it is dependent (Setia et al 2009, p.1). In this regard, they argue that the distinction between parataxis and hypotaxis has developed as a powerful grammatical strategy for guiding the rhetorical development of text. They further argue that the choice between parataxis and hypotaxis characterizes each relation between two clauses (each nexus) within a clause complex, and clause complexes are often formed out of mixture of parataxis and hypotaxis. Halliday (1994:216) states that parataxis is logical interdependency between clauses where the interdependents are of equal status. In this regard, he further elaborates that hypotaxis is logical interdependency between clauses where the interdependents are of unequal status. Accordingly, in this paper the issue of logico-semantic relations is mainly investigated in the selected students’ essays.
Context and scope of study

This paper focuses on the analysis of clause complex (parataxis and hypotaxis) in a small number of argumentative texts written by three Thai students in three groups; low, mid and high at a Thai government university. Three kinds of texts; Pre-test, Exposition and Discussion were taken from a genre based course offered in semester one in 2007 for the analysis. In this regard, two research questions were set up to meet the purpose of the study as follows.

1) Was it possible to observe developments in the student’s deployment of

2) the resources for construing inter-clausal relations (what within Systemic Functional Linguistics are termed “logico-semantic” or “conjunctive” relations”)?

3) Is it plausible that any such developments could be related to the genre-

4) based pedagogy employed in the course?

Methodology and the analysis

Analysis of the students’ use of logico-semantic relations

The analysis was developed in order to provide for the possibility of findings relating to developments in the students’ language at a more micro level – at the level of the clause and of clause connections. Any number of areas of meaning making might usefully and revealingly have been made the focus of analytical attention. Thus, for example, any changes in the students writers’ use of the interpersonal meanings by which they enter into virtual relationships with the reader might have been examined. Similarly, any changes might have been examined in how the student writers managed the flow of Theme choices across sentences, or the range of Process and Circumstance types employed, and so on.

It was decided, therefore, to focus on the resources by which speakers/writers establish “logical” relations between clauses and between clause complexes – relations which Halliday has broadly divided into those of “projection” and “expansion”, and, within “expansion”, into “extension”, “elaboration” and “enhancement” (see, for example, Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, chapter 7). More specifically:

5) “projection” (where one clause “projects” another as reported speech or thought),

6) “extension” (where one clause adds to another or provides alternation or a replacement),

7) “elaboration” (where one clause elaborates another via exemplifying or specifying the other clause),

8) and “enhancement” (where one clause enhances another by indicating, for example when the process presented in the other clause occurred, or what caused the process, or what its purpose was, and so on).

The students’ use of these resource (and any change therein) was selected for close analysis because this is obviously a key aspect of meaning making. It is vital that the student writers are able to mobilize these resources since they are the means by which the interconnected “logic” of texts is built up. It was also felt that this was an area of meaning making which would be analytically manageable, since it is relatively straightforward to track, classify and count the inter-clausal connections in a given text. Even so, the task is still a demanding and time consuming one, since such statistics need not only to be collected but then qualitatively interpreted by considering actual instances of use of these resources in the essays. Accordingly, it was decided to limit this logico-semantic analysis to just the three essays of three students (i.e. nine essays in total) – specifically the pre-test, mid-point and end-point essays of students (HGS1, MGS1 and LGS1). It was considered that this would be adequate to enable any trends to be discovered in how these students deployed these logico-semantic resources and therefore to possibly reach conclusions as to developments in the writing of the students as a
group. Obviously caution had been exercised to avoid over generalising conclusions based on such a relatively small data set. The specifics of this methodology were as follows.

**Division into clause complexes/sentences**

Each of the nine texts was divided into clause complexes, which, in the interests of ease of reference are usually termed “sentences” in this dissertation. The clause complex/sentence was defined as one or more clauses which together formed a single, separate and independent grammatical unit. There were occasional analytical complications associated with this, usually as a result of the students’ non standard use of punctuation and capitalization. What this meant is that on a few occasions judgements as to what constituted a single clause complex/sentence differed from what might be seen as indicated by the student writer’s punctuation. Most frequently this occurred when students ran clauses together to make extended “sentences” without providing the connections necessary for these spans to constitute single grammatical units. The total number of both clause complexes/sentences and these “simple sentences” was tallied for each text and the tally placed in a Microsoft Excel database for the purpose of statistical analysis.

**Division into clauses, and tracking of logico-semantic sub types**

Each clause complex/sentence was then divided up into individual clauses, either what were termed “top level” clauses (i.e. non rank shifted) or embedded clauses (i.e. rank shifted). The following coding system is employed there.

- Key: | = hypotactic boundary; || = paratactic boundary; […] = clause embedded as Qualifier in a noun group; […] = clause embedded as entire noun group.

For example:

And for those [who do not want to sleep on the floor || and still have all the room’s accommodations], they feel like | they pay a higher cost | because there is, at least, one more person [to share everything with].

Relations between clauses were categorized firstly according to whether, in Halliday’s terms, they were “paratactic” (i.e. the clauses were of equal status grammatically) or “hypotactic” (i.e. of unequal status, with one clause dependent on, or subordinate to the other), and secondly according to whether, as indicated above, they involved, projection, extension, elaboration or enhancement. Instances of “enhancing” relations were further categorized according to sub type – specifically as to whether the relationship was one of temporality, cause-or-effect, condition, purpose or counter-expectation/concession.

**Classification of clause relations as “internal” or “external”**

Following the work of Martin (see, for example, Martin 1992), a further distinction was made between what Martin terms “internal” and “external” conjunctive relations. In the case of “external” conjunction, the relation is one which is presented as existing in the “real world”, while in the case of “internal” conjunction it is one which operates in the rhetorical world of the text – it is a text “internal” relationship. As Eggins explains (2004 pp.46-49) the following extract involves “external” relations of time, since clauses are linked together in terms of their relative timing is some “real world” event.

Mrs Mallard was very affected by her husband’s death. **First** she cried in her sister's arms. **Next** she sat alone in her room. **Finally**, she joined her sister to walk downstairs.
In contrast, the following extract, also supplied by Eggins, involves “internal” relations of time, as clauses are related to other clauses as sequential steps in the argument being presented by the writer.

Mrs Mallard was very affected by her husband’s death. **First** it meant liberation from marriage. **Next** it gave her financial independence. **Finally** it allowed her to pursue her own interests.

Also following Martin, the analysis of these conjunctive, logico-semantic relations was not confined to those which hold between clauses within a clause complex, but is extended to include those which operate between clause complexes, when these are explicitly indicated via connectives such as *however, therefore, moreover, then and firstly*.

**Classification of relations as “attempted” or “achieved”**

The analysis attended to one further distinction. We chose to distinguish between instances where the student simply “attempted” a particular logico-semantic relation and where the student “achieved” that relation. According to the identification diagnostic we formulated, for an instance to be classified as an “attempt” it was only necessary that it was possible to determine the nature of the relation which was intended. For an instance to be classified as having “achieved” the relation, it was necessary that those aspects of the clause involved in construing the relation were lexico-grammatically “standard” or “idiomatic”. Thus, for example, the following would be classified as an “an attempted” but not an “achieved” logical relation of purpose, because the writer has used the non-idiomatic “for” (“for getting the high quality goods”) by way of connective.

9) **In my view education should not be a business which we invest in for getting the high quality goods.**

Accordingly, the analysis of this clause would have recorded that it contained one instance of “attempted” hypotaxis, specifically a hypotactically related clause of “purpose”, but no instances of “achieved” hypotaxis.

In contrast, the following would have been classified as having both “attempted” and “achieved” this logical relation.

10) **In my view education should not be a business which we invest in in order to get the high quality goods.**

It is important to note that instances are still classified as having “achieved” the logico-semantic relation in question even when there is some grammatical or lexical anomaly elsewhere in the clause, as long as that anomaly is not related to the construing of the particular logical relation. Thus example (2) above would still be recorded as not only “attempting” but also “achieving” the logical relation of purpose, even while the “the” in “the high quality goods” is anomalous. Since this “the” has nothing to do with the wordings by which purpose is construed, it is not relevant for this particular categorisation.

It was decided to classify instances of logico-semantic relations in the texts as both “attempted” and “achieved”, thus tracking the frequency with which students “attempted” but did not “achieve” idiomatic realisations of these relations, because by this, it is possible to observe students in the preliminary stages of realizing these relations. It is important to observe when students begin seeking to construe these relations, even when they are not able to always realize these idiomatically.
Statistical tallies

Tallies were calculated for the following:

- the number of clause complexes/sentences in each text
- the number of “simple sentences” in each text and the proportion (as a percentage) of the total number of sentences in the text constituted by these “simple sentences”
- the number sentences with at least one instance of a hypotactic or paratactic relation between top-level clauses, and the proportion of the total number of sentences in the text constituted by these sentences,
- the number of “attempted” hypotactic and paratactic connections in each text and the average frequency of these connections per sentence for each text
- the number of “achieved” hypotactic and paratactic connections in each text and the average frequency of these connections per sentence for this text
- the number of instances and the average frequency per clause of the following relations: projection; internal and external extension; internal and external consequentiality; internal and external condition; counter-expectation/concession; purpose, elaboration.

Quantitative findings derived from these tallies provided for investigations as to whether there were trends across the three students’ essays in terms of their use of these resources. Thus the purpose of this quantitative and qualitative analysis of the students’ use of logico-semantic relations was to determine whether any trends could be identified which would indicate that their writing had changed significantly in this aspect of meaning making over the duration of the course. If any such changes could be observed, then it might be plausible to argue that the course itself may have had role in effecting this changes.

The analysis of clause complexity is framed by the resources by which speakers/writers establish “logical” relations between clauses and between clause complexes – relations which Halliday has broadly divided into those of “projection” and “expansion”, and, within “expansion”, into “extension”, “elaboration” and “enhancement” (see, for example, Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, chapter 7).

While the focus of the course was not so directly placed on these resources, they were nevertheless frequently brought to the students’ attention through the text modelling process. Thus, for example, students would be directed to attend to how relations of cause-and-effect or temporality (sub types of “enhancement”) were conveyed in texts when such meanings were present in the texts being used as models, and when the student’s own texts were being reviewed. Accordingly, it was deemed appropriate to focus on the students’ use of these resources as another way of tracking developments in their academic literacy.

The focus was both on the writing of individual students and on trends which could be observed across the writing of the students as a group, since it is by reference to such group based trends that it becomes possible to propose correlations between the course itself and such literacy development outcomes. The students’ texts were divided into clause complexes (here termed “sentences” for ease of reference), and then the clause divisions within these sentences were identified. Clause relations were classified according to whether they were paratactic or hypotactic and then classified as either instances, in Halliday’s terms, of projection, extension, elaboration or enhancement. Instances of “enhancing” relations were further categorized according to sub type – specifically as to whether the relationship was one of temporality, cause or-effect, condition, purpose or counter-expectation/concession. Further distinctions were observed between “external” and “internal” relations and between instances where the relation was “attempted” and where it was “achieved”.
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The findings and interpretation

From the analysis, the findings can be demonstrated in the comparison of the three students as follows.

The statistical findings for the students’ use of clause complexes which involved at least one inter-clausal hypotactic or paratactic connection are set out in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th>essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HGS1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGS1</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>48.43%</td>
<td>59.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGS1</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data indicate a clear trend to towards more frequent use of hypotactic or paratactic relations across the three essays – a near doubling when essays 3 and essays 1 are compared for students HGS1 and MGS1.

A clausal analysis of this student’s essay 1 is provided below in order to give a sense of how it reads, with its 63 percent of sentences with paratactic or hypotactic expansion.

Key: | = hypotactic boundary; || = paratactic boundary; […] = clause embedded as Qualifier in a noun group; [[…]] = clause embedded as entire noun group.

Simple sentences have been indicated by means of a bold typeface.

Table 2 Essay 1 by student LGS1

1. In my view, I disagree with the statement for 2 reasons.
   2. First of all, I think | it does not depend on [[studying abroad | | or studying in the country]],
   3. it depends on each person.
   4. For example, Jane is a son of the rich || and he planed to study abroad | after he finished the high school.
   5. When he went to abroad, | he did not attend the class || and he just drink, smoke, take drugs.
   6. At last, he ungraduated || and he come back to his hometown.
   7. According to this example that presented, the disadvantages of studying abroad.
   8. I think | [[studying abroad]] that did not suitable for everybody,
   9. it depends on the person.
   10. Second, I think | every country has the same of sufficiency.
   11. Indeed, I disagree | that [[studying abroad]] is better than [[studying in country]].

While this essay may be seen as undeveloped in many ways, this is arguably not on account of any overuse of simple sentences or under use of the resources of hypotaxis or parataxis. The essay is arguably quite well developed in terms of its use of the resources of logico-semantic relations, even while the student does not always realize these meanings in an idiomatic way. Thus the simple sentences don’t occur in sequence, an arrangement which can make writing seem stilted or disconnected, but are instead distributed at appropriate points throughout the essay, typically summing up material which has just come before.
As well, we notice the writer frequently and consistently employing hypotaxis and parataxis to produce relatively complex sentences. Thus sentence 2 involves hypotactic projection (“I think…”), and a paratactic extension between two embedded clauses.

First of all, I think | it does not depend on [[studying abroad || or studying in the country]],

Similarly, sentence 4 includes an instance of paratactic extension and an instance of hypotactic enhancement.

For example, Jane is a son of the rich || and he planed to study abroad | after he finished the high school.

In arguing that this essay is reasonably well developed in terms of “attempted” inter-clausal connections, we note also that the student did not actually punctuate two of what we classified above as “simple” sentences as separate sentences, presenting them as part of a preceding clause complex. For example,

(2) First of all, I think | it does not depend on [[studying abroad || or studying in the country]], (3) it depends on each person.

In the interest of consistency across the analyses of all the essays, this second “it depends…” clause was treated as structurally separate from the previous clause (i.e. a “simple sentence”), since there was nothing here by way of a formal indicator of a connection or relationship with the preceding clause. However a more “lenient” analysis, guided by the student’s punctuation, might well have connected this to the previous clause, thus indicating an even lower rate of clauses without any parataxis or hypotaxis.

It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that here is a student who has begun the course with a reasonably developed ability to employ the resources of logico-semantic relations, or at least a propensity to seek to use these in most of her sentences. Thus the fact that she did not increase the rate of use from essay 1 to essay 2 is not all that significant in terms of an analysis of the development of her academic literacy. Tellingly, of course, she did increase the frequency of her use of these resources in her final essay 3, a point which I will return to below.

This particular analysis, then, provides for the conclusion that there is a correlation between these students undertaking this course and a substantial increase in their use of the resources of logico-semantic relations – they end the course by more frequently establishing such “logical links” links between clauses than they did at the commencement of the course. On the face of it this would seem to constitute a development or improvement, in the sense that their writing has become richer, so to speak, in terms of logico-semantic relations. Some caution, however, is necessary on this front. We should not assume that “more” is necessarily “better”. Before reaching a final decision on this matter, we need to look beyond the quantitative statistics to consider what is actually entailed communicatively in the shift these students have made from less frequent to more frequent construing of logico-semantic relations. With this objective in mind, the following section provides a detailed analysis in which a student essays with one of the lowest frequencies of sentences with at least one top-level hypotactic or paratactic relation (essay 1 by MSG1 – 37.50 percent of all sentences) is compared with the student essay with the greatest proportion of sentences with top-level hypotactic or paratactic relations (essay 3 by LGS1 – 90.91 percent).

Note that for this analysis, the focus is on instances where the writer attempts such logico-semantic relations, and not on whether or not she construes these idiomatically. This is because whether or not the “attempt” involved an idiomatic wording (i.e. could be classed as “achieving” or “not achieving” a given conjunctive relationship) is not relevant for this particular analysis. Our interest here is in whether or not the writer sought to construe one of
these meaning relationships, and not on whether she effected such by means of a grammatical “standard” wording.

Key: | = hypotactic boundary; || = paratactic boundary; [...]= clause embedded as Qualifier in a noun group; [[...]] = clause embedded as entire noun group.

Sentences without top-level hypotactic or paratactic connections are indicated in bold typeface.

Table 3 Essay 1 by student MGS1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>For me, I agree with the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The first reason is [[there are very inappropriate websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>This can make children easily enters to these websites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>If we can censor the inappropriate websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Because they can’t read and see anything [that may motivate in the a bad way]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Second, parents don’t keep an eye on their children every time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sometimes they can see them [[play the Internet]],</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>during the time children may click the inappropriate one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>This is a problem of parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>With this reason, we should agree with the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Lastly, on the internet has many games [to serve children's entertainment].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>And it has both good and bad one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Some games make children abuse,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>they play all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The advantages of [censoring the inappropriate websites] have a lot of ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>We should support and do it for ourselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here sentences with at least one instance of top-level hypotaxis or parataxis are in the minority – 6 out of 16 sentences – and simple sentence structures predominate. It is at least arguable that the language comes across as undeveloped, stilted and not very fluent on account of this. Certainly there are a number of points in the essay where the writing would have been more fluent if the writer had made more use, or more appropriate use, of the resources by which clauses can be linked together. Consider, by way of example, the following sequence. (7) Sometimes they can see them [[play the Internet]], || but when parents go to work || or have something [that must go out to do it],

(8) during the time children may click the inappropriate one.

While the student punctuated this as a single clause complex, the actual grammar was such that the sequence was analysed as two separate sentences, with the second element (clause 8) a simple sentence. (For this to be analysed as an “achieved” hypotactic relations, the writer would have needed to have avoided including “during the time” as a marked circumstantial

---

Note that structures such as this (where there are two verbs linked by “and” and sharing the same Subject and the same Object/Complement) are treated as a single clause, not as a clause complex.
Theme at this point.) However, a minor change would have resulted in both these elements being unproblematically analysed as a single clause complex. For example,
Sometimes they can see them [[play the Internet]], || but when parents go to work || or have something [which they have to go out to do], the children may click the inappropriate one.

Clearly this is more coherent and more fluent as a result of the presence of an additional successful conjunctive relation – namely one by which “the children may click the inappropriate one” is presented as a main clause, with “when parents go to work or have something which they have to go out to do” in a hypotactic relationship with it.

A similar situation applies with the following sequence.

(13) **Some games make children abuse,**
(14) they play all the time || and some days the parents can’t see their parents | because they are in the room all day.

A relatively minor change would result in this sequence becoming a single clause complex.

(13) Some games do harm to children | because they play them all the time, || and some days the children can’t see their parents because they are in the room all day.

By means of this additional hypotactic relation the writing would become more sophisticated and more fluent.

There is one final sequence were a similar situation applies.

15. **The advantages of [censoring the inappropriate websites] have a lot of ways.**
16. **We should support and do it for ourselves.**

Again the writing would have been more fluent had an additional conjunctive element been included.

The advantages of [censoring the inappropriate websites] have a lot of ways, and accordingly we should support and do this censoring ourselves.

On the basis of this analysis, it seems reasonable to argue that the resources of logico-semantic relations are under used in this essay - there are a number of points in the text where the writing would have been more fluent and easier to follow had the writer construed additional logical relations. It can be argued that this is one of the reasons why the essay is not fully effective communicatively and seems under developed.

We turn now to comparing this previous text with the essay with the largest proportion of sentences with at least one instance of a hypotactic or paratactic relation – essay 3 by student LGS1 (with a rate of 90.91 percent). Sentences without top-level hypotactic or paratactic relations are indicated in bold typeface.
Currently, the University Unit of Kasetsart university, Khamphaeng Saen campus had paid forward a plan to the university administration which involve an increase the number of students in each room because the number of students coming to the university is increasing each year.

The university are no funds available to construct the new building.

Moreover, the students do not have to pay too much money like living in the private dormitories or apartment.

They say it can make the close relationship between the new friends and the new friends or between the freashy and the senior.

However, the students who don’t accept this idea, arguing that increasing the number of students per room will have a lot of problem, for example, it will lose of privacy, it will noise and It’s impossible to sleep two people in one bed.

They said the university unit should find the new idea for sloving this problem.

Thus, my essay will present the both sides of this debate that the university should increase the number of students per room or not.

The university unit said that we give a chance for the poor students because university has the quota for the children of famer.

So the number of students increase from the quota of the poor students.

If we limit the number of students as we limit the chance for the poor student or between the freashy and the senior.

The students who don’t like this idea arguing that it’s too much people for living in a small room.

In the room has 3 beds but it has 4 people, that means it will have one person sleep on the floor or two people must sleep in one bed.

They said if the boss of the university were them which way that the boss would like to choose.

Moreover, for the fat, If they must to sleep with other people in the same bad, they may feel uncomfortable and the bad may break.

The university unit argue that almost the university of pubic must do like this not only in Khamphaeng Saen Campus but also every university in Thailand.

They said that we don’t have the fund to construct to the new building because they use the fund for developing the teaching.

They said if they have the money, they will immidately build the new dorm for the largest student intake.

They support that the comfortable of students in dormitory must come first but the chance of the poor student which will be the brain of the country must come before.

The student said they knon the brain of the country must come before but why the boss of the university don’t find the better way for solving this problem like, adding the bed per room or waiting for making the new dorm finished and after that the boss will increase the number of students.

This argument will continue considering that the university should increase the number of student per room or not.

In my view, the university should prepare everything before increasing the number of students.

If they don’t prepare, It will full of the problem like this situation.
This essay obviously includes many unidiomatic wordings, and a significant proportion of the logico-semantic relations are “attempted” but not “achieved” - i.e. they are unidiomatically worded. But, unlike the case with the previous essay, there are no obvious points in the essay where the writing can be seen as stilted or lacking cohesion on account of an obviously “missing” logico-semantic connection. The essay is much richer in terms of these relations, and as result is logically more complicated and hence more fluent, at least in this aspect.

An analysis such as this, involving comparisons of just two texts, cannot of course provide grounds for very generalised conclusions. Nevertheless we do have support here for the proposition that a trend towards more frequent use of logico-semantic relations is likely to also involve positive developments in a writer’s academic literacy, in what they are able to do more communicatively in these areas. Accordingly, there is support here for the proposition that the increased deployment of logico-semantic relations observed across the work of all three students is a pointer to an improvement in their writing, in at least this one aspect. Of course, the second essay just analysed (essay 3 by student LGS1) would have been even more effective if all the logico-semantic relations had been idiomatically realised – i.e. if more had not only “attempted” but “achieved” the construal of these logico-semantic relations. This issue will be taken up in more detail in a later section.

**Trends in the use of hypotactic relations**

Another clear trend across the essays of the three students could be observed when attention was focussed more narrowly upon just hypotactic relations involving clauses. This time rates of both “attempted” relations and “achieved” were included in the analysis. That is, the total number of instances of inter-clausal hypotactic relations was determined per text, with this number then being divided by the total number of clause complexes/sentences in that text, to give an average frequency of these relations per clause. Thus, by way of illustration, if a text had 20 sentences, and 10 instances of inter-clausal hypotactic relations were identified, then a rate of 0.50 would be returned (10 divided by 20) – indicating that, on average, one hypotactic relation occurred every two sentences. Similarly if a text had 20 sentences and 20 instances of hypotactic relations, then a rate of 1.00 would be returned, indicating an average frequency of one relation per clause complex/sentence. The relevant statistical findings for rates of use of hypotactic relations are provided in the following table.

**Table 5 Rates of hypotactic relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>student HGS1</th>
<th>student MGS1</th>
<th>student LGS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>essay 1</td>
<td>essay 2</td>
<td>essay 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average rate of attempted hypotactic</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connections per clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average rate of achieved hypotactic</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations per clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These figures reveal that the rate of occurrence of “attempted” hypotactic relations increased substantially from essay 1 to essay 2 in the writing of all three students. Thus for example, the rate for students HGS1 and MGS1 increase by approximately 50 percent (for example from 0.40 to 0.63 for student HGS1), while the rate for student LGS1 almost doubled (from .55 to 1.04). This meant, of course, that student LGS1 went from a frequency of, on average, one relation every two sentences to one relation every sentence. In the case of students HGS1 and LGS1, the average frequency continued to increase at a similar rate from essay 2 to essay 3. The only departure from this pattern was student MGS1, for whom the rate declined slightly between essay 2 and 3, from 0.61 to 0.56.

The significance of these findings is similar to those discussed in the previous section – they essentially provided a more fine grained view of the issues discussed there. They show the writers making increasingly greater use of the resources by which logico-semantic relations are construed and hence making their texts, in a way, “more meaningful”, at least from the perspective of this particular type of meaning. Thus they are strongly suggestive that the students’ writing has advanced over the duration of the course.

Further insights are provided when attention is turned to the second aspect of this analysis, the findings with respect to “achieved” instances of these hypotactic relations. As outlined previously, this category of “achieved” relates to instances where those wordings involved in realising a particular relation are seen as “idiomatic”, as essentially “standard” or grammatically “correct”. Thus the count for “attempted” instances includes all instances, whether idiomatically or unidiometrically worded, while he count for “achieved” instances includes only those instances which employed idiomatic or “grammatically correct” wordings, For all students, rates for “achieved” instances are lower than for “attempted” instances, indicating that all have some instances where the wordings by which these hypotactic relations are realised are not idiomatic. With respect to patterns of rate of use of these resources across the three essays, essentially the same pattern of development can be observed, with all students substantially increasing the average frequency from essay 1 to essay 2, and with students HGS1 and LGS1 continuing to increase the rate from essays 2 to 3.

It is also noteworthy that the findings reveal a decrease in the disparity between “attempted” instances and “achieved” instances across the three essays. Thus for example, in essay 1 the figures for student HGS1 are an average frequency of 0.40 for “attempted” instances and 0.27 for “achieved”. In terms of actual numbers this involved seven “attempts” and five “achieved” instances. In contrast, in essay 3, the figures from this student were 0.93 for “attempts” and 0.89 for “achieved” instances, which reflected an actual count of 25 instances of “attempts” and 24 instances of “achieved” relations.

In order to demonstrate what is actually entailed here communicatively, instances of these hypotactic relations from these two essays by student HGS1 are presented and discussed in the following section. Instances of sentences with inter-clausal hypotactic relations from essay 1 are presented first, and then instances from essay 3. Sentences which did not include any hypotactic relations have been removed. Instances are marked in bold typeface where the wordings realising the relation are unidiomatic, and the specific words at issue are underlined. Hypotactic boundaries are indicated by “|”, paratactic by “||” and embedded clauses by “[[…]]” or “[...]”.
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Table 6 Instances of inter-clausal hypotaxis in essay 1 by student HGS1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I both agree and disagree that [[studying abroad]] has much more advantages for students than [[studying in the country]].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Thai students then need to adjust their way of studying that might take a big while (a couple of months to six months or to a year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It is better if Thai students take one – year English preparation class abroad before going to study full English education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>In order to studying abroad and to have the best English improvement, they might take one – year English preparation class abroad before going to study full English education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>If you dedicate yourself, truly put your mind and do what you have to or should, you can be and have as much advantages [as you want].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We notice here that the student idiomatically construes hypotactic projection in sentence 1, idiomatically construes two instances of hypotactic enhancement (condition and time) in sentence 3, and one instance of hypotactic enhancement in sentence 5. In sentence 2, the one instance of hypotactic elaboration is unidiomatic in that the relative pronoun “which” would have been required, rather than the “that” which was employed. Thus the relation would have been idiomatically construed had the student written,

Thai students then need to adjust their way of studying, which might take a big while (a couple of months to six months or to a year).

The instance in sentence 4 was categorized as unidiomatic on account of the student’s unidiomatic use of the present tense participle (“studying”) instead of the non-finite form (“to study”). This was because such tense choices are intimately involved with the realization of the relation of purpose in such non-finite subordinate clauses. To realize the relation of purpose inter-clausally, it is always necessary to employ the non-finite form, rather than any other.

When attention is turned to this student’s essay 3, we observe the student making frequent use of hypotactic relations across a more extended text, with only the one marginally unidiomatic instance,
The matter of this essay is [[that the university dormitory unit of Kasetsart university, Kamphaeng Saen campus has put forward a plan to the university administration ]] | which would involve an increase in the number of students [living in each dormitory room] from three to four and from five to six or seven per room.

2. Those [who support the idea] say | that the increase in the number of students in each room is necessary | because there are on funds available to construct new buildings | | and this is the only way [[to help students [[who cannot afford to live in private dormitory or apartment. ]]]

3. However, students are apposed to the plan, | arguing | that increasing the number of students per room will result in a number of problems, including an increase in noise and a loss of privacy and higher cost of payment.

4. First, the plan’s supporters claim | that the increase in the number of students in each room is necessary | because the number of students coming to the university is increasing each year, | | but there are no funds available to construct new buildings | to accommodate the larger student intake.

5. This, the opposers argue | that it is the university’s responsibility [to get more fund from other sources] | | or the university can raise the administration fees a bit more.

6. Some of the opposers even ask and wonder | what has the university done with the administration fees, the additional university’s maintenance fees, and of course the dormitory fees [that the students pay each semester.]

7. Next, supporters say | that it is a better idea [[to help students [who cannot afford more] to live outside the university]], | | that is, the students do not have to pay more comparing to [[living in private dormitories and apartments]]

8. Although it is true, | the students opposed | that it will a little bit higher cost | if they share room with friends.

9. They think | it worths [[to pay a little bit more money]] | instead of living in a tiny room

10. they can hardly find space | to do anything;

11. they feel like | they don’t have enough air | to breath;

12. they hardly find the way to walk | without hitting things | or crashing each other;

13. And for those [who do not want to sleep on the floor | | and still have all the room’s accommodations,] they feel like | they pay a higher cost | because there is, at least, one more person [to share everything with].

14. After a deep consideration and weighing up the pros and cons on the issue, it seems to me | that the argument in favor of [opposing the plan] far outweigh the positives.

15. My suggestion for this controversial subject is [[that the university should not admit number of students more than [the university dormitory units can provide] ]] | unless the new buildings have already been constructed.

16. The university should not put the problems onto students and their parents’ responsibilities | while the university still collects the payment from them.

The expression in sentence 8 (“Although it is true, | the students opposed | that it will a little bit higher cost…””) is clearly anomalous as a result of the student choosing the lexical item “opposed” rather than a more appropriate term such as “argued” (“Although it is true, | the students argued | that it will a little bit higher cost…””). The structure “the students opposed
that it will a little bit higher cost” was still classified as involving an instance of “achieved” hypotactic projection, since this “error” was a matter of lexical choice, not of wordings by which one verbal process clause projects another.

In sentence 13, the structure “they feel like | they pay a higher cost” was classified as an unidiomatic realisation of hypotactic projection (and hence an “attempted” but not an “achieved” instance) on account of the student’s choice of tense – “pay” versus “are paying”. This was, in fact, a rather marginal case, in that choice of tense here is arguably not immediately connected with the realisation of this relationship in that the frame “feel like” does allow for a relatively wide range of tense choices in the projected clause, according to context. Thus, in context, all the following would be possible, “The feel like they pay too much for petrol.”, “They feel like they are paying too much in rent.” and “They feel like they have been paying too much in rent.” Accordingly, this might well have been classified as both having “attempted” and “achieved” the relation of hypotactic projection. This student, therefore, can be seen has achieving almost 100 percent accuracy in her realisation of inter-clausal hypotactic (even while there are obviously still anomalies in other parts of her expression) by her final essay. For this student, then an increase in the rate of “achieved” hypotactic relations across her three essays can unproblematically be interpreted as pointing to a clear improvement in her academic literacy. She not only makes increased use of this resource but does so in an increasingly idiomatic way.

While this last analysis has focussed only on the work of one student, it is nevertheless supportive of the conclusion that the trend identified in the three students work towards increasingly idiomatic deployment of hypotactic relations can be interpreted as evidence of a positive development in their writing.

Trends in the use of the relation of projection

We turn now to a consideration of those analyses which attended to any trends in the students’ deployment of the different sub types of lexico-grammatical relations, rather than to the broader categories of hypotaxis and parataxis. We will begin by reporting findings with respect to the students’ use of projection and then turn to considering some key sub types of expansion.

The findings for average rates of projection per sentence in the students’ three essays are provided in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th>essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student HGS1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student MGS1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student LGS1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear trend towards increased use of projection, both in terms of absolute number and in terms of average rate of occurrence per clause, can be observed when the students’ first essays are compared with their later writing. Thus student HGS1 steadily increased her rate of use from 0.07 in essay 1, to 0.26 in essay two, and finally to a rate of 0.48 (almost one instance per every two sentences, on average) in essay 3. For the other students the trend, while still towards increased use, is not quite so straightforward. Student MGS1 increased the rate to almost 0.25 in essay 2 (approximately one instance for every four sentences, on average) but
falls back slightly from that in essay 3 (0.22). Student LGS1 increased her rate from approximately one instance for every four sentences (0.27) in essay 1 to approximately one instance for every two sentences (0.54) in essay 2, and only increases this slightly in essay 3 (0.59). It is noteworthy in this regard that student MGS1’s essay 3 is much longer than the other essays with which it is being compared, being 54 sentences in length compared with the 27 sentences for student HGS1’s essay 3 and the 22 sentences for student LGS1’s essay 3.

Obviously an increased frequency in the use of projection cannot be interpreted as necessarily, or of itself, indicating an improvement in the students’ writing. It needs to be demonstrated that the increased usage is appropriate to the type of text, and does enable the writer to more readily achieve the communicative effects typically required of this type of writing. Overall, a close analysis of the texts does support the conclusion that this increased use of projection can be interpreted as a positive outcome.

Firstly, a close analysis reveals that the increase is partly due to the writers coming to use projection to reference the words and views of others – i.e. to introduce other voices into their texts. Some examples of this are provided from the students’ 2nd and 3rd essays (for the examples of full analysis see entries under the “pr” column in the textual analyses supplied in Appendix A and statistical analysis in Appendix B).

**Student 1 (HGS1)**

**Essay 2**

The study has shown | that these people are riskier [to have lung cancers than smokers.]
The study and news have shown | that people spend lots of money on these two evils.

**Essay 3**

Those [who support the idea] say | that the increase in the number of students in each room is necessary
However, students are opposed to the plan, | arguing | that increasing the number of students per room will result in a number of problem
First, the plan’s supporters claim | that the increase in the number of students in each room is necessary
This, the opposers argue | that it is the university’s responsibility [to get more fund from other sources]

**Student 1 (MGS1)**

**Essay 2**

As we know, | in this 4 months, we heard about the news [that the government has proposed introducing laws | to limit the advertising of cigarettes and alcohol in the mass media.]

**Essay 3**

They claimed | that, it was too much people in the room | and it would cause many problems
they said | that the amount of the student [that came to the university] were increase
The students [who lived in the university dormitory] said | that first, if there were too many people in the room | it would cause too many problems also.

**Student 1 (LGS1)**

**Essay 2**

The second, I ever heard | the government said | “The quality of education have to investment”.

**Essay 3**
They say it can make the close relationship between the new friends and the new friends or between the freshmen and the senior. They said the university unit should find the new idea for solving this problem. The university unit said that we give a chance for the poor students, because university has the quota for the children of famer. The students don’t like this idea arguing that it’s too much people for living in a small room. The university unit argue that almost the university of public must do like this not only in Khamphang Saen Campus but also every university in Thailand.

We believe it can be unproblematically proposed that this type of intertextual reference is a typical feature of academic writing and hence appropriate, since a key feature of academic writing is the referencing of the words and views of other external sources. Accordingly the above trend can relatively easily be interpreted as pointing to a positive development in the students’ writing as they apparently become better equipped, or more readily disposed, to including these kinds of references to external voices, via projection, in their texts. This picture, however, is somewhat complicated by the fact that some proportion of the projection in all the students’ essays involved the projecting of, not the views of external sources, but the views of the writer’s themselves. Many of these instances involved the formulation “I think…” For example,

**HGS1**

*Essay 2*

According to these reasons, I think that such constraints should be placed on the operation of advertisers and the mass media.”

**MGS2**

*Essay 2*

First point, I think advertising make people interested in the products.

**LGS1**

*Essay 2*

Another reason, I think, if the university turns into the autonomy, it might because of the investment in the university.

Within Systemic Functional Linguistics such formulations are typically treated as “interpersonal metaphors” which are akin to modals of probability such as “perhaps” and “may/might” (see Halliday & Matthiessen 2004, p.626). According to Martin and White (2005: chapter 3), such formulations act to explicitly ground propositions in the writer’s own subjectivity thereby indicating that the position being advanced is but one of a range of possible viewpoints, thus opening up what they describe as “dialogic space” to alternative voices and viewpoints. This kind of dialogic expansiveness is a common feature of academic writing, as writers demonstrate a scholarship which is aware of alternative positions and shows itself ready to engage with these. (For fuller discussion of this issue see, for example, Ravelli & Ellis (2004, pp.26). In general terms, then, the fact that there is a trend towards the students doing more of this “dialogic expansion” can be seen as evidence of a positive development in the students’ writing – they are more closely matching academic conventions of intertextuality.

There is only one possible qualification required here, following from the fact that the students typically use the formulation “I think” for this purpose. In some contexts this specific
formulation would be seen as contrary to the conventions of academic writing, as perhaps too “conversational” or too “informal”. Accordingly alternatives such as “it can be argued” or “the evidence suggests” or even “in my view” would be seen as more “conventional” and hence “appropriate”. For those holding such a view, this increase in the use of “I think” could possibly be seen as, at least partly, a negative development. We do not hold to this view, seeing this use of “I think” as a positive in that it involves the writers become more “dialogically expansive” in the ways in which they mount their arguments.

**Trends in the use of relations of causality – internal and external**

We turn now to considering the analysis of the students’ deployment of one of the sub types of expansion, specifically that by which relations of cause-and-effect or causality are construed. We will firstly deal with external causality, where the cause-and-effect is presented as operating in the “real world”, before then turning to internal causality, where the cause-and effect is a matter of text internal, “rhetorical” relations by which one clause is seen to motivate or justify another persuasively. It should be noted that, as discussed previously, the analysis attended to this relationship both when it held between clauses within a single sentence, and when it held between adjacent sentences (i.e. with a following sentence supplying a consequence or a cause of the preceding sentence).

**Trends in the deployment of external consequentiality**

A trend was identified in which the frequency of use of these relations increased in the essays of two of the students – HGS1 and MGS1 – with both of these students deploying some of these meanings in their later essays after initially employing none in essay 1. One of the students – MGS1 – demonstrated greatly stability in her use of this resource. This student used this resource in her first essay, and continued to do so at essentially the same frequency across her three essays. The relevant statistical summaries are provided in the following tables.

**Table 9** Student HGS1 – deployment of external consequentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th>essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“attempted”</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>1 0.05</td>
<td>3 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“achieved”</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>1 0.05</td>
<td>3 0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10** Student MGS1 – deployment of external consequentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th>essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“attempted”</td>
<td>2 0.13</td>
<td>3 0.09</td>
<td>5 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“achieved”</td>
<td>2 0.13</td>
<td>3 0.09</td>
<td>5 0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11** Student LGS1 – deployment of external consequentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th>essay 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“attempted”</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>4 0.14</td>
<td>3 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“achieved”</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>4 0.14</td>
<td>3 0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We note, in passing, that the similarity between the figures relating to “attempted” instances and “achieved” instances indicates that this was a relation which the students were able to realize idiomatically, once they began to deploy it. Examples of the meanings and formulations at issue are as follows:

**HGS1**
*Essay 2*
This is [(because they fully inhale the smoke)]

*Essay 3*
This is mostly [(because the student’s home is too far away from the university)]. One person will not have any accommodations in the room – a desk, a cloth closet, a bed, so he will have to sleep on the floor. They feel like they pay a higher cost because there is, at least, one more person to share everything with.

**MGS1**
*Essay 2*
First point, I think advertising make people interested in the products. So, if there isn’t advertising people will smoke and drink alcohol less than before. But people who smoke or drink, they still do the same. So, the producer of the product can still sell their products.

*Essay 3*
Nowadays, many students came to study at the university which were far away from their homes. Therefore, they had to rent the house, pay for their apartments, or buy the condominiums in order to stay as their home. The problems came to the student because in next semester there was the increasing of the student in the campus.

**LGS1**
*Essay 2*
Thus, this means the poor students cannot be able to attend in public university because the cost of education is higher. Moreover, If I don’t have money or I am a poor student that means I must become the “illiterate” because I don’t have the money for pay the tuition fee.

*Essay 3*
Currently, the University Unit of Kasetsart university, Khamphaeng Saen campus had paid forward a plan to the university administration which involve an increase the number of students in each room because the number of students coming to the university is increasing each year. The university unit said that “we give a chance for the poor students, because university has the quota for the children of famer.

The logico-semantic relation of external causality can, we believe, be unproblematically seen as central to virtually all academic writing. So much of academic discussion is concerned with identifying causes or effects or make argumentative claims about causes and effects (for an extended discussion see, for example, Coffin, 2006). The fact that the two students who made
no use of this resource in the first essay came to use this is later essays is therefore relatively unproblematic evidence of a positive development in terms of their academic writing. They have clearly enhanced their meaning making potential in this regard in their later essays.

**Trends in the deployment of internal causality**

As outlined previously, internal causality involves ‘rhetorical’ relations of evidence and justification, where one proposition is presented as motivating or justifying another – for example, “The government has failed the people because it didn’t keep interest rates down.” Here there is no “real world” causality between “interest rates rising” and the proposition that the government has failed the people. Rather it is an internal, rhetorical relation. The speaker justifies making the claim that the government has failed the people on the basis that interest rates haven’t been kept down. This kind of relationship is obviously crucial in academic contexts. With regard to this feature, we can observe a trend in which two of the student writers go from making no use of this meaning making resource in their initial essay to employing it a number of times in their later essays. These are students HGS1 and LGS1, and statistics for their use of internal consequentiality are provided in the following two tables.

**Table 12** Student HGS1 – deployment of internal consequentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13** Student LGS1 – deployment of internal consequentiality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of these students’ use of their resources are as follows.

[HGS1] Those [who support the idea] say | that the increase in the number of students in each room is necessary | because there are no funds available to construct new buildings | and this is the only way [[to help students [[who cannot afford to live in private dormitory or apartment.]]]]

[LGS1] Moreover, If I don’t have money | or I am a poor student | that means | I must become the “illiterate” | because I don’t have the money | for pay the tuition fee.

This trend is somewhat complicated by the findings for student MGS1, who uses the resources at a largely stable rate throughout her three essay. She does, however, show an increase in the rate by which she realizes the relation idiomatically (i.e. in the rate of her “achieved” instances). The statistical findings for this student are presented in the following table.
While the actual numbers of instances are quite small across the essays of all students, and while the analysis only considers the work of three students, it is nevertheless supportive of the conclusion that there is a trend for students to enhance their ability to make use of such meanings as the course unfolds.

Trends in the deployment of relations of counter-expectation (adversatives)

A very similar trend can be observed in the three students’ use of the resources of counter-expectation (adversatives). These are meanings by which the writer acknowledges certain expectations as likely to have arisen in the reader, but then indicates that they have failed or not been satisfied. They are typically associated with connectives such as “however”, “nevertheless”, “although”, “yet” and some instances of “but”.

The trend is again one in which students HGS1 and LGS1 begin by making no use of these meanings in their pre-test essay, and then employ them at greater rates in their essays 2 and 3. Their statistics are provided below.

Table 15 Student HGS1 – deployment of relations of counter-expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>essay 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“attempted”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“achieved”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Student LGS1 – deployment of relations of counter-expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>essay 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“attempted”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“achieved”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples from their essays are as follows.

[HGS2] Those [who support the idea] say | that the increase in the number of students in each room is necessary | because there are on funds available to construct new buildings | | and this is the only way [[to help students [[who cannot afford to live in private dormitory or apartment.]]]

However, students are opposed to the plan, | arguing | that increasing the number of students per room will result in a number of problems, including an increase in noise and a loss of privacy and higher cost of payment.

[LGS1] In the room has 3 beds | | but it has 4 people, | that means | it will have one person sleep on the floor | | or two people must sleep in one bed.

Again student MGS1 slightly deviates from this pattern, although this time she lines up with the other two in displaying an increase in the rate of her use across here three essays.
Table 17 Student MGS1 – deployment of relations of counter-expectation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>essay 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>essay 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>essay 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“attempted”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“achieved”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was the case with the trends relating to consequential relations, there is some support here for the conclusion that this is evidence that the students’ writing has been enhanced over the duration of the course. They showed themselves more ready to employ this rhetorically crucial resource as the course unfolds.

Potential counter indicators

It must be stressed that such trends could not be observed in all the logico-semantic relations which were included in the analysis. We have, in fact, singled out for attention those which revealed the clearest trends with respect to what can be interpreted as a positive development in the students’ writing. In some cases no such trend was apparent because there was too much variation in the findings for the different students. In other cases the trend was one of stability – i.e. the students’ rate of use remained largely stable across the three essays.

Conclusion and recommendations

In conclusion, this paper has demonstrated what can be interpreted as positive developments in the writing of the three students by which they extend their communicative range and by which their writing becomes more fluent and more nuanced. They make their writing less disjointed by employing fewer simple sentences, and they increase the frequency with which they construe logical relations generally and with which they deploy the relations of projection, causality and counter-expectation. Under these developments, they made their texts more “heteroglossic” (see, for example Martin and White (2005) for this notion), and enhanced the complexity of the portrayal their texts provides of “real world” experience.

The research does, therefore, seem to have identified positive outcomes in the writing of at least these three students. As indicated previously, it is not possible to say definitively that these outcomes flow directly from the teaching and learning experiences provided by the course, although the fact that the same trend could be observed across the three students lends plausibility to a claim that the course was in some way influential. Of course, for a more definitive conclusion, the essays of a greater number of students would need to be included in the analysis. If the same trends were to be observed across a substantial majority of the class, then such claims could be made with more confidence.
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Appendix A  Text sample analysis of Student 1 (MGS1): Pre-test text

| Row 1 | I | I | X | X | I | I | X | X | I | I | X | X | I | I | X | X | I | I | X | X |
| Row 2 | T | V | T | V | T | V | T | V | T | V | T | V | T | V | T | V | T | V | T | V |
| Row 3 | h | h | p | p | eN | eN | eQ | eQ | pr | ad | ad | ad | t | t | t | t | c | c | c | c | pu | pu | co | co | co | co | av | av | av | av |

1. For me, I agree with the government that should censor inappropriate websites to solve the problems concerned for three reasons.

2. The first reason is that there are very inappropriate websites are in the advertisement form which is a part of every type of websites such as educations, sports, movies, songs, news and so on.]

3. This can make children easily enters to these websites.

4. If we can censor the inappropriate websites I think

---

1
we will not have the problems.

5. **Because** they can’t read and see anything [that may motivate in the a bad way]

6. **Second**, parents don’t keep an eye on their children every time.

7. Sometimes they can see them [[play the Internet]], but when parents go to work || **or** have something [that must go out to do it],

8. during the time children may click the inappropriate one.

9. This is a problem of parents || **and** may be the most important for every family.

10. **With this reason**, we should agree with the government.

11. **Lastly**, on the
internet has many games [to serve children’s entertainment.]

12. And it has both good and bad one.

13. Some games make children abuse,

14. they play all the time | | and some days the parents can’t see their parents | because they are in the room all day.

15. The advantages of censoring the inappropriate websites have a lot of ways.

16. We should support and do it for ourselves.

|    | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
## Appendix B: Comparison of 9 essays of three students (HGS1, MGS1, LGS1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>HGS1</th>
<th>MGS1</th>
<th>LGS1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># rate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% simple sentences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% clauses with attempted para or hypotaxis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of attempted hypo per clause</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of achieved hypo per clause</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of attempted para per clause</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of achieved para per clause</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of attempted n-group embeds</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of achieved n-group embeds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of attempted Qualifier embeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate of achieved Qualifier embeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate = 

\[
\text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Attempted}}{\text{Achieved}} \times 100
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. rate projection</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.07</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0.26</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>0.48</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.063</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>0.24</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>0.22</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0.27</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>0.54</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>0.59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. rate attempted internal Additive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. rate achieved internal Additive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. rate attempted external Additive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. rate achieved external Additive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. rate attempted internal Temporal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. rate achieved internal Temporal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. rate attempted external Temporal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. rate achieved external Temporal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. rate attempted internal causative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. rate achieved internal causative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. rate attempted external causative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. rate achieved external causative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. rate attempted purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. rate achieved purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27. rate attempted | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.03 | 3 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00
| 28. rate achieved | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00
| 29. rate attempted | 2 | 0.13 | 1 | 0.05 | 1 | 0.04 | 1 | 0.063 | 3 | 0.09 | 4 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 0.21 | 4 | 0.18
| 30. rate achieved | 2 | 0.13 | 1 | 0.05 | 1 | 0.04 | 1 | 0.063 | 3 | 0.09 | 4 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 0.21 | 4 | 0.18
| 31. rate attempted | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 0.11 | 5 | 0.19 | 1 | 0.063 | 5 | 0.15 | 4 | 0.07 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.04 | 4 | 0.18
| 32. rate achieved | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 0.11 | 5 | 0.19 | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 0.15 | 1 | 0.02 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 0.14