

Constructing Social Reality Through Text Analysis: A Case Study of SUT Students, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand

Dhirawit Pinyonattagarn, Ph.D.
School of English
Suranaree University of Technology
Nakhon Ratchasima 30000, Thailand
dhirawit@ccs.sut.ac.th

Abstract

The present study is a case study of a group of Thai EFL and EAP learners of English V Academic Writing Course. It aims primarily to describe the cultural and situational influences on academic writing by SUT students of English V course under the systemic-functional approach as developed by Halliday (1973,1976,1985) and other functionalists who follow him and suggest how discourse-linguistic analysis can improve students' writing skills, course materials, and classroom interactions. The main focus in this paper is upon those aspects of text analysis that relate to the ideational function of language and to ideational meanings-to 'constructing social reality'. The emphasis is, therefore, upon the role of discourse in signification and reference, where the former comprises the role of discourse in constituting, reproducing, challenging and restructuring systems of knowledge and belief. The two main discourse samples are from the students' selected paragraphs written in the final examination of the academic year 2000. The particular analytical topics covered are: vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure.

1. Introduction

Concerning English writing courses, van Peer (1997: 192) mentioned, "Present-day teaching of writing poses problems. The difficulties involve teachers and students alike; they affect adult illiterates and semi-illiterates as well as youngsters. The problems for society that are thus produced are of an order of magnitude that renders them difficult to be ignored. Also, if general impressions do not mislead us, these problems seem to be increasing rather than diminishing, both in scope and in depth. They also bear on a variety of writing skills: on spelling and on

syntactic well-formedness, but also on compositional and argumentative matters on formulation and style."

Most of these problems may be observed outside school walls, but they are very often discussed and interpreted with reference to the school. Mostly all complaints over poor writing skills are translated into accusations directed at the educational system and its personnel, or into recommendations to improve educational practice or the preparation of teachers. Such ideas may look naïve, but they show us the fundamental anchorage of all writing. In other words, it is in the institutional practice of the school that all our concepts and expectations, our habits and repertoires are formed.

Research in this area has no doubt widened and broadened our knowledge of institutional matters. However, factors such as the home environment of the student, the student's motivation and general and social background, the influence of peer groups or of youth subcultures, or even the student's personal learning style are normally left unexplained by the instructional approach. This study believes **"people do not write in a social vacuum, nor do they learn to do so."** (op cit: p. 193)

At Suranaree University of Technology (SUT), the first autonomous state university of Thailand, founded in 1990 in the northeast Thailand, all students of engineering and science are required to earn 15 credits of English (5 courses, 3 credits each), more than those required by other technological universities in the country. **"SUT's English V demands that students write an academic paper following specific organizational and format rules. It prepares students to look objectively at a topic of their own selection, search for outside support in the form of published data or cited statistics, and compile the whole into a coherent argument, following a very basic version of what is known as a 'theme': 5-6 paragraphs, with a stated point of view in the introduction, 3-4 distinct supporting paragraphs, and a conclusion"** (Owens, 1998: 51-52). Nevertheless, SUT students are struggling with all the English courses: they either fail or pass the course with shockingly low grades, especially when it comes to academic written English or English V which all students must write an argumentative essay of 1,500 words in length. The main reasons for this failure are our students' lack of proficiency in English grammar and vocabulary and a much shorter time to

complete a course than all other universities in the country, about 12 weeks, or a mere thirty-six hours of classroom instruction.

1.1. Discourse Analysis

The major focus of data analysis in this study is on "**Discourse Analysis**". The label 'discourse analysis' has been applied in very different ways in the social sciences, and before attempting to explicate discourse analysis as a method it is important to be clear what we mean by it. There are at least four types of work that have been described in this way. The first is influenced by speech act theory and directed at a systematic account of the organization of conversational exchange in settings such as classrooms (e.g. Coulthard and Montgomery, 1981). The second is much more psychologically orientated, focussing on so-called discourse process; for example, the effect of discourse structure on recall and understanding (e.g. van Dijk and Kintch, 1983). The third type of discourse analysis developed within the sociology of scientific knowledge, partly as a response to methodological difficulties with other ways of studying science (e.g. Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984). It was concerned less with the traditional sociological question of how 'social factor' influence acts such as theory choice than with exploring how scientists construct their talks and texts to display their acts as rational and warrantable in any particular setting. The fourth and final approach comes from a very different tradition of continental social philosophy and cultural analysis. While most proponents worked with the titles of semiology or post-structuralism, Foucault (1971) is notable for characterising his '**archeology**' of madness and medicine as discourse analysis. Appropriations of this work in psychology, sociology and cultural studies (e.g. Coward 1984) have tried to show how institutions, practices and even the individual human subject itself can be understood as produced through the workings of a set of discourses.

However, as the analytic aims are so closely tied to the general theoretical concerns in discourse analysis, it is important to give a sketch of what we see as the distinguishing features of our particular variant of discourse analysis (for more detail, see Edward and Potter, 1992, and Potter and Wetherell, 1987, for example). In this regard, **three features of discourse analysis** are particularly pertinent for its research practice. **First**, it is concerned with talk and texts as social practices; and as such it pays close attention to features which would traditionally be classed as **linguistic content**- meanings and topics- as well as attending to features of **linguistic form** such as grammar and cohesion. **Second**, discourse analysis has a triple concern with action, construction and variability (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). People perform actions of different kinds through their talk and their writing, and they accomplish the nature of these actions partly through constructing their discourse out of a range of styles, linguistic resources and rhetorical devices. One of the principal aims of discourse studies is to reveal the operation of these constructive processes. Once discourse is conceptualized in this way it becomes clear that there will be significant variation in descriptions of a phenomenon, as participants perform different kind of actions. A **third** feature of discourse analysis is its concern with the rhetorical or argumentative organization of talk and texts. Rhetorical analysis has been particularly helpful in highlighting the way discursive versions are designed to counter real or potential alternatives (Billig, 1991). In other words, it takes the focus of analysis away from questions of how a version relates to some putative reality and asks instead how a version is designed successfully to compete with an alternative.

As we can see, much of the work of discourse analysis is a craft skill, something like **bike riding** or **chicken sexing** (Potter and Wetherell, 1994), which is not easy to render or describe in an explicit or codified manner. In fact, as the analyst becomes more practised it becomes harder and harder to identify explicit procedures that

could be called 'analysis'. Five types of consideration are: using variation as a lever, reading the detail, looking for rhetorical organization, looking for accountability, cross-referencing discourse studies. In short, as Potter and Wetherell (1994: p. 63) put it, ***“the quality of analysis is dependent on how particular analytic interpretations can be warranted, and this depends on a whole range of factors: how well they account for the detail in material, how well potential alternatives can be discounted, how plausible the overall account seems, whether it meshes with other studies, and so on.”***

1.2. Principles of Discourse Analysis

While analysing the data, this study will take into account Dijk's (1997: 29 - 31) twelve principles of Discourse Analysis as follows:

1. Naturally Occurring Text and Talk: Most pervasive in the study of discourse is the virtually exclusive focus on actually or naturally occurring talk and text.
2. Contexts: Discourse should preferably be studied as a constitutive part of its local and global, social and cultural contexts.
3. Discourse as Talk: Talk is often considered as the basic or primordial form of discourse.
4. Discourse as Social Practice of Members: Both spoken and written discourse are forms of social practice in sociocultural contexts.
5. Members' Categories: It has become widespread practice not to impose preconceived notions and categories of analysts, but to respect the ways social members themselves interpret, orient to and categorize the properties of the social world and their conduct in it, including that of discourse itself.
6. Sequentiality: The accomplishment of discourse is largely linear and sequential, in the production and understanding both of talk and of text.
7. Constructivity: Besides being sequential, discourses are constructive in the sense that their constitutive units may be functionally used, understood or analyzed as elements of larger ones, thus also creating hierarchical structures.
8. Levels and Dimensions: Discourse analysts tend to theoretically decompose discourse at various layers, dimensions or levels and at the same time to mutually relate such levels.
9. Meaning and Function: Both language users and analysts are after meaning.
10. Rules: Language, communication as well as discourse are assumed to be rule-governed.
11. Strategies: Besides rules, language users also know and apply expedient mental as well as interational strategies in the effective understanding and accomplishment of discourse and the realization of their communicative or social goals.
12. Social Cognition: Less generally recognized but no less relevant is the fundamental role of cognition, that is, of mental processes and representations in the production and understanding of text and talk.

1.3.The Main Tenets of Critical Discourse Analysis

Following Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271-280), we can summarize the main tenets of Critical Discourse Analysis as follows:

1. Critical Discourse Analysis addresses social problems
2. Power relations are discursive
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture
4. Discourse does ideological work
5. Discourse is historical
6. The link between text and society is mediated.
7. Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

2. Analysis of Students' Paragraphs

Let us first take a closer look at SUT students' writing ability as shown by the final examination (Trimester 2/2000, the same topic, 2 hours), 18 December 2000, from these randomized papers of two students from Group 04.

Original Texts (containing errors, grammatical and others)

Paragraph A

The University Education System in Thailand

At present, Thailand has many university education systems. There are three types of university education systems in Thailand. Public university, private university and autonomous university. Firstly, public university is government organization. The board of education is the government officer. The administration of public university is slowly. Because, there are many procedures of administration from the government. The students enter public university by entrance. The problems of entrance examination are operated by the government. All public universities in Thailand have two entrance examinations annually. The problems of each public university are the same. Secondly, private university. The private university is non government organization. All of administrations are controlled by the administrator and board of education of each university. The board of education is not the government officer. The students enter private university by entrance examination and some case enter by quota. The problems of entrance examination are same the problems of public university entrance examination. But, most scores of entrance examination of private university are less than the scores of public

university entrance examination. Sometime(!!!) the students enter private university by quota. Each private university want to received the good student from the secondary school. The students that enter the private university from this case are not pass entrance examination. But, they must have high grade level from secondary school, which deped on the standard of each private university. Finally, autonomous university. This university manage by board of each university but it is controlled by the government. The board of education is not the government officer. It is estrablished by each university. Usually, the students enter the automatic university by quota more than the entrance examination. Such as in Suranaree University, it has quota students about 80% and 20% are entrance examination students. Autonomous university can rapidly administration because, all of administrations depen on the board of education of each university. At present, the public university are especially well-know. Because, it is a long time that it was estrablished and there are many university in Thailand.

Paragraph B

The University Education System in Thailand

The university are high education for student which have public, private and autonomous. First, public university are university of government which are students have a competitive examination if students do fix of university they receive select to enter university. Public university in Thailand have every place provincial part. Most study in public university in Thailand is 2 semester. The student must have collect credit that are complete of university that usually used time about 4 year or more year but limited about 8-10 year. Open of university is public university that the student don't have competitive examination. The student can application and select major study by themselves which are university give opportunity for students are mistake from a competitive examination. Second, private university are university of generally people which have knowledge and money. Cost of study in private university have high money more than the study in public university. Most student is mistake from a competitive examination of public university. Furthermore somewhere private university, the student don't have examination. System study have 2 semester. The student must have collect credit that are complete of university. Third, autonomous university such as Suranaree University of Technology. Autonomous university is uinersity in supervise of

government which have 2 place in Thailand. Valiluk uniersity is autonomous university. The students have a competitive examination as same as the student in other public university. Autonomous university have independent management in university or called "university of town". Suranaree University have 3 semester which is different from other university that have 2 semester. The student in suranaree university rather hard study because study system is 2 semester. The student need make adjustment. The student must have collect credit that are complete of university as same as other university. The study in university in Thailand or in the world have purpose with to buit human. Human is good person and have knowledge with development country.

2.1. The Four Sentence Requirements

We will now begin by analysing certain aspects of text cohesion and sentence structure in this sample; this will provide a way into looking at the sort of argumentation that is used, and the sort of standards of rationality it presupposes; this in turn will give some insight into the sorts of social identity that are constructed in the text. Let us first consider the way in which sentences are constructed in Paragraph A and B. Hannay and Mackenzie (1990: p. 213:) observed that "one way of clarifying the role of the sentence in the construction of texts is to formulate a number of requirements that each sentence in the text should ideally fulfill---no more than ideally, however, for the satisfaction of one requirement may thwart that of another requirement. The art, recurring in each sentence we write, is to present the new information it offers in a manner that is accessible to our imagined readers, at the same time linking it back to preceding material, yet not disguising its newness, all the while preserving grammatical unambiguity and all the other aspects of style, register, tone, rhythm, variation, and so on.

As Hannay and Mackenzie (op cit) state, "the art of sentence writing can be effectively conveyed by making certain that every sentence the student writes must fulfil the following four requirements:

1.The requirement of structure: The fundamental grammatical structure of every sentence must accord with the conventions recognized by the reader.

2.The requirement of coherence: Every sentence, as regards both content and form, must contribute to the coherence of the ambient discourse.

3.The requirement of prominence: The communicatively most important elements of every sentence must occupy a prominent place in that sentence.

4.The requirement of ease of processing: The information presented in every sentence must be presented to the reader in chunks that can be processed easily."

Based on these four requirements, we may say that Paragraph A is better than Paragraph B in the sense that it fulfils, to a great extent, the requirement of structure, and the requirement of coherence even though it does not adequately respond to the requirement of prominent and the requirement of ease of processing; whereas Paragraph B accords much less with all of these conditions, especially the requirement of prominence and the requirement of ease of processing, due to weaknesses in every areas of writing ability and skills.

2.2. Paragraph Writing and Text Grammar

In Paragraph A, we can see that this paragraph contains several sorts of errors: punctuation, spelling, word choices, verb forms, singular and plural nouns, active-passive voice, and incomplete sentences. The most serious ones have to do with the use of *because* to combine the sentence and *such as* to begin the sentence. The possible causes of errors include, among other things, limited knowledge of vocabulary, lack of understanding of punctuation, grammar, sentence formation skills, and spelling skills; and mother tongue interference. These errors can to a great extent hinder, obscure, or, in a serious case, distort the meaning of the sentences in a paragraph making it hard to understand and interpret for both native and non-native speakers. However, these errors can be avoided if the teacher explains the usage of *because* and *such as* properly. Other problems can be solved as well if the student learns more or pays more attention to word choices, spelling, and punctuation with teacher's assistance and explanations. **We can thus theorize that correct grammatical structures and sound writing mechanism are prerequisite to a meaningful and coherent writing, without which Thai students cannot produce any piece of good writing.**

Now if we look at **Paragraph B**, we can also clearly see that this paragraph is far worse than the first paragraph; it contains various kinds of errors and inaccuracies ranging from basic to intermediate and advanced points (articles, verb forms, noun forms, word choice, prepositions, comparison and contrast, spelling, capitalization, countable and uncountable nouns, sentence structures, general writing skills and general knowledge). There is also a problem of factual inaccuracies or confusion such as two or three trimesters. Moreover, there is an obvious case of mother tongue interference, here and there, in the patterning and construction of sentences and choice of words. Because of these problems, this student could not achieve even a moderate scores of ten. However, the student has tried very hard to pull out all the resources he has at hand to express his ideas and prove his points with the time limit given. But the grammatical weaknesses totally obstruct the reader's understanding of the meanings he is trying to convey in the paragraph. The pedagogical implications here are that both the teacher and the student must work hard together to get rid of these problems, that is, the teacher must effectively explain major grammatical points frequently found in student writings before or during the writing sessions, add more problem-solving writing practices, and give suitable feedback to students so that they can improve their grammar and writing skills. The teacher should also explain the possible interference of a mother tongue in student writings and ask them to avoid or beware of such a problem. **From the analysis of Paragraph B, we can further theorize that apart from grammatical structures and writing mechanism, it is also essential that students have adequate general knowledge, knowledge of the topic chosen, knowledge of existing social reality, and vocabulary to convey relevant and exact meanings in their writing without which their communication can be vague, ambiguous, misleading, or even distorted.**

As posited by Fairclough(1999: 75) "Text analysis can be organized under four main headings: '**vocabulary**', '**grammar**', '**cohesion**', and '**text structure**'. This can be thought as ascending in scale: vocabulary deals mainly with individual words, grammar deals with words combined into clauses and sentences, cohesion deals with how clauses and sentences are linked together, and text structure deals with large-scale organizational properties of texts." In other words, the main unit of grammar is the clause, or simple sentence, every clause is multifunctional, and so every

clause is a combination of ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. In looking at 'cohesion' (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Halliday, 1985, 1997), one is looking at how clauses are linked together to form larger units in texts; linkage is achieved in various ways: through using vocabulary from a common semantic field, repeating words, using near-synonyms, and so on; through a variety of referring and substituting devices, such as pronouns, definite article, demonstratives, ellipsis of repeated words, and so on); through using conjunctive words, such as 'therefore', 'however', 'and', and 'but'.

Likewise, according to Jackson (1997:247), "Texts have grammar, just as sentences have grammar. Just as the grammar of sentences serves to organise and structure the elements in sentences, so the grammar of texts organises and structures the elements of texts. The difference is that the elements of texts are themselves sentences, and the structuring principles of text grammar operate differently from those of sentence grammar. There are three areas of text grammar that we are going to consider: first of all the elements of text, then the ways in which sentences are adjusted to enable the flow of information in a text, and lastly the ways in which sentences connect in a text and make a text cohesive.

a. Elements of a text

If we consider Paragraph A and B, we see that a text is made up of sentences. Sentences have the same relationship to texts as words have to sentences: they are the basic building blocks. But when words combine, certain types of word attract other words into their orbit; for example, nouns attract adjectives and determinatives. This structuring principle does not operate in texts: there are not certain types of sentence which attract other sentences into their orbit.

b. Textual adjustment of sentence order

In the above paragraphs, we noted that generally a progression occurred from "**given**" information to "**new**" information, within a text and within a sentence. This suggests that the initial element in sentence normally represents "**given**" information, usually taken up from the preceding sentence, and the later elements in a sentence represent the "**new**" information. The grammatical terms used for elements in these positions are **theme** or **topic** for the initial position, and **rheme** or **comment** for the final position.

c. Branching

One further factor which affects the ordering of elements in a sentence is the relative position of subordinate and main clauses. Essentially, the subordinate clause may occur before the main clause, in which case the sentence is said to be "left-branching"; or the subordinate clause occurs after the main clause, when the sentence is said to be "right-branching". A third, but less common, alternative is "mid-branching", when the subordinate clause interrupts the main clause. Right-branching is considered to be the more neutral ordering, since the reader does not have to retain subsidiary information in mind before the main information is reached. However, left-branching is not uncommon and often serves both to link sentences and to create a tension in the text by making the reader wait for more significant information.

2.3. Paragraph Cohesion

According to Halliday (1999: 309), there are four ways by which cohesion is created in English: by **reference, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical organization**. Cohesion refers to the ways in which the sentences of a text are grammatically and lexically linked. A bond is formed between one sentence and another because the interpretation of a sentence either depends on or is informed by some item in a previous- usually the previous-sentence. Grammatical cohesion may be dealt with under the headings of reference, identification, ellipsis and conjunction; and lexical cohesion includes repetition and collocation. We can illustrate all of these from the following text.

Little Boy Blue, come blow your horn!
The sheep's in the meadow, the cow's in the corn.
Where is the boy that looks after the sheep?
He's under the haycock, fast asleep.
Will you go wake him? No, not I!
For if I do, he'll be sure to cry.

(Halliday, 1997: 309)

The use of **he ...him...he** refer back to 'the boy that looks after the sheep' is an instance of reference. The form **no not I** and **if I do** are examples of ellipsis; they have to be interpreted as **no I (will) not (wake him)** and **if I (wake him)**. The word *for* expresses a conjunctive relationship between 'I will not' and 'if I do he will cry'. The word **sheep** in line three reiterates **sheep** in line two;

cow relates to *sheep*, *corn* to *meadow*, and *wake* to *asleep*; these are all examples of lexical cohesion.

So, if we apply the criteria of cohesion to **Paragraph A**, we come up with the following facts:

a) Reference: 1 plural personal pronoun (**they**), 5 singular personal pronouns (**it**), 2 singular demonstratives (**this**), 30 definite article (**the**), and 4 comparatives (**same, most, less than, more than**)

b) Ellipsis: none

d) Conjunction: 12 (**at present, firstly, because, secondly, but, but, finally, usually, sometimes, at present, because**)

e) Lexical Cohesion and repetition: important words used repeatedly here and there throughout the paragraph include **public university, private university, students, entrance examination, board of education, government officers, and government.**

And applying the same criteria to **Paragraph B**, we get these facts:

a) Reference: 2 plural personal pronouns (**they and themselves**), 12 definite article (**the**)

b) Ellipsis: none

d) Conjunction: 6 (**first, second, third, furthermore, but, because**)

e) Lexical Cohesion and repetition: Like Paragraph A, Paragraph B shows repetition of these words: **public university, private university, students, entrance examination, and government.**

These facts indicate that Paragraph A has better cohesion than Paragraph B but it is still not good enough because there is no use of ellipsis or substitution devices; besides, there is too much use of definite article (the), singular personal pronoun (it) and the same words (public university, private university, board of education,

etc.) but little use of plural personal pronouns (they) even when many opportunities arise in the text; whereas Paragraph B indicates a moderate use of definite articles (the) but too little use of pronouns and conjunctions that results in a poorer cohesion than Paragraph A. However, the two paragraphs do not contain any ellipsis at all. As pointed out by Halliday, 1999, Halliday and Hasan 1997, these (cohesive) resources collectively meet the text-forming requirements. They make it possible to link items of any size, whether below or above the clause; and to link items at any distance, whether structurally related or not. In short, cohesion is a process because discourse itself is a process. Text is something that happens, in the form of talking or writing, listening or reading. When we analyse it, we analyse the product of this process; and the term 'text' is usually taken as referring to the product - especially the product in its written form, since this is most clearly perceptible as an object.

3. Conclusion

We can thus conclude that correct grammatical structures, sound writing mechanism, and adequate vocabulary are prerequisite to a meaningful and coherent writing, without which Thai students cannot produce any piece of good writing; and that apart from grammatical structures, vocabulary and writing mechanism, it is extremely essential that students have adequate knowledge of the topic chosen or existing social reality (in this case, the education system for higher education in Thailand), and vocabulary to convey relevant and exact meanings in their writing without which their communication can be vague, ambiguous, misleading, or even distorted. The analysis of cohesion indicates that Paragraph A has better cohesion than Paragraph B, but it is still not good enough because there is no use of ellipsis or substitution devices at all; besides, there is too much use of definite article (the), singular personal pronoun (it) and repetitious words (public university, private university, board of education, etc.) but little use of plural personal pronouns (they) even when many opportunities arise in the text; whereas Paragraph B indicates a moderate use of definite articles (the) but too little use of pronouns and conjunctions

that results in a poorer cohesion than Paragraph A. However, the two paragraphs do not contain any ellipsis at all. **In short here, the role of discourse in constituting, reproducing, challenging, and restructuring systems of knowledge and belief depends on the ideational function and meanings of language which further rely on the language proficiency of the writer who presumably does not write in a social vacuum.**

Bibliographies

- Brown, Gillian & Yule, George. (1983). ***Discourse Analysis***. Cambridge: CUP.
- Burton, Jill. (2000). **“Learning from Teaching Practice: A Case Study Approach.”** To appear in *Prospect: A Journal of Australian TESOL Special Issue 2000*.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. (1979). ***An Introduction to Discourse Analysis***. London: Longman.
- Eggins, Suzanne. (1999). ***An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics***. London: Pinter.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1995). ***Discourse and Social Change***. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Flowerdew, Lynne. (2000). **“Using a Genre-based Framework to Teach Organizational Structure in Academic Writing.”** In: *ETL Journal*, vol. 54/4 October 2000, pp. 369 – 353.
- Fang, Zhihui. (2000). **“Developing Written Discourse Knowledge in Whole Language and Code Emphasis Classrooms.”** *British Journal of Educational Psychology* (2000), 70, 317 – 335.
- Foucault, Michel. (1972). ***The Archeology of Knowledge & Discourse on Language***(Translated from the French by A.M. Sheridan Smith). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gerot, Linda. (1998). ***Making Sense of the Text: The Context – Text Relationships***. NSW: Gerd Stabler.
- Gerot, Linda, & Wignell, Peter. (1994). ***Making Sense of Functional Grammar***. NSW: Gerd Stabler.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). ***An Introduction to Functional Grammar***. London: Edward Arnold.
- _____ . (1989). ***Spoken and Written Language***. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). ***Cohesion in English***. London: Longman.

- _____ . (1989). **Language Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective**. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP.
- Hannay, Mike, & Mackenzie (1990). **The Writing Student: From the Architect of Sentences to the Builder of Texts**. In Walter Nash(ed.). (1990). *The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse, Written Communication Annual: An International Survey of Research and Theory, Vol. 3*. London: Sage Publications.
- Johnson, Keith & Johnson, Helen. (1990). **Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics**. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Longacre, R.E. (1979). "The Paragraph as a Grammatical Unit". In T. Givon (Ed.) *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Longrace, R. (1983). **The Grammar of Discourse**. New York: Plenum Press.
- McCarthy, Michael. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- McCarthy, Michael & Carter, Ronald. (1998). **Language as Discourse**. London: Longman.
- Nash, Walter(ed.). (1990). **The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse, Written Communication Annual: An International Survey of Research and Theory, Vol. 3**. London: Sage Publications.
- Owens, Catherine. (1998). **Blind Double Marking: Assessment to Promote Objectivity**. Suranaree Journal of Science and Technology. 5: 51-57.
- Pinyonattagarn, Dhirawit. (1998). "Writing Is Thinking: A Critical Step for Effective Writing." Suranaree Journal of Science and Technology. 5 : 101 - 104.
- _____ . (1998). "Second or Foreign Language Acquisition Theories: How Do They Fit Into Thai Contexts?" A Paper Presented at The Seminar on "Can Learner Independence Be Taught?" jointly organized by SUT, ELCA, and SUR 11 of Nakhon Ratchasima, at Suranaree University of Technology, 27 March, 1999.
- Reid, Joy M., & Lindstrom, Margaret. (1985). **The Process of Paragraph Writing**. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Rutherford, Willaim E. (1987). **Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching**. London: Longman.

- Titscher, Stefan, Meyer, Michael, Wodak, Ruth, & Vetter, Eva. (2000). **Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis**. London: Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T.A. (Ed.). (1997). **Discourse as Structure and Process, Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction**, Volume 2. London: Sage Publications.
- _____. (Ed.). (1998). **Discourse as Social Interaction, Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction**, Volume 2. London: Sage Publications.
- Wood, Nancy V. (1999). **Writing Argumentative Essays**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.