CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Rationale

Argumentation has been traditionally the domain of rhetorics and logics, rather than linguistics. Since Aristotle’s time, scholars have studied how ideas are organized in different ways to make an argument. Aristotle was the first person who realized two main constituent of an argument, a Position, and its Justification. Later on Ad Herennium (86-2BC) expanded the argumentation structure to include five parts: a proposition, a reason, a proof of the reason, an embellishment and a resume. In modern time, Toulmin (1976) put forward a model of argumentation which closely resembles the ancient one, including a claim, data, and warrant. Hatim (1990) identified two patterns of argumentation: through-argumentation and counter-argumentation. These two patterns differ in the way thesis is presented. In the former, thesis is cited to argued through; in the latter, thesis is the other side’s claim, which is cited to be opposed by writer’s claim. Linguistic study of argumentation is restricted to a small number, including that of Werlich (1976) and Biber (1988). Biber studied argumentative texts in English using corpus-linguistics methodology and discovered that they are characterized by a cluster of grammatical structures including modals, suasive verbs, conditional subordination, nominal clauses, and to-infinitives.

According to Hatch (1992), argumentation is realized differently in different languages. Although several attempts have been made, cross-cultural comparison of argumentation is still at embryonic stage (Hatim, 1990). Hatim did a research into argumentative pattern in English and Arabic. The findings reveal an interesting difference that English prefers counter-argumentation while Arabic opt for through-argumentation. Biber (1995) made a cross-linguistic study on the variation of registers (genres) and found that grammatical features characterizing argumentative texts vary to a certain extent in different languages like Arabic, Tuluvan, German and Korean. As far as I am concerned, no research paper has been done to investigate into the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese argumentation.
Editorials are a rich source of argumentation; they are pervasive everyday texts which help readers to make up their mind about the events of the world. They often discuss major aspects in society, so they are predominantly about socio-political issues. Given this prominent function, they receive much less attention that other narrative genres like news reports (Van Dijk, 1996). Therefore, to have a comprehensive view of how argumentation works in English, to what extent it resembles and differs from that in Vietnamese, the study will examine argumentation in socio-political editorials at both schematic level and linguistic level.

1.2. Aims of the study

The purpose of the study is to uncover similarities and differences in argumentation of socio-political editorials in English and Vietnamese. Specifically, the thesis was set up to identify which argumentative pattern, through-argumentative or counter-argumentative, is preferable; what and how linguistic devices are frequently used as argumentative strategies, in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials.

1.3. Research questions.

In order to achieve the aim of the study, the following research questions are addressed:

1. What argumentative pattern, through-argumentation or counter-argumentation, is commonly employed in socio-political editorials in English and Vietnamese?
2. What and how grammatical devices are frequently used for argumentation in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials?
3. What are the similarities and differences in argumentation in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials?

1.4. Scope of the study

The study focuses on argumentation at schematic and linguistic levels in socio-political editorials. More specifically, the study investigates into macro-patterns and grammatical
expressions of argumentation. The scope for investigation is narrowed to the analytical framework including at schematic level, the prototype argumentative model by Hatim (1990), and at linguistic level, grammatical features which are uncovered and categorized by Biber (1988) in the group so called ‘overt expression of persuasion’ in argumentative discourses. As labor-intensive and painstaking nature of analyzing editorial texts, just ten editorials in each language are taken as data for this study.

1.5. Methods of the study

This corpus based study employ both descriptive and qualitative methods. Firstly, the research deals with naturally occurring data and makes no attempt to manipulate it. Secondly, descriptive method is deductive, beginning with a hypothesis or a framework for investigation. Descriptive method is also quantitative. In this study, the frequencies are counted and interpreted. Qualitative methods are used to spot the emerging patterns in the uses of linguistic devices. The study is also a piece of contrastive analysis which attempts to highlight the differences between English and Vietnamese argumentative styles.

The methodological steps are as following: The study calculated the frequency of argumentative patterns and grammatical devices in the data, investigated how they were used in the texts and gave an account of difference in argumentative styles in socio-political editorials in the two languages. Frequency counts of grammatical devices were normalized to a common base of 1000 words of text, thus no matter how long a particular text is, frequency counts were comparable across texts. Data analysis was both manual and computerized by using computer software programs, namely Wordsmith 5.0 and SPSS 17.0.

1.6. Significance of the study

The study is significant in that it provides an insight into the differences and similarities in argumentation in Vietnamese and English socio-political editorials, the aspect which has received hardly any consideration so far. The research findings would greatly facilitate Vietnamese learners of English in reading and correctly understanding English argumentative texts in general, and in socio-political editorials in particular. Having the
knowledge of difference in argumentation styles between the two languages would assist Vietnamese learners of English reach more closely to the writing styles of native speakers. The findings of this study could also be a reference for linguists who are interested in cross-linguistic study of argumentation.

1.7. Organization of the study

Chapter 1 presents the rationale, the aims, the objectives, the scope and the methodology of the study. Chapter 2 provides theoretical background of the study, including concepts as genres and text types, argumentative text type and editorials, the review of the previous works already done on this topic, etc. Chapter 3 discusses the issues of methodology, including data, data collection, data processing and analytical framework. Chapter 4, the main part of the study, presents the data analysis and discusses results in preference for argumentative patterns and the use of grammatical devices for argumentation in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials. Chapter 5 is the conclusion, which briefs the major findings of the study, implications and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The paper will look into English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials, focusing on their canonical text type - argumentative text type. More specifically, the paper will study, at textual level, patterns of argumentation preferred and at sentential level, grammatical devices for persuasive purpose in these genres in each language. Therefore, this chapter will present literature on the broad concepts of genres, text types and their interrelationship. Then the study will proceed to argumentative text type, their linguistic devices, illocutionary types in editorials.

2.1. Genres and text types

2.1.1. Genres

Earlier definition of genre considers genre as "a distinctive type or category of literary composition" (Trosborg, 1997). Today genre refers to a distinctive category of discourse of any type, spoken or written, with or without literary aspirations. Genres are classification of texts based on differences in external format and situations of use, and are defined on the basis of systematic non-linguistic criteria, i.e. a text that is spoken or written by a particular person, for a particular audience, in a particular context, for a particular purpose. (Biber, 1988). Examples of genres are guidebook, nursery rhyme, poem, business letter, newspaper article, advertisement, etc. According to Bhatia (2006),

Genres are recognizable communicative events, characterized by a set of communicative purposes, identified by and mutually understood by members of professional and academic community in which they regularly occur. Genres are highly structured and conventionalized constructs (Bhatia 2006, p.23)

By recognizable communicative events, he means the context for a text to be written: for whom it is written, by whom it is written, about what it is written, how it is written, and why it is written or the specific purposes, e.g. to introduce a product, to invite to a wedding party, etc. This communicative setting constrains the use of lexico-grammatical and discourse resources. So different genres have their own structures or constructs, which are
relatively stable for a period of time. As Couture (1986, p.80) puts it, genres are ‘conventional instances of organized text’ like short stories, novels, sonnets, informational reports, proposals, and technical manuals, etc.

Another scholar, Longarce (1972, p.200) groups genres into four major categories, labeling them according to their text types, based on two sets of criteria: temporal succession and projection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal succession</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>+ projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Temporal succession</td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Temporal succession</td>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>Hortatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Longarce (1972, p.200)

Temporal succession means that the sequence of events and temporal projection means the future of the events. According to Longarce, narrative genres recount a sequence of events represented as having taken place in the past, procedural genres list a sequence of actions that must be followed in order to operate something. Expository genres describe present states of affairs and/or problems and possible solutions to the problems. Hortatory genres are to induce readers to take some future course of actions or to adopt some point of view. In 1992, Longarce introduced into his taxonomy a new genre, persuasive, which is the combination of both expository and hortatory. Examples of narrative genres are newspaper reports, TV news, etc; examples of persuasive genres are debates, political speeches, editorials, etc. (Biber, 1988; Vestergaard, 2003; Morley, 2004)

2.1.2. Text types

In order to have a thorough understanding of what text type is, we should have a look at what texts are. Texts, in functionalist or semiotic view, are a sequence of recognizable communicative purposes - to inform, to narrate, to entertain, to persuade, etc, which are, of course, different from the composer’s communicative intention (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Martin, 1992; Mann and Thomson, 1992; Longarce,1992). In addition, to qualify a text, the
linguistic sequence should be reducible to one macro-proposition, or in other words, its general meaning. (Thomson and Mann, 1992; Longarce, 1992).

Then, texts types are defined by Hatim and Mason (1990) as "a conceptual framework which enables us to classify texts in terms of communicative intentions serving an overall rhetorical purpose" (Hatim and Mason 1990, p.140). Rhetorical purpose is made up of strategies which constitute the mode of discourse - narration, description, exposition, and argumentation (Trosborg, 1997). Mode of discourse is the schematic pattern, cohesion and coherence at textual levels, and lexical and grammatical features. As Biber remarks, text types are groupings of texts that are similar with respect of their linguistic forms and with "underlying shared communicative functions". (Biber, 1989)

However, the number and the labels of text types vary according to the linguist’s orientation and preferences. For example, Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) classify texts based on their communicative function and label them descriptive, narrative, argumentative; Reiss's typology divides texts into three main types - informative, expressive and operative (instructive and argumentative). Kinneavy classifies texts into four groups, depending on whether they emphasize the writer, the reader, reference or the language. They are expressive (writer), persuasive (reader), reference (reference), and literary texts (language). Werlich (1976) includes five idealized text types or modes and looks at them from cognitive perspective. (adopted by Hatim and Mason, 1990; Albrecht, 1995):

- description: differentiation and interrelation of perceptions in space
- narration: differentiation and interrelation of perceptions in time
- exposition: comprehension of general concepts through differentiation by analysis or synthesis
- argumentation: evaluation of relations between concepts through the extraction of similarities, contrasts, and transformations
- instruction: planning of future behavior
  - with option (advertisements, manuals, recipes)
  - without option (legislation, contracts)

(Werlich, 1976)
According to Werlich, descriptive texts organize objects and situations in space order, narrative texts arrange actors and events in time order, expository texts decompose concepts into constituent elements or compose concepts from constituent elements; argumentative texts evaluate and instructive texts form future behavior of readers.

Unlike Werlich’s classification which distinguishes exposition from argumentation, Art Foster’s (2003, p. 291) considers exposition as a big concept covering explanation, argumentation and persuasion.

**A Text typology**

![Text typology diagram](Art Foster 2003, p.291)

According to this approach, exposition may simply explain or inform something. Or more often they may analyze and evaluate the subject, selecting and organizing information with the intention of convincing the readers of a particular opinion or persuade readers to adopt some particular point of view. Despite its flaws, this classification is of great importance in making the distinction between argumentation and persuasion, which are often confusing concepts. They are both aimed to get people convinced in some belief or idea; but persuasion is to induce people to act while argumentation may be not. Of course, in natural
setting, persuasion and argumentation are hardly separated- argumentation can be persuasive or not; and in order to persuade, facts and opinions can barely absent.

These classifications, different as they maybe, have one thing in common. That is, the labels of text types express their communicative functions or rhetorical purposes: whether the text is to describe, to argue, to instruct or to explain, etc. These criteria to classify texts also have direct influence on the kind of lexical/semantic, grammatical/grammatical, and rhetorical/stylistic features in use. (Hatim & Munday, 2004).

As we can see, the labeling and categorization of text types are so confusing. In the framework of this paper, argumentative and expository are two distinct types; the term ‘persuasive’ is used to describe the purpose or effect of argumentation.

### 2.1.3. Genres and text types

According to traditional concepts of genres and text types as discussed above, genres are named based on their situational contexts - for whom, by whom, about what, why. Meanwhile, text types are labeled just based on their intention or rhetorical purposes. These factors, in turn, regulate the linguistic features as well as structure of the text; so different text types are represented by different lexical or syntactic elements. As Biber (1988) puts it, genres are classified based on non-linguistic factors while texts are grouped according to their linguistic features.

A particular genre may make use of several modes of presentation or several text types. Pure narration, description, exposition and argumentation hardly occur. Text type focus or contextual focus refers to text type at the macro level, the dominant function of a text type in a text (Morris, 1946; Werlich, 1976; Virtanen, 1992). As Hatim (1990, p.190) observes, ‘texts are multifunctional, normally displaying features of more than one type, and constantly shifting from one type to another’ For example, Parret (1987, p.165) detects the overlap between argumentation and narration - whereas a televised presidential debate is predominantly argumentative, we still find clearly narrative, expository and descriptive chunks in it. On the other hand, text types, being properties of a text, often cut across genres. For instance, newspaper articles, political speeches or debates all have
argumentative text type. Editorials contain three text types, *narration, exposition and argumentation*, with argumentation as the focus type. (Biber, 1989; Hatim, 1990; Van Dijk, 1996; Schaffner, 2002; Vestergaard, 2003).

2.2. Argumentative text type

2.2.1. Definition of argumentation

Generally speaking, scholars have quite similar views on what argumentative text is. Argumentation in the context of this study is the form of discourse that attempts to persuade and influence readers through the configuration of conceptual relations, violation, value, significance and opposition in order to establish apposition or claim (Toulmin, 1958; Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981; Andrews, 1989; Rottenberg, 2000). More specifically, Beaugrande and Dressler define argumentative texts as

> those utilized to promote the acceptance or evaluation of certain beliefs or ideas as true vs. false, or positive vs. negative. Conceptual relations such as reason, significance, volition, value and opposition should be frequent. The surface texts will often show cohesive devices for emphasis and insistence, e.g. recurrence, parallelism and paraphrase... (1981, p.184).

According to Beaugrande, the dominant function of the text is to manage or steer the situation in a manner favorable to the text producer’s goals. The goal is to convince the reader that the view put forward by the author is right, all other competing opinions are wrong. Similarly, Hatim (1990) claims that argumentation is operative - influencing opinions or behavior and provoking action or reaction. Operative texts have such characteristics as *suggestivity* (manipulation of opinions by exaggeration, value-judgements, implication, etc.), *emotionality* (anxieties and fears are played on, threats and flattery are uses, the associations of words are exploited), *language manipulation* (propaganda disguised as information through linguistic devices), and *plausibility* (appeals to authorities, witnesss, ‘experts’, etc) (Hatim, 1990, p.160). Emeren (1987, p.267) also agrees that argumentation is persuading by revealing the validity of a given assertion, its value, necessity, and acceptability; and shaping reader’s behavior. He adds another characteristics of argumentation, i.e. rejection of the counter assertion:
‘…argumentation is an activity of reason, that is, the arguer puts forward an argument and gives a rational account of his or her position on the matter… Argumentation arises when there exist differing ideas around the subject matter, and the arguer wants his or her standpoint to be accepted and adopted, and all other views to be rejected…’

Emeren (1987, p. 267)

This type of text is labeled differently by different scholars. Longarce (1997) and Vestergaard prefer to use ‘persuasive’, arguing that argumentation is just the process to achieve persuasion. Others like Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) and Werlich (1976, 1982) name this text type ‘argumentative’, claiming that persuasion is just one of the purposes of argumentation. Foster (2003) distinguish between argument and persuasion, putting them into two different categories under the headline of ‘exposition’. In the present study, I will follow the term in Beaugrande and Dressler’s, and Werlich’s classification.

2.2.2. Argumentative patterns

The term *argumentative patterns* used in this study refer to the macro-structure or rhetorical structure of argumentation; or the format of argumentation. Aristotle was the first to recognize the structure of argumentation that is composed of two parts: a Position, and its Justification or Support. Ad Herennium (86-2BC) then expanded the argumentation structure model to include five parts: a proposition, a reason, a proof of the reason, an embellishment and a resume. According to Hatch (1992), argumentation structure is classically described to include introduction, explanation of the case under consideration, outline of the argument, proof, refutation, and conclusion. However, Maccoun in examining a series of articles and news reports, finds several patterns beside this classical pattern for organizing argumentative discourse in written prose. The first one is called ‘zig-zag’ pattern with the outline pro-con-pro-con-pro (if the author is a proponent of a position) or con-pro-con-pro-con (if the author is an opponent of a position). A second pattern consists of the problem, refutation of the opposition’s argument, followed by a solution. The solution, if not the problem, suggests the author’s bias. A third pattern is ‘the one-sided argument’ where one point of view is presented, and no refutation is given. A
fourth pattern is an ‘electic approach’, where the author choose to reject some points of view and accept another or some combination of them all. A fifth pattern starts with the opposition’s arguments first, followed by the author’s argument. The sixth pattern is the ‘other side questioned’ pattern which involves the questioning, but not direct refutation of the opposition’s argument. According to Werlich (1976), at macro-level, argumentation can be either deductive or inductive. The deductive type starts with the claim, arguments, evidence, then conclusion. In converse, inductive type starts with arguments, evidence then claim. Hatim and Mason (1990) put forward a model of argumentation including two macro-patterns: through-argumentation and counter-argumentation.

**Graph 3.1 Argumentative patterns in English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Through-argumentation</th>
<th>Counter-argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Thesis cited to be argued through)</td>
<td>(Thesis cited to be opposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced argument</td>
<td>Lopsided argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explicit/implicit

*Contrastive connection*  *Concessive connection*

*But, however, etc*  *Although, while, etc*

(Adapted from Hatim and Mason, 1990)

Through-argumentation is the type of argumentation in which claim made by the author is cited is to be argued through; while counter-argumentation is another type in which antagonist’s claim is cited then opposed by author’s claim. This model is adopted in this study because it is be useful in studying the difference in argumentative styles between different cultures.
2.3.3. Argumentative linguistic devices

Literature on linguistic features of argumentation is quite scarce, restricted to some major studies by Werlich (1976) and Biber (1988). Werlich (1976) studies the linguistic realization of argumentative text type and finds out several distinguishing grammatical features. They include **quality-attributing sentence type**, (e.g. *The obsession with durability in the arts is not permanent*); clause expansion types are **causal, conditional and nominal**; sentence type is **contrastive**; text structure is **deductive, inductive, and dialectical**; the tense is **present**. Hatim (1990), in differentiating argumentative text from other types, claims that argumentative text is permeated with evaluativeness, which is realized by surface linguistic features as recurrence or parallelism. However, within the framework of this study, Biber’s approach to linguistic features of argumentative text type will be investigated and adopted.

Biber, (1988, 1991) studies linguistic features of different registers based on LOB corpus of one million words, and finds that argumentative texts are characterized by linguistic clusters so called **overt linguistic expressions of persuasion** includes **infinitives, nominal clauses, suasive verbs, conditional clauses, prediction, necessity and possibility modals**. He argues that the three modal classes distinguish among different stances that authors take towards their subject. Conditional clauses, nominal clauses, and infinitives can function as part of the same overall scheme of argumentation. He takes the example in one editorial which considers various possible future events and possible arguments for and against excluding South Africa from the Commonwealth: *Will it end....? There is a possibility that it will not be settled...it may be agreed to wait...But if a final decision is to be faced...? The Archbishop...must be heard ...he holds that it would be a mistake....it would also be against the interests...more pressure can be put...than could be exercised...*The combined use of these features provides the overall structure of the argument in these texts, identifying possible alternatives and the author’s stance towards each of them.
2.3. Editorials

Editorials are a genre that may be characterized both as a special type of media discourse, as well as belonging to the large class of opinion discourses. Opinions may be expressed by language users in many types of discourse, in which (dis)agreement is expressed or persuasion enacted (Van Dijk, 1996)). Editorials function to analyze, interpret current events and persuade readers to consider different points of view or to adopt a particular standpoint (Hiebert & Gibbons, 2000). Therefore, they serve to formulate readers’ opinion about the events of the world (Van Dijk, 1996). Editorials can be institutional editorials and personal editorials. The only difference between these two types is formally, i.e. personal editorials are signed, and institutional editorials are not signed. (Biber, 2005). In theory, editorials are written by editor, but in practice, editorials are mostly written by a senior writer staff. In Vietnamese, the function of analyzing, interpreting and persuading readers is carried out in the section named Bình luận, Phân tích nhận định, Câu chuyện quốc tế. These are the places where editorial as well as personal opinions on socio-political and economical issues of the day are expressed (Hoa, 1999). As Uyen (1992) defines:

‘Nhịm vụ chính của bài bình luận là giải thích, cát nghĩa một sự kiện, một quá trình hoặc một vấn đề trong đời sống kinh tế, chính trị và đời sống văn hoá…Bài bình luận phải có sự đánh giá của Ban biên tập về các sự kiện và từ đó rút ra một số kết luận…’(1992, p.239-240).

According to Lạc & Hoà (2004, p.114-115), editorials have argumentative text type (văn bản nghị luận), which demonstrates writer’s comment. It is agreed by scholars that this genre is a configuration of explanation, interpretation, and justification in order to persuade readers (Lạc & Hoà, 2004).

2.4. Review of previous works

In English, socio-political editorials have received much less attention than narrative genres like news report. Van Dijk (1996) remarks
given this prominent function of editorials in the expression and construction of public opinion, one would expect a vast scholarly literature on them… There are virtually no book-length studies, and rather few substantial articles, on the structures, strategies and social functions of editorials.

So far, editorials have been studied mainly for their generic structure. Adrian Bolivar detects the triad structure of newspaper editorials: Situation, Development and Recommendation, resembling the two-part or three-part exchange we meet face-to-face in daily conversations. In his article, Opinion and Ideology, Van Dijk (1996) puts forward the rhetorical structure of editorials which consists of three canonical categories which defines the functions of the respective parts of the text: 1. Summary of the event, 2. Evaluation of the event especially actors and actions, 3. Pragmatic conclusion (recommendation, advice, or warning). Vestergaard (2003), in examining persuasive genres in press, makes out the macro-generic structure of newspaper editorials as problem-solution pattern which include four moves: Problem-Solution-Argumentation-Appeal. He also finds that the illocutionary acts prevalent in these genres including evaluations, proposals, causal explanations, interpretations.

Morley (2004) conducts a research on modals in persuasive journalism in the Economist and finds that modals are frequently used for persuasive effects. As for argumentative patterns, Hatim (1989a) in ‘argumentative style across cultures’, which take editorials into account, found that English displays a marked trend towards counter-argumentation. In contrast, the Arabic language shows preference for through-argumentation. Of course, through-argumentation does occur in English, and counter-argumentation in Arabic, but this is not popular. Even when counter-argumentation occurs in Arabic, it is the ‘although-’ variety that is stylistically preferred.

In Vietnamese, few studies have been made concerning socio-political editorials. Among them is Doctorate Dissertation by Nguyen Hoa (1999). His research gives insight into the generic structure of editorials in English and in Vietnamese as the constitution of three parts: Opening, Development, and Conclusion. At the same time it attempts to describe the development of the editorials in terms of relevance and name the salient linguistic features
of this genre. Nguyen Hoa found that commentation is one of the main characteristics of editorials in both languages, which are realized by such linguistic devices as modals, evaluative adjectives and first personal plural pronoun ‘we’.

In general, most of the research papers on socio-political editorials, are concerned mainly with the rhetorical structure of the genres, little has been done about the argumentation style and argumentative linguistic features systematically. In Vietnamese literature on socio-political editorials, very few attempts have been made regarding cross-linguistic comparison of socio-political editorials.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Overview of methodology

The procedure for the research will be as following:

1. The analysis of the structure of editorials in English and Vietnamese will be conducted based on the model of argumentation postulated by Hatim (1990).
2. The argumentative patterns are calculated, and the interpretation of the results is given based on pragmatics.
3. Grammatical devices put forward by Biber (1988) will be investigated in both English and Vietnamese data. Thesegrammatical devices are counted for their frequency, using computer software programs, namely Wordsmiths 5.0. To enable the comparison across texts, the frequency counts are normalized to a common basis of 1,000 words of text.
4. Results are discussed and interpreted. Functions of grammatical devices in the texts are investigated.
5. A brief account of similarities and differences in argumentative styles in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials is given.

The present chapter discusses each of these methodological steps for editorials in the two languages. The data, data collection method, data processing, and the framework for analysis used in the study are presented.

3.2. Data

With time and resource constraints, the study just can take as its data twenty editorials in socio-political field from English and Vietnamese quality papers, ten from each language, constitutes. These 500-800 word long articles, dated in 2008, are about big events currently taking place in the world like Iraq war, Beijing Olympic Games, G8 meetings, Russia-Gruzia conflicts, US presidential election, etc.
3.3. Data collection method

Data in both languages are randomly collected from quality papers with high prestige and wide circulation rates. This kind of papers will make a reliable source, representative in English and Vietnamese. For Vietnamese data, Nhan dan and Quan doi nhan dan are perfect choices. These newspapers are the official voice of Vietnamese Communist Party and Vietnamese people’s Army, which provide a major coverage of political events and their evaluation. For English data, International Herald tribune, the international edition of New York Times, and Time Magazine are chosen. International Herald Tribune (IHT) is a widely read English language international newspaper founded in 1887 and circulated in more than 180 countries in the world. Time Magazine is an English-language weekly news and international affairs publication owned by The Economist Newspaper Ltd with an average circulation of 1.3 million copies in the US as well as worldwide. These two newspapers constitute the premier source for the analysis of current affairs and world business, providing authoritative insight and opinion on the main events – business and political of the week. Second, the articles should be taken from the most recent editions of newspaper, because language changes as time changes. Articles from the same newspaper but one year apart can be markedly different in their styles. Therefore, the text corpus for this study is based on recently written articles.

3.4. Normalized frequency counts

Frequency counts of linguistic features in this study will follow Biber’s approach. Biber (1991) remarks, an analytical problem in quantitative cross-linguistic comparisons concern the need for a common basis for text counts. Therefore, in calculating statistics in this paper, all frequency counts are normalized to a basis of 1,000 words of text. For example, in a text of 800 word length, the frequency of will is 5. If we convert to a text of 1,000 words, its frequency will be 6.25. So we can say that the frequency of will is 6.25 ptws. This will enable fair comparisons across texts and across languages.

Frequency counts are done by using Wordsmiths Tool to create word lists and concordance list. Wordlists will tell us how many instances of an item appear in the text and what its percentage is, used just for the counting of modals. Concordance lists produce lists of sentences in which the item occurs so that we can examine every occurrence of grammatical devices in question in contexts. Going through concordance lists, we can look into the use pattern of such devices and exclude non-relevant cases for each item. For example, to calculate and examine the pattern of nominal clauses, we browse its
Frequency counts and scrutinious examination of grammatical devices are time-consuming and labor-intensive. So with these technological aids, the job of quantitative analysis will be much more precise and simpler, especially useful for a small or average corpus of under 50,000 words. For a larger corpus, however, autonomic tagging of grammatical items is required.

3.5. Analytical framework

The study will focus on argumentative patterns and grammatical devices, how these devices are used pragmatically.

3.5.1. Argumentative patterns

Through-argumentation is the type of argumentation in which claim made by the author is cited is to be argued through; while counter-argumentation is another type in which antagonist’s claim is cited then opposed by author’s claim. More specifically, the patterns of through-argumentation and counter-argumentation containing obligatory elements and optional elements are represented as following:

Table 3.1 Argumentative patterns in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Through-argumentation</th>
<th>Counter-argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tone-setter)</td>
<td>(Tone-setter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thesis cited to be argued through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis cited to be opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Substantiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substantiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hatim & Mason, 1990, p.158)
The two variants are different regarding whether the opponent’s viewpoint is mentioned or not. In both patterns, tone-setter is an optional part. Tone-setter is the general statement which sets the scene in a subjective manner, aiming at managing or steering the reader’s conception. (Schaffner, 2002). Tone-setter displays evaluative features such as comparison, judgment and other markers of evaluative texts (Hatim & Mason, 1990, p. 156). In other words, tone-setter is the ground for the thesis to be presented. The thesis is the sentences which state the author’s or the opponent’s specific viewpoints or assessments on the events/action/actor in question. In through-argumentation, the thesis must be immediately justified by arguments for it. As Hatim puts it, ‘through argumentation advocates or condemns a given stance and makes no direct concession to belief entertained by an adversary’ (Hatim, 1990). Unlike through-argumentation, counter-argumentation gives the opponent’s viewpoint first, which is then rebutted. Hatims (1990) remarks

Counter-argumentation involves two protagonists confronting each other, an absent protagonist, who has his or her thesis cited to be evaluated and a present protagonist, performing the function of controlling the debate and steering the reader in a particular direction (Hatim & Mason, 1990, p.136).

In counter-argumentation, the claim made by the opponent is often used as straw-man, one typical argumentative tactic in English, which gives the impression that the views of the other side are being fairly represented and the argumentation seems to be more objective. Following the claim made by the opponent, a counter claim is presented and expanded. The text then focuses to give evidence, reasons and using manipulative languages to persuade and convince the readers to the counter claim. Counter-argumentation has two subtypes: the balance pattern and lopside pattern. In the former, the text producer signals the contrastive shift between what may be viewed as a claim and a counter claim either explicitly (by using a contrastive connective) or implicitly (no connectives). The latter pattern, the relationship between a claim and counter claim is not contrastive but concessive (by using concessive conjunctions, while, although, despite, etc).
3.5.2. Argumentative linguistic devices

Grammatical features that will be investigated in my paper incorporate those proposed by Biber (1988) – prediction modals, probability modals, necessity modals, suasive verbs, conditional subordination, to-infinitives, and nominal clauses.

3.5.2.1. Modals

Modal systems in English can be realized by modal auxiliaries (can, could, may, might, etc), adjectives, adverbs and nouns. These are closed classes, i.e. they consist of fairly stable and delimited sets of form: can, could, may, might, should, ought to, need, must, have to, would, will, possible/possibly/possibility; probable/probably/probability; certainly; surely; undoubtedly; seemingly/apparently/clearly, etc. In general, modals can be divided into three groups: those that denote possibility, ability and permission; those that denote volition and/or prediction; those that denote obligation and/or necessity. (Hermeren, 1978; Quirk et al., 1985). The first group consists of can, could, may, might, possible, possibly, probably, likely, certainly, surely, undoubtedly, maybe/perhaps; the second group comprises will and would; the third group is composed of should, ought to, need, must, have to.

In terms of meaning, it is observed that all modal verbs have two kinds of meanings, intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic modality involves some kind of human control over the events, while extrinsic modality involves human judgment over what is going to happen or not (Quirk et al, 1985, p. 219-221). These two kinds of modals uses can also be coded as espitemic and deontic (intrinsic and extrinsic) (Saeed, 2003), or espitemic and root (Yule, 1998). Both deontic modals and espitemic modals signal speakers’ judgement, but while with espitemic the judgement is about the way the real world is, with deontic it is about how people should behave in the real world. Espitemic uses sound like deductions or conclusions made by the speaker from what is known already. For example, given a proposition (Suzy/be/ill), the speaker can indicate his or her assessment as in 3a, b, c.

3

a. Suzy is ill
b. Suzy must be ill
c. Suzy may be ill (Yule, 1998, p.93)
The modal verbs indicate the speaker’s assessment of whether the state of affairs is simply the case 3a, necessarily the case 3b, and possibly the case 3c. That assessment is based on the speaker’s deduction from what is known. This is called the espitemic use of modals. For espitemic modals, Halliday (1994) categorizes modals into three levels of certainty: Low, median, and high value. He also classifies the manifestation of modals into explicit and implicit. These are illustrated in the following graph:

### Table 3.2 Expressions of different degrees of certainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manifestation</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td><em>May, might, can, could</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td><em>Possibly, apparently</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td><em>We think it is possible that</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td><em>It is possible that</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Root modality is not based on the speaker’s knowledge of the facts but on the speaker’s awareness of what is socially determined (Yule, 1998). Root modals are typically used interpersonally and have to do with obligation and permission. For example, given a proposition (Suzy/leave before noon), the speaker can express this propositional content as a simple observation as in 4a. If the speaker has some socially-based power to control the action, then she or he can use modals to indicate her or his power as in 4b and 4c.

4  
   a. Suzy leaves before noon
   b. Suzy must leave before noon
   c. Suzy may leave before noon.

(Yule, 1998, p.93)

In 4, the modals indicate the speaker’s perspective on whether the event simply occurs 4a, is required to occur 4b, and is permitted to occur 4c.
i. Prediction modals

According to Biber (1999), prediction modals include *shall, will, would* and their negative form *won’t and wouldn’t*. As Biber (1988) puts it, prediction modals play the part of directing pronouncements that certain events will occur. This characteristics of prediction modals makes them a great tool for persuasion. *Would* has conceptual meaning as the combination between remoteness and possibility. It is relatively remote from the point of utterance; leading to the interpretation of distance in time or possibility from the moment of speaking. Therefore, this modal is associated with ‘not likely at all’ or hypothetical. Remote possibility combined with prediction, the event has little likelihood of happening soon. (Yule, 1998, p.184). As far as modals *shall* and *will* concern, they have the two meanings of volition (intrinsic) and prediction (extrinsic) (Quirk et al, 1985, p. 228-231). Generally speaking, these modals have core meaning of likelihood. (Yule, 1998, p.104). As for their espitemic uses, prediction modals means ‘what it is reasonable to expect’ (Palmer, 1991, p.57). Coates (1983) remarks, *will* ranks high on the scale of confidence, it means *‘I confidently predict that...’* On the scale of certainty, *will, would* have median value, lower than *must*. (Halliday, 1994). Nevertheless, as the ‘blurring’ nature of these two concepts (Biber et al,1999, p. 495), distinction between them is not made in this study.

ii. Possibility modals

Possibility modals include *can, may, might, could, (im)possible, probable, perhaps, maybe, possibly, probably, surely, certainly*. In English, modals of possibility have the functions of evidentials that mark reliability (Chafe, 1985) and hedges (Hinkel, 1997a; Hoye, 1997; Hyland, 1998.), so they can be used in argumentative discourse. According to Yule (1998), the espitemic uses of *may, might, can, could* express the meaning of possibility or potential. *Can* tends to be used when there is a desire to convey the potential for an event taking place, even the speaker is not sure of how and when the potential will be realize. E.g. *Grammar can be fun!* (Yule, 1998, p.93). With respect to the degree of certainty, modals of this type have low value compared with *will, would and must*. (Halliday, 1994). *Could, may, might,* express the doubtfulness, with the meaning of ‘I think it is perhaps possible that...’ As Yule (1998) remarks, *may* is associated with weak possibility; *might* is
further distant in possibility than *may* so it expresses uncertainty; *could* is relatively remote in possibility from point of utterance than *can*, so it can be interpreted as less likely. Therefore, they can serve as hedges, indicating less than complete commitment.

iii. **Necessity modals**

Necessity modals in English include *must, should, ought to, need to, to be to, have to, necessary*. *Must* and *should* are considered as central modals, while *ought to, need to, to be to, have to, be supposed to* are often referred to as marginal modals or semi-modal (Biber et al, 1999, p. 484). According to Coates (1985, p.53), *need* is similar in meaning to *must*, which means ‘it is essential that…’ E.g. *We need to add in a column or something* (Coates, 1983). But the meaning of *need* is softer than that of *must*, because ‘it allows the speaker to avoid direct reference to their own authority. *Need* requires the external forces require the task to be done,’ (Bernadette, 2001, p.112). *Need* is stronger than *should*, but weaker than *must* and *have to* ((Bernadette, 2001, p.113). *Should* has the core concept of requirement and expresses weak sense of obligation (Yule, 1983). Palmer (1990) puts it that modal *should* in its deontic use tends to denote a certain degree of tentativeness since the speaker may envisage the non-occurrence of the future event. On the scale of imposition, *must* has the highest value, then comes *need*; they are often used to convey an order or a threat. As Biber & Keck (2004, p.21) remark ‘Obligation meaning of *must* used to convey information with certainty and authority’.

As the name suggests, necessity modals have the core meaning of necessity, with socially-oriented (root) necessity being interpreted as obligation and knowledge-oriented (espitemic) necessity being interpreted as conclusions. However, the distinction between these two concepts is too fuzzy to describe them separately (Smith, 2003, p.241) in many cases, the two meanings are merged (Coates, 1983, p.77-79), which means that they are used with intermediacy. Because of this and of the facts that all meanings of these can serve argumentative purpose, no distinction between root and espitemic meanings is made.
3.5.2.2. Suasive verbs

Along with public verbs and private verbs, suasive verbs is a class of factual verbs which consists of a limited number of words: allow, ask, beg, concede, determine, ensure, insist, intend, prefer, pronounce, propose, recommend, command, propose, urge, require, resolve, pledge, demand, stipulate, suggest, decide, etc. E.g. I absolutely insist that classes should be entertaining (Hinkel, 2005). Suasive verbs function as mandative and causative, and are normally used to introduce indirect directives or imply an intention to bring about changes in the future (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 1182-1183.). These verbs are followed by ‘to-infinitive’ or that-should clause.

3.5.2.3. Conditional subordination

In English, conditional sentences have structure: if X happens, (then) Y follows. Conditional subordination specifies the conditions that are required in order for certain events to occur, which is useful for argumentative discourse. That is, in the subclause we find the condition that has to be fulfilled before what is stipulated in the main clause can happen. The condition may be either open or hypothetical (Quirk et al., 1985, p.1087–1092). An open condition leaves open the question if the condition is fulfilled or not. A hypothetical condition “conveys the speaker’s belief that the condition will not be fulfilled (for future conditions), is not fulfilled (for present conditions), or was not fulfilled (for past conditions). These two types of conditions are encoded as ‘real’, as in (5), and ‘unreal’ conditions, as in (6)

(5) If he comes, I’ll see him. If she was awake, she certainly heard the noise
(6) If he came, I’d see him. If she’s d been awake, she would have heard the noise.

(Quirk, 1985, p. 326)

Finite adverbial clauses of condition are introduced chiefly by the subordinators positive if and negative unless. Other conjunctions like provided, providing, as long as, so long as, and on condition, under the circumstances, then, in that case that are also used to express the meaning of ‘if and only if’; and negative condition is signalled by otherwise, unless.
3.5.2.4. Nominal clauses

Nominal clauses are explicit or omitted that or wh-complement clauses following main clause verbs, such as public (reporting), private, suasive, seem/ appear, mental (think, believe, understand), emotive (love, hate, like), expecting/wanting/tentative verbs (attempt, desire, tend, plan, expect, try, want, hope,) and performative (e.g. announce, ask, claim, comment, indicate, propose, say, state) (Hinkel, 130). According to Biber (1995), nominal clauses are typically used to provide informational elaboration while at the same time explicitly presenting the speaker’s stance or attitude towards the proposition. E.g. Do you think [that there is any chance...]. In this example, the speaker’s stance is encoded in the verb of the main clause- think- and the proposition itself is presented in the dependent clause. Regarding the position, nominal clauses can be in initial position as subject, as direct object, as subject complement, as adjectival complement, and as prepositional complement.

3.5.2.5. To- Infinitives

To-infinitives are grammatical structures which function as sentence constituent with a verb base and as its head word. It is quite surprising to see the presence of infinitive in the list of salient features of argumentation. But Biber points it out that

Although to-infinitives can have other functions, they are most commonly used as adjective and verb complements; in these constructions, the head adjective or verb frequently encodes the speaker’s attitude or stance towards the proposition encoded in the infinitival clause (e.g. happy to do it; hoped to see it)

( Biber, 1988, p.111)

As Morley (2004, p. 74) finds out in his study of modals in persuasive journalism, the use of to-infinitives accords well with the high frequency of attitude and stance markers in editorials. To-Infinitives, and in most cases, has quite flexible collocation: it can follow adjectives, for-construction, verbs and even nouns. Traditionally, infinitives function as purpose adjunct to express purpose or intended result of the action in the main verb (Los, 2005, p. 27). E.g. I left early to catch the train. (Quirk et al, 1985, p. 564). Here, the action intended to accomplish is ‘catch the train’.
3.5.3. Illocutionary types in editorials

According to Hatim and Mason (1990), a text consists of a succession of speech acts and the cumulative effect of sequences of speech acts leads to the perception of a text act—the predominant illocutionary force of a series of speech acts. In socio-political editorials, the predominant illocutionary force is to persuade, which, at lower level, is made up of different types. According to Vestergaard, there exist at least five illocutionary types in socio-political editorials, namely evaluations, proposals, predictions, causal explanations, and interpretations.

**Evaluations:** It is about whether things, real or imagined, are good or bad, desirable or undesirable. E.g. *But what matters most, in our view, is how Euro-enthusiasts responds to yesterday’s vote.*

**Proposals:** are what need to be done if the current state of affairs is not satisfactory. E.g. *A healthy Western Europe is important and greater unity is still worth striving for.*

**Predictions:** can be real, hypothetical, or even counterfactual. E.g. *There is the wider lens through which Europe will be viewed in the year 2008*

**Interpreting** a phenomenon is to ascribe the meaning to it. That is, to say that a real meaning of an observable phenomenon is perhaps not the most readily inferable one. E.g. *To declare that British Eurosceptics are out of line with the rest of Europe is to misread the signals.*

**Causal explanation:** In the physical world, we observe one event happens before another. However, whether or not the precedence relation is a causative relation is the question of assessment. E.g. *A pounds 53million tax rebate, dangled as the reward for a Yes, also played a part (in making the Danes vote Yes.)*

(Vestergaard,1999, p. 103-104.)

In his article, Opinion and Ideology, Van Dijk (1995) proposes some more illocutionary types as pragmatic conclusion, including recommendation, advice, or warning. These speech acts can be found in the concluding part of the editorial to answer the questions ‘What next?’, ‘What are we going to do about this?’, ‘What (e.g. the authorities) should or should not do?’ This pragmatic part about what should/could (not) be done is action-oriented, and therefore based on norms. However, Van Dijk also observes that in the actual editorial, pragmatic conclusion can occur in any part, not just in concluding one.
CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

As discussed in chapter 1, this study is aimed to find out about the argumentative text type in socio-political editorials in English and Vietnamese. More specifically, this chapter will give answer to following questions:

1. What argumentative pattern is commonly employed in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials?
2. What and how grammatical devices are used as argumentative devices in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials?
2. What are the similarities and differences in argumentation in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials?

The pattern of through-argumentation and counter-argumentation postulated by Hatim, B (1990) act as criteria for the investigation of argumentative pattern in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials. As for linguistic devices realizing argumentation, Biber’s findings are investigated, including: *modals, conditional subordination, to-infinitives, and nominal clauses*. Certainly, to-infinitives are not a grammatical category in Vietnamese, so they are not counted in Vietnamese data. The study is based on the presumption that these linguistic features are present in English argumentative text type as proved by the linguists.

The results reveal that English editorials prefer counter-argumentative pattern while those in Vietnamese opt for through-argumentative pattern. Out of ten English texts investigated, eight have counter-argumentative patterns. This lends support to Hatch’s remark that ‘in American culture, arguments are to be raised and disposed of by counterarguments.’ As for linguistic strategies, it is found that most of the languages in the analytical framework appear with quite high frequency in English editorials, except for suasive verbs. The patterns of prediction modals, probability modals and necessity modals agree with the findings by Biber (1989), while conditionals and to-infinitives show much higher
frequency. Virtually all the linguistic devices present in English argumentative discourse are found in socio-political editorials in Vietnamese. However, the general trend shows that almost all linguistic devices, except for necessity modals and suasive verbs, have quite lower frequency in Vietnamese editorials. This section will go further into argumentative patterns and the use of each linguistic device in each language; then compare them.

4.1. Argumentative patterns and linguistic devices in English data

4.1.1. Argumentative patterns

The study reveals an overwhelming preference for counter-argumentative pattern in English editorials: nine out of ten texts in the data follow counter-argumentative pattern ‘Tone setter- thesis cited to be opposed- Thesis- substantiation- Conclusion. The only text (texts 8) has through-argumentative pattern: Tone setter- Thesis- substantiation-conclusion.

Table 4.1 Argumentative patterns in English data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argumentative patterns</th>
<th>Number of texts (N=10)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through-argumentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-argumentation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1.1. Through-argumentative pattern

Through-argumentative macro-pattern is found only in text 8, What FBI saw during US interrogation, where the writer demonstrates his frustration and objection to the crimes made by US interrogators and higher officials towards Iraq prisoners, for which he uses the word ‘atrocities’. Tone-setter represents the scenes of US interrogators’ humiliation and torture of Iraq prisoners, which are extracted from the report by an FBI inspector, plus with the writer’s comment.
Muslim men are stripped in front of female guards and sexually humiliated. A prisoner is made to wear a dog's collar and leash, another is hooded with women's underwear. Others are shackled in stress positions for hours, held in isolation for months, and threatened with attack dogs.... These atrocities were committed in the interrogation centers in American military prisons in Iraq, Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. ...They were described in a painful report by the Justice Department's inspector general, based on the accounts of hundreds of FBI agents who saw American interrogators repeatedly mistreat prisoners in ways that the agents considered violations of American law and the Geneva Conventions. According to the report, some of the agents began keeping a 'war crimes file' - until they were ordered to stop.

These sentences are full of value-laden words atrocities, painful, repeatedly mistreat, war crimes, etc., which implicitly indicate writer’s attitude toward these events. The thesis expresses writer’s point of view on the issue - he disapprove these behaviors and accuse high rank officials like the president, secretary of defense, etc. of corrupting American law to allow these atrocities - but in a detached manner by using inanimate subject:

These were not random acts. It is clear from the inspector general's report that this was organized behavior by both civilian and military interrogators following the specific orders of top officials. The report shows what happens when an American president, his secretary of defense, his Justice department and other top officials corrupt American law to rationalize and authorize the abuse, humiliation and torture of prisoners.

The thesis is then substantiated by three main reasons for it: more scenes of torturing: our FBI agents saw an interrogator cuff two detainees and force water down their throats; the higher rank officials deliberately ignore and cover these behaviors: ... FBI agents reported this illegal behavior to Washington... but the bureau appears to have done nothing to end the abuse. ... Bush has refused to tell the truth about his administration's inhuman policy on prisoners...and actions impending to bring these crimes to court: Now, the Democrats in charge of Congress must press for full disclosure....Representative John Conyers, who leads the House Judiciary Committee, said he would focus on the FBI report in coming hearings...The only contra-argument for the writer’s claim is the excuse by Bush for the deeds: Bush claims interrogations produced invaluable intelligence, which is, however, immediately suppressed by the writer’s argument.
Conclusion explicitly states writer’s stance with a detachment toward the issue – what he thinks should be done

It will be a painful process to learn how so many people were abused and how America's most basic values were betrayed. But it is the only way to get this country back to being a defender, not a violator, of human rights.

It seems that the objection is too strong to start with the concession of the other side’s viewpoint, so through-argumentation is employed as the macro-pattern. However, the number of through-argumentative text is not big enough to reach any conclusion about when the writer uses this argumentation type. But even in through-argumentative text, contra-argument is still included. The following table summarizes how through-argumentative pattern is realized in English data.

Table 4.2. Realization of through-argumentative pattern in English data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone setter</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Persuasion/Manipulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Claim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writer’s attitude and emotion: implicit frustration and objection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiation</td>
<td>Pro-arguments (predominant), Contra-arguments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts, Reasons, Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Evaluation of the issue as rebuttal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion for solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tone-setter is background information which heralds the main problem stated in the thesis. Thesis is the claim made by the writer which implicitly expresses a position and emotion: criticism and frustration. Thesis is justified by predominantly pro-arguments and sparsely contra-arguments. These arguments are made up of reasons, which are then backed up by facts and evaluations. Reasons are statements of writer’s or others’ opinion, which in their turn, are supported by facts and evaluations. These two elements are
sometimes separated, but most of the time are interwoven. When arguments for and against the thesis are enough to convince readers to the writer’s point of view, it is time for writers to make it clearcut the intention of his argumentation. This is where the argumentation reaches the climax - main argument is pinpointed, proposals for solution are made. To make the illocutionary force of the proposal softer, a concession is preceded. The whole process of argumentation turns out to get readers convinced by, thus to take action for the rectification of the situation. In other words, the purpose of argumentation is to persuade and manipulate readers.

4.1.1.2. Counter-argumentative pattern

In counter-argumentative texts, tone-setter, an optional component, is absent in just one text, text No 10. In some texts (text 4, 5, 9), tone-setter is just one sentence or two sentences; in the other texts, they are a whole paragraph. Tone-setters mostly present the background information carrying writer’s attitude, (text2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9), a philosophical statement (Text7), an anecdote (text1). All these are used to set the tone for the writer’s claim. For example, in text 5 ‘The real enemy’, talking about situation in Afghanistan, the writer starts his argument with an opening:

As Nato’s member nations convene in Bucharest, Romania, to discuss the state of the alliance, Afghanistan will be at the top of the agenda (TM5).

The statement is seemingly factual, but as we notice the presence of ‘will’, which is both a marker of future tense and a modal verb of prediction, the sentence implicitly expresses the writer’s assessment of the event - the likelihood is that Afghanistan is going to be at the top of the agenda because of its alarming situation. In text 7, ‘Obamas courageous speech on race and religion’, tone-setter is a statement of philosophy, which leads to the writer’s explicit praisal of Obama’s speech:

There are moments- increasingly rare in risk-abhorrent modern campaigns-when politicians are called upon to bare their fundamental beliefs. In the best of these moments, the speaker does not just salve the current political wound, but also illuminates larger, troubling issues that America is wrestling with (IHT7).
Thesis- cited to be- opposed and thesis are statements of evaluation, prediction, or warning of the events, expressing the other side’s and the writer’s viewpoint either implicitly or explicitly- evaluation of an event/action good or bad (text 2, 3, 4, 6, 7) right or wrong ( 9, 10 ). For example,

*There is a lot of talk that Hillary Rodham Clinton is now fated to lose Democratic nomination and should pull out of the race. We believe it is her right to stay in the fight and challenge Barack Obama as long as she has the desire and the means to do so. That is the essence of the democratic process. But we believe just as strongly that Clinton will be making a terrible mistake-for herself, her party and for the nation-if she continues to press her candidacy through negative campaigning with disturbing racial undertones (IHT9).*

The writer precedes his face-threatening statement which implicitly claims the action of ‘pressing’ and ‘negative campaigning’ as being wrong …we believe just as strongly that Clinton will be making a terrible mistake—by a soothing and endearing statement made by the writer himself, using a plural subject we, acting as a strawman: *We believe it is her right to stay in the fight… That is the essence of the democratic process.* As thesis is a counter-claim of the claim preceded, so it is often introduced by contrastive connectives ‘But’ (text 2, 3, 6, 7, 9). In some cases, both thesis cited to be opposed and thesis are the evaluation from the same source; in others, it is from different sources.

Substantiation in all the counter-argumentative texts consists of mostly pro-arguments for the thesis, preceded by a few contra-arguments. This lends support to Eemeren’s remark that both pro-arguments and contra-arguments act as complementary tools for justifying the claim. For example, in text 1, two contra-arguments and four pro-arguments; in text 3, three contra-arguments and five pro-arguments are found, in text 5, one contra-argument and four pro-argument, etc.:

*The demonstrations against the Olympic torch were as spectacular in London and San Francisco as they were in Paris. Yet the Chinese have singled out France as the ideal place to post their defiant message to the world (TM3).*
Conclusion may be prediction (in text 6), proposals (text 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 8) or summaries of main argument (text 7, 10). It is where the argumentation reaches the highest point, where the writer’s intention of argumentation is clearly and overtly stated. Conclusion in almost all the texts, even in through-argumentative texts (except for text 4) consists of two parts: concession or rebuttal, and reassertion of the stance. The relation between these two parts is contrastive, realized by juxtaposition. The concession precedes the assertion which acts as the counter-claim and is signaled by either implicitly, or explicitly signaled by ‘but’, ‘however’:

- Twenty years ago, when China was weaker, a boycott might have been possible, since other countries could ignore Beijing…Today, China can no longer be ignored (TM2).
- It will be a painful process to learn how so many people were abused and how America’s most basic values were betrayed. But it is the only way to get this country back to being a defender, not a violator, of human rights. (IHT 8)

To sum up, counter argumentative patterns are realized in English data as following:

- **Table. 4.3. Realization of counter-argumentative pattern in English data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone setter</th>
<th>Orientation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tone setter</strong></td>
<td>Background information, philosophical statement, anecdote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis cited to be opposed</td>
<td>The other side’s viewpoint/stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the event/action (good or bad, right or wrong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression of criticism, appraisal, support or objection to a certain behavior, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Writer’s viewpoint/stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opposition of the claim made by the other side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiation</td>
<td>Pro-arguments (predominant), Contra-arguments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons, Facts, Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Intention of the argumentation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion for solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tone-setters are mostly background information, philosophical statement and anecdote are not very common. They serve to lead or guide readers to the thesis, or set the tone for the whole text. Thesis cited to be opposed is the claim made by an absent opponent, who can be the writer himself or not. This claim explicitly expresses a position: supporting or opposing, criticizing or praising, evaluating the event as being right or wrong, good or bad, etc. Thesis is the claim which is made to oppose the preceding claim and is argued for during the rest of the text. Substantiation follows the same procedure like in through-argumentation. Conclusion is realized by drawing out the core of all the arguments set out in the substantiation, and/or by suggesting their own solution to the problem. To soften the illocutionary force of proposals, concession to the other side’s view is repeated, but in other forms. Conclusion is the climax when writers explicitly persuade readers to adopt their viewpoint, or their proposals. The whole argumentation is set out for manipulation of readers’ thoughts and behaviors: to induce/dissuade them from a certain action, and to alter their viewpoint.

- **Pragmatic meaning of argumentative patterns**

The findings show that English socio-political editorials follow the norm of text politeness as they mostly employ counter-argumentation pattern, especially balanced type. Through-argumentative pattern is almost avoided in English socio-political editorials. As Hatim (1998: 92) puts it that ‘Texts are said to be upholding norms of politeness when in terms of both their micro- and macro-structure they are seen to fulfill expectations regarding to all or some of the normal and customary contextual requirements’. Counter-argumentative text format constitutes in itself a form of positive politeness in that it is a means of ‘claiming a common ground’. That is, in order to carry out the face-threatening act (FTA) of countering an opposing point of view, the conventional text strategy is to agree first, then disagree. Within the counter-argumentative pattern, balance type is preferred to lopsided type because the former is considered to be more face-threatening. In lopsided argumentation, hypotactic construction immediately subordinates the opposing argument, which is face threatening suggestion that the other argument is less valid. Balance argumentation with paratactic construction is face saving by delaying dispreferred move. (Kuhlen & Thomson, 1999). Through-argumentative
pattern goes against people’s expectation or is ‘done in blatant contravention of the norms of text politeness’.

4.1.2. Argumentative linguistic devices

Linguistic devices in the analytical framework are found to occur quite frequently in English data. As the study reveals that the most frequent expressions of argumentation in the data processed are infinitives (22.7 ptws), following by nominal clause (12.69 ptws), probability modals (8.9 ptws), prediction modals (7.19 ptws), intensifiers (6.46 ptws). Conditionals and necessity modals are also characteristics of English editorials but occur with less frequency, 3.66 ptws and 3.74 ptws respectively. On the other hand, suasive verbs, in contrast with findings by Biber (1981), seem not to be significant in our data, with only 1.00 ptws.

| Table 4.4. Uses of linguistic devices in English data (ptws) |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                 | Prediction     | Probability    | Necessity      | SuasiveVs      | Conditionals  | NominalClauses |
| Mean            | 7.7090         | 8.2770         | 3.7890         | 1.0030         | 3.6630        | 12.6880        |
| SD              | 5.51443        | 3.57985        | 2.79595        | .93446         | 2.76569       | 6.71850        |
| Range           | 18.25          | 11.31          | 10.12          | 2.50           | 8.10          | 19.98          |
| Min             | .00            | 4.68           | .00            | .00            | .00           | 3.12           |
| Max             | 18.25          | 15.99          | 10.12          | 2.50           | 8.10          | 23.10          |
| Sum             | 77.09          | 82.77          | 37.89          | 10.03          | 36.63         | 126.88         |

| Infinitives     | 22.6970        | 7.70072        |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                 | 22.972         | 7.70072        | 22.6970        | 7.70072        | 22.972         | 7.70072        | 22.972         |
4.1.2.1. Modals

Generally speaking, modals are quite frequently used for persuasive purpose in English socio-political editorials. They occur in 10/10 texts, concentrating primarily in the substantiation (10/10 texts), conclusion (9/10 texts), and thesis (5/10 texts). As it can be seen, probability modals represent the highest frequency (8.9 ptws) of the three variables; prediction modals rank the second with 7.19 ptws and necessity modals have the lowest frequency (3.03 ptws). This finding also agrees with several corpora linguistic studies.
which reveal that *will*, *would*, *can*, and *could* occur a lot more often than other central modals (Coates 1983, p. 23, Biber 1999, p. 484). Modals are used to either predict the future consequences of present or potential event/action, or to discuss the possibility of some situations, making claims or arguments for and against claims. They are also used to express writer’s own stance on the issue to serve the final goal of the writer – to persuade readers that the writer’s viewpoint is right, and to influence and control readers’ behavior.

**i. Prediction modals** (*will*, *would*) are present in nine out of ten texts, with high density in some texts – texts 2, 9 have 12.52 ptws and 18.25 ptws- , and average density around mean in almost all others. Prediction modals are used to predict future events or their consequences in a moderate or tentative manner. By using *will* and *would* for predicting effect, instead of *must*, the writer would avoid being too committed to the truth of what she is expressing. As Coates observes,

The prediction sense of *Will* qualifies the speakers’ commitment to the factuality of the proposition far less than the deduction sense of *must*, which explicitly draws on the speaker’s- perhaps limited- knowledge (Coates, 1983: 184)
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The result also shows that *will* have a higher frequency than *would*: *will* accounts for 62.2% and hypothetical *would* accounting for 37.78%. *Will* is present in 9 out of 10 texts (except for text 10), especially in texts 2 and 9, six and seven instances of *will* are found respectively. These two texts discuss possible arguments for and against the claims ‘boycotting Beijing Olympic Games would backfire miserably’ and ‘Clinton will make terrible mistake if she continues campaigning’: ‘a boycott *will* cost activists whatever ongoing leverage they have over China,’; and ‘a boycott *will* gain support among Chinese liberals’. Prediction modals have lowest frequencies in text 3 and 4, where just two instances are detected each. Nevertheless, three occurrences of *would* are found in text 3 and many occurrences of probability modals are found in text 4 to substitute for prediction modals.

Hypothetical *would* also occurs in 7/10 texts (except for text 1,3,10), but with lower frequencies of just one or two per text (except for text 2 with five instances of *would*). Hypothetical *would* is used as hedge to make the claim more tentative, thus distancing the writer from the truth value of the proposition. As hypothetical *would* expresses the uncertainty or little commitment, it is often used to avoid face-threatening in sensitive subjects or to make statements which the writer feels uncertain about it. For example, text 7 about Obama speech on race and religion, a very sensitive subject, *would* is used to give writer’s comment on his speech: ‘nothing to suggest that he *would* carry religion into government’ (IHT 7).

Prediction modals project potential future events, making the tone-setter (text 1, 5), claim (thesis) (texts 2, 9), arguments for and against the claim (9/10 texts), or conclusion (text 5, 7, 8). In tone-setter, prediction modals are used to express writer’s overall judgement of the event to make the general picture or discourse context for writer’s claim. For example, in text 5 discusses the real enemy of Afghans is corruption and loose law, the writer begins with the comment on situation in Afghanistan in general as alarming by predicting that ‘As Nato’s member nations convene in Bucharest, Romania, to discuss the state of the alliance, Afghanistan will be at the top of the agenda.’ Writers use prediction modals in the thesis to clearly state his or her viewpoint on the issue ‘But the boycott would backfire miserably’ (TM2), ‘Clinton will make terrible mistake...’(IHT9). In the substantiation,
prediction modals are employed to give reasons for this viewpoint, ‘activists almost surely would lose any interaction with Chinese officials’ (TM2), ‘the party will be harder to unite’ (IHT9), or reasons against it ‘a boycott will gain support among Chinese liberals’ (TM2). Prediction modals are used in the conclusion to give writer’s judgement on what will happen next, but mostly as rebuttal which precede the concluding statement. For example:  *It will be a painful process to learn how so many people were abused and how America’s most basic values were betrayed. But…* (IHT8)

Pragmatically, prediction modals are often used to issue warnings as they predict adversative effects of some actions, with an aim to discourage people who are impending the actions. This illocutionary forces are most vividly demonstrated in text 2 and 9, when the writers project negative impact of the impended action ‘boycotting’ and ‘Clinton’s continuing campaigning’: ‘a boycott will only turn them against the West.’ (TM2), ‘More attack ads and squabbling will not help achieve that goal’ (IHT 9). By envisaging these miserable futures of the actions, writers want to communicate the message that those who are mulling the actions should stop doing so.

**ii. Probability modals** are found in all texts, with exceptionally high concentration of 15.99 ptws and 20.35 ptws in texts 7, 10 respectively. They cluster around mean in all other texts, with the lowest frequency of 4.68ptws. Probability modals are found to include modal verbs, viz. can, could, may, might; modal adverbs, viz. likely, surely, certainly, possible, possibly, probably, perhaps. Modals with low value are much preferred, accounting for 74.11%; they are found in all the texts. E.g.  *they can be removed from their posts, sent to desk jobs or medical leave* (TM1). Modals with median value have a much lower proportion, 17.32%; they occur in three texts (3, 4, 10), especially concentrating in text 10 where nine instances of the form likely are found. E.g.  *Hajj is also less likely to support the use of violence and show no evidence of any increased hostility toward the West* (IHT 10). Modals with high value (certainly, surely) have lowest percentage of just 8.57%; they are present sparsely in four texts (1, 6, 7, 8). E.g.  *It certainly never told Congress or the American people* (IHT8). Of the modal verbs, can is the most frequent form of probability modals in English editorials, with total 3.03 ptws, followed by could.
with total 1.51 ptws. *May* and *might* are much less used, with total 0.954 ptws and 0.288 ptws respectively.
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Probability modals are mainly used to discuss possibility of the events, or their possible consequences, making tone-setter (text 8), claim (thesis) (text 10), arguments for and against the claim (10/10 texts), and conclusion (text 1, 2, 6, 7, 10). Writers use probability modals in tone-setter to give comment on the situation, creating a general picture of the whole story. E.g. *You might think we are talking about that one cell block in Abu Ghraib,...* (IHT8). When used in the thesis, modals of probability signify writer’s or the other side’s viewpoint on the issue. E.g. *According to a 2007 survey conducted by the PEW Forum, 45 percent of Americans believe Islam is more likely to encourage violence than other religions...* (IHT10). Probability modals mostly discuss possible pro-arguments or contra-arguments for the claim when occur in substantiation. For example, in text 4, the writer expresses his opinion on the presidential race when the primary is over and gives suggestion for the coming race, he uses probability modals *likely*, *can*, *could* four times to express pro-arguments. E.g. *They can help make him an even stronger candidate in what could well be a very tough race* (IHT4). Whereas, in text 10,
the viewpoint the writer wants to prove is that religious orthodoxy is not associated with violence or intolerance, 15 occurrences of probability modals are found, one of which is used to make contra-argument: **While all religious may have radical seminaries or extremists groups that promote an orthodoxy that goes hand in hand with hostility towards outsiders** (IHT10). In conclusion, probability modals express writer’s evaluation of the possibility of the events, explicitly stating writer’s stance, reasserting the thesis. E.g. **...mixing with others across nationa, sect, gender lines can help promote tolerance...** (IHT 10); **Twenty years ago, a boycott might have been possible, since other countries could ignore China. Today, China can no longer be ignored** (TM 2).

Probability modals are also used to indicate the commitment and certainty of the author to the proposition expressed. The popular use of modals with low and median value like *can, could, may, might, possible, likely* moderates the author’s claim, helping him or her avoid full responsibility for the truth value of the proposition. *Could, may, might*, even make the statement more tentative. E.g. **The success of Obama’s candidacy sends the very opposite message, which may be why Wright is so threatened by it** (TM6).

Pragmatically, probability modals also serve as recommendation (text 2, 9). *Can* is used to suggest the solution to the problem, or to implicitly express writer’s opinion on what should or should not be done. For example, in text 2, two instances of can are found to give proposals: **Only a combination of tough public shaming,... not ostracism, can produce results...** **Today, China can no longer be ignored** (TM2). *May* and *might* are also used in concessives for 33% of their uses. They are used when the writer wishes to acknowledge the possibility of some event or state of affairs being the case, but not necessarily relevant for current discussion. E.g. **...‘as imperfect as he may be, he has been like family to me’** (IHT7).

### iii. Necessity modals

Necessity modals are the least frequent type of modals in the list, with a mean frequency of 3.03 ptws. This agrees with the general tendency of necessity modals in English, as Biber et al (1999) observe, necessity modals have the lowest frequency of all modals. They are present in 9/10 texts (except for text 6) with low or average frequencies, concentrating densely in just one text (text 9) with 6 occurrences of *should, need, and must*. All other texts have small occurrences of from 1 to 4. It should be noted that almost all uses of necessity modals are deontic. The less frequency of these modals compared with other modals indicates that the writer would like to shun from overtly authoritarian
This conclusion is backed up by another fact that, of the three modals, *should*, modal with weakest obligation meaning, takes up the largest portion, 60% of total, while *must* and *need* have much lower rates of 20% each.
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Necessity modals are used in the texts to tell readers what, in writer’s opinion, should be done as the current situation is not satisfactory. They are used in thesis (text 2, 9), in substantiation, and mostly in conclusion (text 3, 4, 8). In thesis, necessity modal *should* is used to express the opponent’s viewpoint: *There is a lot of talk that Hillary Rodham Clinton...should pull out of the race*’ (IHT 9); Richard Gere, the Hollywood star declared *‘...we should boycott (the Olympics)’* (TM2). In substantiation, writers use necessity modals to give other sources’ or their opinion as to what is needed, to provide reasons strengthening the claim. E.g. *Conyers also wants to question FBI Director..., both of whom should be subpoenaed if they do not come voluntarily* (IHT 8). In conclusion, necessity modals demonstrate writer’s stance as to what should be done as a solution to the problem. E.g. *The Chinese, however, should not be too quick to celebrate their victory...* (TM3).

Pragmatically, necessity modals mostly serve as recommendations. The writer clearly expresses his or her viewpoint about what should be done as the current situation is not
satisfactory. E.g. All Americans **should** be helping them. (TM1) As they can exert strong effect on the readers, necessity modals are often placed in marked positions: in thesis (3/10 texts) and conclusion (4/10 texts), where attention can be drawn. In these positions, as well as in other positions, necessity modals function to formulate the readers’ future behavior in a strong manner.

*To sum up*, modals are frequently used as an overt marker of arguer’s stance and persuasion in my data. Necessity modals are less frequent due to their face-threatening effect. They are used to tell readers what will happen, is possible to happen, and should happen. They express writer’s stance on the issue in a moderate or tentative manner, and reasons to support this stance. They can be used in thesis, substantiation and conclusion. Together, necessity modals serve to influence and direct readers to the writer’s viewpoint which is explicitly or implicitly stated in the thesis. Pragmatically, they function to make recommendation or warning.

### 4.1.2.2. Suasive verbs

In contrast to Biber’s finding, suasive verbs are very infrequent in English editorials in my research, with just mean frequency of 0.994 ptws. Four out of ten texts are void of this kind of verbs. Suasive verbs found in English data include *allow, tell, ask, decide* and *suggest*. All these verbs appear in the substantiation to provide support for writer’s claim; none are found in the thesis or conclusion. All of the suasive verbs are attributed to other sources rather than the author himself or herself. For example, *The Secretary of State for Human Rights, Rama Yeade, who reportedly suggested that there would have to be conditions if Sarkozy was to attend the Olympics.* (TM3)

The unpopularity of suasive verbs in the data implies that English socio-political editorials avoid authoritarian and imposing manner. As Quirk (1985) remarks, suasive verbs are often used in mandative or directive; they exert great imposition on listeners or readers. Therefore, they are more often employed in power-oriented discourse, as a way the writer asserts dominance; men’s letter writing is dominated with this feature, (Meyer, 2003, p. 102). For example, this kind of verbs frequently occur in policy resolution in contracts which highly represent authority (Adam, 2004).
4.1.2.3. Conditional subordination.

Conditionals are also typically used as an argumentative device in English socio-political editorials, with an average mean frequency of 3.66 ptws. These constructions occur in almost all texts (9/10 texts). Texts 6 & 9 have the highest frequency of conditionals, 7.00 ptws and 9.1 ptws respectively; on the contrary, texts 2, 8, 10 have as low frequency as 1.25 ptws, 1.63 ptws, and 1.25 ptws respectively. Almost all of the instances (85.7%) found are first conditionals, with just 4.3% as third conditional. First conditionals discuss potential situations and their results, which implies that situations or events are much likely to happen. This increases the persuasive effect of the argumentation.
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Conditional subordinations are used to express writer’s stance on the issue in a tentative manner. Conditionals set up situations as potential, then inferring its consequences using prediction modal will. E.g. But if Afghans have no faith in their government to provide equal justice and uniform law, Nato’s efforts will be of little worth (TM5). Or they tell readers what should be done as the solution, using necessity modals. E.g. If the authorities
hope to crush it, then they **must** crush corruption first (TM5). Using conditional subordination helps the writer distance herself from full commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed. As Barbara (2000) observes, *If* maintains neutral stance compared with ‘*since, when*’. They can be used in the thesis (text 2, 9), substantiation (8/10 texts), and conclusion (text 5, 6, 9). In the thesis, conditionals convey the opponent’s or writer’s viewpoint on what will happen, or what should happen tentatively. E.g. *We believe that Clinton will be making terrible mistake if she continues ...*(IHT 9). In the substantiation, conditionals express ideas which support (pro-arguments) or reject (contra-arguments) the writer’s stance which is already stated in the thesis. For example, in text 6 where the writer demonstrates his criticism for Wright’s outrageous behavior, three occurrences of conditionals are found in substantiation, one of which is used for contra-argument: *...good works..if Saint Peter actually does sit on a cloud with an account book, will surely prove more important than Wright’s self absorbed lurches into hateful speech* (TM 6). In conclusion, conditionals are mostly used to explicitly state writer’s opinion on what should be done or what will happen in a tentative manner. E.g. *If the authorities hope to crush it, they must crush corruption first* (TM5).

Pragmatically, conditional clauses often combine with modal verbs in the main clauses to create illocutionary force of prediction or warning, and recommendation. The use of conditionals to make these illocutionary forces more tentative. Prediction in conditional is a type of reasoning, which consists of setting up hypothetical situation, and inferring its consequences based on the knowledge of cause-effect chain and general world knowledge. The effect of warning is created when the main clause predicts adversative consequence of the action in the subclause (text 5, 6, 9) . E.g. *If Obama wins, he will be that much more battered and the party will be harder to unite* (IHT 9). Recommendation is popular in conclusion (text 5, 9) when conditional subordination goes with necessity modals. E.g. *If (the protests) are not handled correctly, yes, we **should** boycott (the Olympics)* (TM2).

In conclusion, conditional constructions are quite common in the process of reasoning in argumentation in English socio-political editorials. They are used to express writer’s point of view on the issue, making claim, pro-arguments and contra-arguments for the claim, and conclusion. The use of conditionals will put the writer in safe position as what she is writing is just potential. Conditionals, more than just setting up potential situation and predict results, can make the recommendation, warning or prediction more tentative. In the texts, they can appear in any position, especially in thesis, substantiation and conclusion.
4.1.2.4. Nominal clauses

The study findings lend supports to the claim by Werlich (1976) that nominal clauses are one of the main clause expansion type in argumentative texts, with a mean frequency of 12.69 ptws. Nominal clauses spread on a wide range of 19.98 ptws, with min value of 3.12 ptws and max value of 22.56ptws. These constructions are present in all the texts. In some texts (text 4,7), they have as high frequency as 22.56 ptws and 23.71 ptws. Most of the other texts have average high frequency around mean; except for texts 2 and 5 where they only represent 6.25 ptws and 3.12 ptws respectively. This type of clauses is explicitly introduced by *That*, *Wh-* element, or implicitly without any markers. A high percentage of nominal clauses (40.57%) follow public or reporting verbs, 20.2% come after private verbs (*believe, find, know, wonder, imagine, etc*), only a minor portion of nominal clauses (10.14%) appear in initial position, the rest act as subject complement (8.9%), prepositional complement (10.1%), adjectival complement (2.8%) and suasive complement (2.8%).
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The dominance of nominal clauses in verb complement position and the unmarked presence in adjective or preposition complement is perhaps due to the writing style of English socio-political editorials. In these genres, dynamic forms are preferred more than static form to direct readers to the intended goal of the writer. In almost all positions, nominal clauses are encoded with the writer’s stance; which are disguised by attributing to other sources. In this way, the arguments will sound more objective and valid. Hunston & Thomson (2000, p. 22) admit that the packaging of proposition in That or Wh-clause can contribute to the evaluation.

Nominal clauses provide information as evidence after reporting verbs like says or declare. For example, in text 1, where writer would like to justify his opinion that psychological consultancy is important, he cites the words from another source: "A lot of these people come home and find that their jobs are no longer there," says Grange,... (TM1). Nominal clauses also elaborate evaluation by writer or other sources, especially authoritative sources, when coming after private verbs , persuasive verbs, and in subject complement or subject position. E.g. The Secretary of State for Human Rights, Rama Yeade, who reportedly suggested [that there would have to be conditions if Sarkozy was to attend the Olympics](TM3); [What may be surprising to some] is [that the hajj makes pilgrims more tolerant of both fellow Muslims and non-Muslims] (IHT10). The information and evaluation from other sources serve as justification for the writer’s claim, increasing the validity of the claim. Together, they are aimed to influence readers’ behavior: support or oppose one’s viewpoint.

Nominal clauses are often found in thesis and thesis cited to be opposed (text 2, 8, 9, 10), and mostly in substantiation (10/10 texts), conclusion (text 3,7). In thesis, these constructions are used to cite the writer’s and opponent’s evaluation or viewpoint. For example, in text 10, a nominal clause is used to introduce thesis cited to be opposed, and another is used to introduce thesis: 45% of Americans believe [Islam is more likely to encourage violence than other religions,...]... Our recent study shows that [while performing the hajj leads to greater religious orthodoxy it also increases pilgrims’ desire for peace and tolerance towards others.] (IHT 10).

In substantiation, nominal clauses provide information and evaluation, which argue for and against the claim. For example, in text 7, ‘Obama’s courageous speech on religion and
race’, where the writer appreciates Obama handling the rumoured connection with hateful Wright, his mentor. He cites Obama’s words as evidence: e.g. 
...

Or in text 2, writer introduces the reason against his claim by a nominal clause: Some foreign activists believe [a boycott will gain support among Chinese liberals] (TM2).

In conclusion, nominal clauses are used to express writer’s evaluation and point of view in a detached manner. For example, in text 7, the concluding statement which expresses writer’s evaluation on Obama’s speech is introduced by two nominal clauses in subject and subject complement positions; no evidence to show that the writer is involved: What is evident, though, is that he not only cleared the air over a particular controversy-he raised the discussion to a higher plane (IHT 7).

In short, nominal clauses are frequently used to elaborate the propositional content of the main verbs or adjectives, or nouns, allowing the writer to display knowledge, and/or provide evaluation. At the same time, the use of nominal clauses will distance her from the truth value of the proposition by attributing it to someone else. In this way, nominal clauses give the text the tone of detachment and objectivity. These altogether makes the argumentation much more valid by providing both the evidence and other sources’ assessment.

4.1.2.5. To- infinitives

To-infinitives have an unexpectedly high mean frequency of 22.7 ptws in English socio-political editorials. They widely spread from a min value of 6.24 ptws (text 7) to a max value of 31.95 ptws (text 4) with a SD of 7.01. 68% of the scores lie in the range from 22.67 ptws to 29.70 ptws. The study shows that one-fourth of to-infinitive constructions are purpose adjuncts. The rest are found to be preceded by several semantic categories of verbs: suasive verbs (ask, tell, decide, allow, etc); verbs of wants (want, would like, etc); verbs of commission (promise, pledge, etc), intention (tend, going to, plan, try, hope, expect, etc.), other verbs (decide, start, begin, etc) and adjectives of stance (likely, impossible, incorrect, surprising, etc). Most of these verbs and adjectives encode the
writer’s stance, thus like nominal clauses, *to-infinitive* construction following will allow her elaborate the opinion more clearly. For example, In text 3, five instances of *to-infinitive* construction act as purpose adjuncts; the rest 14 instances come after verbs, adjectives, and nouns; In text 4, six occurrences as purpose adjuncts, the rest 18 in other positions.
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As purpose adjunct, to-infinitives indicate reasoning process in which the writer judges the relationship between events as cause-effect. E.g. *...the military is prescribing antidepressants to troops downrange [to help blunt the psychological effects of combat.]*(TM1).

When appear after suasive verbs, private verbs, and adjective, *to-infinitives* add the propositional content to the opinion and evaluation. This function is prevalent in almost
In short, to-infinitive constructions are a very common argumentative strategy in English socio-political editorials. They are often used mostly as adjunct of purpose, then as complement for verbs or adjectives of stance. They have the function of expanding the ideas since they allow the ideas expressed compactly.

4.1.3. Subconclusion

In English socio-political editorials, through-argumentative pattern is outranked by counterargumentative macro-pattern. Detailed examination of argumentation shows that no matter whether the text has through-argumentation or counter-argumentation as macro-pattern, its sub-arguments also have counter-argumentation format; or the other side’s view is considered in conclusion, before the writer’s concluding remarks. The preference for counter-argumentative pattern in English socio-political editorials agrees with the general trend of argumentation practice in English. As Hatch (1992, p. 186-187) remarks, it is widely recognized that one sided argument is unacceptable in English, all arguments are to be raised and disposed by counter-arguments. In both patterns, thesis implicitly shows writer’s stance, which is then argued for during the substantiation and conclusion makes it explicit the overall intention of the argumentation. The permeated element throughout the text is manipulation: manipulation of languages and manipulation of thoughts and behaviors.
Linguistic devices expressing persuasion include modals, conditionals, nominal clauses, and to-infinitives are frequently used in English socio-political editorials. They occur throughout the texts, interweaving with one another, in order to make certain changes in readers’ behavior: to dissuade some people from a boycotting, to geer them to the belief that Mulism is not associated with violence and hatred, to get Hillary Clinton to give up her negative campaigning, etc. They do these in a moderate or tentative, detached manner, avoiding imposing and authoritarian.

4.2. Argumentative patterns and linguistic devices in Vietnamese data

4.2.1. Argumentative patterns

In Vietnamese data, the uses of argumentation pattern are quite balanced: half of the texts follow the format of through-argumentation, another half have the format of counter-argumentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argumentative patterns</th>
<th>Number of texts (N=10)</th>
<th>Percentage of texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through-argumentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-argumentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.1. Through argumentative pattern

Through-argumentative macro-pattern is found in texts 1,2,6,7,8 which consists of four major parts: tone-setter, thesis, substantiation, and conclusion. Tone-setters are present in four out of five texts (except for text 6). They provides background information carrying the evaluation from the writer.

Khó ai có thể tin rằng, 7 năm sau khi Ta-li-ban bị Mỹ láts đỏ, tình hình đất nước Nam Á này lại bất như vậy. Đến nỗi Tổng thống H.Ca-dai phải tính chuyển đâm phán với chính kế thà “không đôi trở chung” (PA1).
Thesis expresses the writer’s comment or evaluation on the situation, his neutral stance. In other words, he describes the situation from his point of view more than shows his opinion. Most of the theses are causal explanations (text 2, 7, 8). For example, Nguyên nhân sâu xa của cuộc khủng hoảng này là những bất đồng khó giải giữa Tổng thống V.Yushenko và Thủ tướng Y.Timoshenko (PP7). In this thesis statement, the writer seems to be the third person who stands aside and observes the situation then describes it from his outlook. Another instance which indicates writer’s objective stance is the use of evidential verbs ‘cho thấy’, putting him in a safe position: Động thái không thể tỏ rõ đường như cho thấy cả chính phủ Áp-ga-ni-xtan và lực lượng liên quan đang ‘duối sức’ với gánh nặng tái thiết hòa bình ở quốc gia Nam Á này (PA1).

Substantiation provides evidence and reasons for the claim. The evidences are mostly information or evaluation extracted from other sources. No argument against the claim is found. For example, in text 8, Cuộc khủng hoảng chính trị ở Zimbabwe ngày càng trầm trọng, the thesis is Zimbabwe’s governmental crisis is getting worse after the first-round presidential election, the writer cites three facts to support his claim: The president’s party and the opposition party accused each other of cheating in election; the opposition denounced the authorities’ prevention of their campaigning efforts; inflation and people’s miserable life. Then he proceeds with the international communities’ reaction to and evaluation of the issue:

- Cuộc khủng hoảng chính trị ở Zimbabwe bùng phát mạnh từ sau cuộc bầu cử Tổng thống và QH ngày 29-3-2008... Phe đối lập tố cáo chính quyền tìm mọi cách ngăn cản các hoạt động vận động tranh cử của MDC.... Zimbabwe làm vào cuộc khủng hoảng kinh tế. Tự chở trước đấy là một vựa lúa của miền nam châu Phi, hiện nay 60% dân số trong số 12 triệu dân nước này phải sống phụ thuộc vào cứu trợ lương thực của nước ngoài.
- Những diễn biến phức tạp ở Zimbabwe làm dự luật quốc tế quan tâm. Tổng Thư ký LHQ Ban Ki-moon cho đây là “diễn biến gây lo ngại sâu sắc”. Mỹ kêu gọi Chính phủ Zimbabwe chấm dứt bạo lực... Đài diễn cấp cao về chính sách đối ngoại của Liên hiệp châu Âu (EU) cho rằng đây là hệ quả của chính sách bạo lực, phá rối và hăm dọa có hệ thống của nhà chức trách Zimbabwe (PP8).
Conclusions are mostly writers’ reassertment of the thesis (text 1, 6), further evaluation or suggestion (text 1, 7, 8), prediction of what will happen next as a result to current situation (text 1, 7). For example, text 1, Lựa chọn bất đắc dĩ, the conclusion restates the claim that Afghan president’s compromise with Taliban is undesirable; and then another comment that this is the necessary action. Here the writer’s viewpoint is implicitly and weakly presented that he supports the action. In text 7, Khủng hoảng chính phủ ở Ukraine, conclusion is the prediction of how the events will become in near future, …..Điều này sẽ làm cho chính trường Ukraine càng thêm rối ren and then a weak reaction which is attributed to other sources: Dự luận hy vọng khủng hoảng chính phủ ở Ukraine sớm được giải quyết ổn thỏa, đặc biệt trong bối cảnh tình hình khu vực có nhiều bất ổn.

To sum up, through-argumentative macro-patterns in Vietnamese data are realized as following:

**Table. 4.6. Realization of through-argumentative macro-patterns in Vietnamese data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone setter</th>
<th><strong>Orientation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Analysis/ Weak persuasion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td><strong>Writer’s evaluation on the issue, a neutral stance</strong></td>
<td>Restatement of thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of the events from the third person’s viewpoint.</td>
<td>Further evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.g. a situation as being serious, a choice as being unwanted</td>
<td>Prediction of future behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tone setters are background information, which, in some texts, are to set the tone for the whole text, but in others, just set the sentences. Thesis hardly shows, explicitly or implicitly, whether writers support or object to an issue, whether they think it is right or wrong, good or bad, what they feel. In other words, writers do not take stand. The claim is then substantiated by pro-arguments which consist reasons, evaluations and facts. Some arguments are deprived of reasons, just facts imparted with evaluation. Conclusion restates the claim, then adds a further evaluation; in some texts, there is a prediction of future behavior.
behavior or a vague proposal for solutions. The process of argumentation, by nature, is often the analysis of the events, plus evaluation from writers as well as other sources; the manipulative effect is so vague that is is almost non-existent.

4.2.1.2. Counter-argumentative pattern

Counter-argumentative macro-pattern is found in texts 3, 4, 5, 9, 10. Specifically, tone setter is present in almost all the texts (except for text 10). It is expressed by the first sentence in the passage (as in text 5, 9); or by the first paragraph (text 3, 4). Tone-setters, in all the texts, are statements of background information, with or without the evaluation. For instances,

- Ngày hôm nay là tròn 5 năm kể từ ngày Mỹ nã quân liều đầu tiên xướng thủ đo Bát-da, “khai hòa” cuộc chiến bất hợp pháp mà hậu quả tối tể của nó không chỉ Mỹ, I-rắc mà cả thế giới phải gánh chịu (PA5).
- Hội nghị cấp cao EU - Nga họp tại TP Nice (Pháp) đã thảo luận một loạt vấn đề, từ tình hình Gzuria, an ninh châu Á, năng lượng, biến đổi khí hậu, tình hình tại Afghanistan, Iran, tiến trình hòa bình Trung Đông, đến cuộc khủng hoảng tài chính toàn cầu hiện nay (PP9).

In the first instance, the background information is imparted with the assessment from the author, expressed in the value-laden words ‘cuộc khủng hoảng trầm trọng nhất’. However, in the second, tone-setter is merely a statement of facts.

In counter-argumentation, thesis cited to be opposed is the claim made about the other side of the problem. Then comes the thesis or counter-claim which counteracts the claim made before. Claim and counter-claim are both statements of facts shaped by writer’s view, or a subjective description of the situation. Writers avoid taking stand - criticizing, supporting, praising, or condemning, etc. Instead, they maintain neutral stance, observing and describing the situation from the point of view of the third person. The counter-claim is introduced by a contrastive connective ‘Nhưng’. For example:
• In the thesis-cited-to-be – opposed, the writer states the importance of US-Korean beef trade agreement as a matter of fact. In the counter-claim, the negative side of this event is described. Statements in theses are not the matter of opinion, but of facts.

Substantiation can be a string of pro-arguments for the claim (text 4, 5, 10); in some text, there exists contra-arguments which precede the pro-arguments (text 3, 9). These pro-arguments are statement of facts and reasons, but contra-arguments are mostly facts. For example, text 4, Dương về đam mê, is a justification for the claim that US exit from Iraq will be tough. Besides citing facts, the writer gives his own comment to support the claim:

*Lực lượng liên quân do Mỹ đứng đầu vận thưởng xuyên phải hứng chịu các cuộc tấn công liên quan đến cuộc chiến I-rác, còn người dân I-rắc thì vất sòng trong điều lo, sợ hãi trước tình trạng bạo lực không ngừng gia tăng. Trong bối cảnh đó, làm sao Mỹ có thể rút quân khỏi I-rắc, bởi điều đó sẽ là don nồng giằng vào uy tín của nước Mỹ. Oa-sinh-ton cũng không thể đừng nhìn Bát-da rơi vào vòng ảnh hưởng của nước lăng gieng I-ran... (PA4).

In text 9, EU và Nga cũng có niềm tin hợp tác, where the writer demonstrates the success of EU-Russia meeting, he also admits its failure, but this contra-argument just provides readers with facts:

*Điều được xem là thất bại của EU tại hội nghị này là các nhà lãnh đạo châu Âu đã không thể thuyết phục Nga rút lại quyết định công nhận độc lập cho hai vùng lãnh thổ ly khai Nam Ossetia và Akhazia ở Gzuria.
Conclusion can be restatements of the thesis cited to be opposed and the thesis (in texts 4, 5, 9), or predictions of future events (text 10), recommendation (text 3). Conclusion is the place where the author implicitly shows his or her viewpoint of the action or event: what should be done, what is coming next.

To sum up, counter-argumentative pattern is realized in Vietnamese data as following:

Table 4.7. Realization of counter-argumentative patterns in Vietnamese data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone setter</th>
<th>Orientation:</th>
<th>Analysis/Weak persuasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis cited to be opposed</td>
<td>The opponent’s claim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A subjective description of the other side of the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.g. An event as a failure, an action as being important, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Writer’s evaluation on the issue, a neutral stance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of events from the third person’s viewpoint: An event as a success, an action as a cause of riots, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiation</td>
<td>Pro-arguments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts, evaluations, reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Restatement of thesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestion for solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prediction of future behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tone setters are background information, which, in some texts, are to set the tone for the whole text, but in others, just to set the scenes. Thesis-cited-to-be-opposed presenting the other side of a problem, e.g. a description of an event as a failure, or an action as being important is suppressed by writer’s claim (thesis). Thesis hardly shows, explicitly or implicitly, whether writers support or object to an issue, whether they think it is right or wrong, good or bad, what they feel. In other words, writers do not take stand. The claim is then substantiated by an avalanche of pro-arguments, interrupted with one or two contra-arguments, which consist reasons, evaluations and facts. Some arguments are void of reasons, just facts in subjective view. Conclusion restates the claim, then adds a further
evaluation; in some texts, there is a prediction of future behavior or a vague proposal for solutions. The process of argumentation, by nature, is often the analysis of the events, plus evaluation from writers as well as other sources.

**Pragmatic meaning of argumentative patterns**

In Vietnamese socio-political editorials, as it can be seen above, both counter-argumentation and through-argumentation are used. It is not necessary to completely destroy an opponent’s arguments to convince readers; recognizing the argument of the other side is acceptable. So it is not necessarily a norm for Vietnamese people to raise all arguments, both pro- and contra-arguments, in order to persuade others of their points. However, it would be a mistake to generalize this conclusion to all Vietnamese socio-political editorials; research on a larger scale is required to be done.

4.2.2. Argumentative linguistic devices

Almost all of the grammatical categories in the analytical framework (except for to-infinitives) are found in Vietnamese data. Infinitives are not a typical category in Vietnamese as Vietnamese verbs do not inflect or change morphologically. As Hinkel remarks *uninflected Asian languages do not have infinitive verb forms.* (Hinkel, 2002, p.115)

| Table 4.8. Uses of linguistic devices in Vietnamese data (ptws) |
Grammatical devices in the analytical framework appear with low or average mean frequency in Vietnamese data. Nominal clauses have the highest occurrences (8.37 ptws), followed by suasive verbs (7.15 ptws), necessity modals (5.69 ptws), prediction modals
(4.76 ptws), and conditional subordination (1.73 ptws). Other findings with quite high mean frequencies include intensifiers (6.58 ptws) and contrastive connectives (4.66 ptws).

4.2.2.1. Modals

In Vietnamese, modals are also of two types espitemic and deontic. Espitemic uses of modals expresses probability, frequency and deontic uses of modals concerns with obligation and inclination. (Ban, 2008, p.38-39). Modality system in Vietnamese is also realized by modal auxiliaries, modal verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and nouns.

Probability modals : có thể, có lẽ, có về như, dưới như, hình như, chắc
Necessity modals : cần, nên, phải, cần phải.

(Ban 2008, p. 494-495)

In fact, Ban does not categorize sẽ into prediction modal, but calls it ‘time marker’. Moreover, the study of its uses in the texts reveals that sẽ has similar functions to will in English- it is also used to pronounce future intention and logical prediction. So in the framework of this study, I will refer to sẽ as prediction modal, as the label time adverb cannot express its functions.

Modals found in Vietnamese data include prediction modal sẽ, probability modal adverbs có lẻ, có thể, chưa thể, không thể, chắc chắn, dưới như and necessity modal verbs cần, nên, phải, cần phải. Especially, there is one exceptional form for probability modals: chưa biết chứng, which can correspond to likely in English: Những Nếu chính phủ một không kịp thời đưa ra các đối sách hợp lý, mà mục tiêu quan trọng hàng đầu là hợp lòng dân, chưa biết chứng sống giờ sẽ tiếp tục nối lên với cường độ còn mạnh liệt hơn (PA 3). Modals occur with average mean frequency in Vietnamese editorials, and there is no marked difference among them. Necessity modals have the highest mean frequency of 5.686ptws; probability and time adverbs have quite similar mean frequency, 4.616 ptws and 4.757 ptws respectively. These modals are used to give writer’s recommendation, warning or prediction for future behavior.

i. Prediction modals predict future events or effects of events, making a claim or justification for the claim. Prediction modal sẽ can also be combined with other modals like có thể, chắc chắn, which explicitly indicate the degree of certainty or hedge the
prediction. Modal sẽ is present in all the texts, concentrating highly in some texts (3,4,10) with 7.85 ptws, 8.12 ptws, and 7.63 ptws; and lowly in others (text 1,8,9) with 2.54 ptws, 2.36 ptws, and 0.95 ptws. It is used in the thesis, substantiation, and conclusion to express writer’s comment on the situation. When used in thesis, it often expresses the other side’s comment. E.g. "Oa-sinh-tom đã là một trong những cuộc diễn biến, tình huống, ổn định và dân chủ cho đất nước “nghìn lẻ một đêm”" (PA5). In substantiation, it is used to give reasons for the claim. For example, in text 5, The costly war, the writer wants to demonstrate the high price Iraq, US, and the whole world have to pay for Iraq war, prediction modal is used four times in the substantiation to give reasons for his claim. E.g. "... nhưng cần báo nên kinh tế thế giới sẽ phát triển chậm lại... vì Tổng thống kế nhiệm và các thế hệ trong lai của nước Mỹ sẽ phải gánh chịu..." (TM5). In conclusion, writer uses prediction modal frequently to tell readers what, in his opinion, will happen next. E.g. "Và một điều chắc chắn rằng "cuộc chiến" lần này sẽ quyết liệt, bởi Nga thể hiện rõ quyết tâm không nhận những sức ép mạnh mẽ từ Mỹ và NATO" (PP10).

Pragmatically, it is doubtful whether writers want to give any recommendation or warning when use prediction modal, as his or her stance is not explicitly stated in thesis or throughout the texts. They just predict the events which are likely to come next, and let the readers decide what to think, and what to do.

**ii. Probability modals** (có lẽ, có thể, chưa thể, không thể, chắc chắn, đường như) discuss possible events or their consequences. They are found in almost all text (9/10). They have average frequencies around mean, except in texts 8,9 where they have just 1.28 ptws and 2.85 ptws respectively. Of all probability modals, có thể and không thể, the modals with median value on the continuum, are the most common forms found in the data, accounting for 84.19%. Despite their better frequency, these two modals are absent in two texts (texts 6, 7). Meanwhile, modals chắc chắn, the modal with highest value, and có lẽ the modal with lowest value on the continuum, are rarely used (10.92% and 4.9% respectively). These two modals scatter in two or three texts (texts 5, 10 for chắc chắn; texts 1, 2, 9 for có lẽ).

**Graph 4.9**
Probability modals are used in the thesis (texts 1, 9, 10), reasons for the claim (9/10 texts), and conclusion (texts 1, 3, 5, 10). Probability modals are also used to moderate the claim, acting as hedge and keeping the author from full responsibility for the truth value of the proposition. In thesis, probability modals tell writers’ general assessment on the events in question. E.g. Những hồi nghĩ có thể được đánh giá thành công... (PP 9). In substantiation, probability modals are used to express writers’ comment, supporting the general comment made in the thesis. For example, in text 3 ‘Sóng gió xung quanh thỏa thuận thải bỏ Mỹ’, the writer shows how worse situation in Korea after the beef trade deal with US, he uses two probability modals in substantiation to express his evaluation of the situation: Làn sóng biểu tình lan rộng tới mục nơi các của tổng thống... có thể sẽ phải từ chức đồng loạt. ...Đề định này có thể chỉ được xem là liệu pháp tạm thời nhằm hạ nhiệt cơ sát hiện nay (PA3). Probability modals are quite frequent in conclusion, present in four out of ten texts. They are used to indicate writers’ comment on current issue in a tentative way, or on the likelihood of what will happen next, together with prediction modals. For example, in text 10, Phương Tây rời rơi trong quan hệ với Nga (Western is divided in relationship with Russia), the writer displays his evaluation on future relationship between Russia and Western countries, based on current situation: Và một điều chắc chắn rằng”cuộc chiến” lần này sẽ quyết liệt, bởi Nga thể hiện rõ quyết tâm không nhận những trước sức ép mạnh mẽ
On the other hand, in text 1, Lâm chọn bất đặc biệt, (unwanted choice), the writer justifies his comment on Afghan government’s decision to compromise with Taliban as unwanted. He concludes by adding to the comment that the decision is necessary but in a hedged manner by using probability modal có lẽ. That is, he implicitly expresses his stance on the issue- supporting the decision: Có điều, trong bối cảnh hiện nay, khi liên quân assume sức với gánh nặng tái thiết an ninh và kinh tế ở quốc gia này thì đây có lẽ là quyết định cần thiết (PA1).

In short, probability modals are moderately used in Vietnamese socio-political editorials to indicate writers’ certainty in his claim, mostly expressing writers’ tentative evaluation on the issue. They can be used to make claim, arguments for the claim, and conclusion. They rarely indicate writers’ stance on the issue explicitly.

iii. Necessity modals (cần,cần thiết, phải, cần phải) are present in almost all texts (except for text 6). In some texts, they cluster as many as 15.21 ptws, 12.56 ptws, 10.44 ptws (texts 3,4,5 respectively). In others, they have as low frequency as 3.39 ptws, 3.81 ptws (texts 1, 7). Of all, phải accounts for 83% ; it is found in nine out of ten texts (except for text 6). Cần and cần phải take up 14.04%; they are present in five out of ten texts (1, 7, 8, 9, 10).

Graph 4.10

Uses of necessity modals in Vietnamese data
Phải is mostly used in Vietnamese texts as a modal of external or objective obligation, i.e. the obligation seems to come from an uncontrollable external source that compels the action (corresponding to have to in English). At the same time, it is often used to convey writer’s assessment of the event—whether the event is desirable or not, or to communicate writer’s certainty towards the claim, and. No instance of phải conveys the idea that the speaker/writer is in authority, so it is not often used to manipulate readers in my data. For example, Vô quyết định của ông Bu-sơ…, nước Mỹ sẽ phải tiếp tục can dự ở I-rác (PA5). This sentence shows the writer’s judgement of future situation—his substantial certainty for the action to take place, at the same time the obligation and undesirability of the action tiếp tục can dự ở I-rác to the actor nước Mỹ. In many cases, on the other hand, the indication of writer’s certainty for the claim is not clear. For example, in text 8 cuộc khủng hoảng ở Zimbabwe, (Zimbabwe’s crisis), the writer uses two instances of necessity modal phải to support for his claim that the Zimbabwe’s crisis is getting worse. E.g. Từ chỗ trước đây là một vựa lúa của miền nam châu Phi, hiện nay 60 % dân số trong số 12 triệu dân nước này phải sống phụ thuộc vào cấu trúc lương thực của nước ngoài (PP8). This statement expresses the writer’s evaluation on the undesirability and obligation of the action sống phụ thuộc vào cấu trúc lương thực của nước ngoài for the actor 60 % dân số. The obligation comes from an external or objective source—cuộc khủng hoảng ở Zimbabwe. As we can see, writer’s certainty of his claim is not stated.

Cần, cần thiết are used to express the necessity for the events to take place. In most cases, cần thiết shows writers’ judgement on the event as necessary, but indicates no obligation. E.g… chính phủ Áp-ga-ni-xtan lại thu hồi sự trợ giúp cần thiết từ lực lượng liên quân. Cần communicates the obligation of the action, but mostly from other sources, and used to support writers’ claim. E.g. …các quốc gia EU đã nhận ra thực tế rằng, Moscow không chỉ là đối thủ cạnh tranh mà cần là đối tác tạo tiền trong chính sách của khối này. Here the obligation comes from các quốc gia EU, not from the writer. The only instance of cần used to express obligation from other sources, but as writer’s disguised suggestion for future behavior is in text 7: Đưa luận cho rằng trong bối cảnh hiện nay, cộng đồng quốc tế cần thân trọng, tránh can thiệp thô bạo công việc nội bộ của Zimbabwe,… (PP8). Seen from pragmatic perspective, this is also the only proposal in my data. However, the proposal
does not come from the writer himself, but from a very vague source Dự luận, making the illocutionary force weaker.

In short, despite their prevalent presence in the texts, necessity modals are hardly used as a tool in persuasion. The most common form of necessity modals in use is phải, then cần; Phái is used to express the undesirability of the action/event for the actor, at the same time the objectivity of the obligation; cần is used as judgment on the necessity of the events but not for persuasive effects, or as recommendation or suggestion from sources other than the writer.

iv. To sum up, modals are used as linguistic devices for argumentation in Vietnamese socio-political editorials with average mean frequencies. They predict potential and possible future behaviors, the necessity of certain actions or events. They are used to express writer’s comment on the situation, but rarely for persuasive or manipulative effects. Pragmatically, they are also used for recommendation or warning, but not popular.

4.2.2.2. Suasive verbs

According to Ban (2008), Vietnamese verbs do have such a class called ‘dộng từ khiển động’ corresponding to so called suasive verbs in English. These verbs are also mandative, causative and express both direct and indirect directives. They include: bắt (ép), bước, bức, cần, cảm, chỉ bảo, cho phép, cố vụ, cưỡng bức, cưỡng ép, dạy, để nghị, đối, đối hỏi, ép, ép bước, giữ, giúp, giúp đỡ, hưởng dân, hò hào, kêu gọi, khuyến báo, khuyến răn, kinh lê, kiến, khuyến khích, kích thích, lãnh đạo, mời, nài ép, nài nị, nài xin, gắng, gắng cần, sai, thúc, thúc đẩy, thuyết phục, xin, yêu cầu, etc. (Ban, 2008, p.151). These verbs require object to be followed, e.g. Giám đốc buộc nói nghị việc. Another class of suasive verbs which represent ‘intention to bring about changes in the future’ can be expressed by such verbs as ‘cam kết, hứa hẹn, đề xuất, quyết định, v.v’

Suasive verbs present in Vietnamese data include kiến quyết, cho phép, đồng ý, để nghị, kêu gọi, tuyên bố, cam kết, etc. This kind of verbs has quite high frequency in Vietnamese editorials, 7.147ptws. They spread widely on a range of 15.92, with 68% lies between
2.458 ptws and 11.83 ptws. They concentrate highly in some texts (texts 8, 9, 10), especially text 9 where they have a frequency of 15.92 ptws. In others, they cluster around 4 to 6 ptws. One text (6) is void of these verbs. Suasive verbs have illocutionary forces of indirect directives, and commissives. However, they are not used in Vietnamese texts to manipulate readers, influencing or controlling readers’ behavior. Instead, they are used as reporting verbs, providing information to support the writer’s claim. For example, text 9 ‘Nga và EU cùng có niềm tin hợp tác’ (Russia and EU reinforce beliefs for cooperation), contains a quite large number of suasive verbs. This text expresses the writer’s evaluation of Russia-EU relationship as being cooperative. Suasive verbs act as reporting verbs to give evidence for the claim:

EC quyết định cử một phái đoàn tới Moscow vào đầu năm tới chuẩn bị các vòng...Nga nhiều lần đề nghị các đối tác châu Âu thảo luận vấn đề NMD, ...Moscow cam kết ủng hộ đề xuất của Pháp về việc cản ngăn thực thi bất kỳ bước đi nào nhắm làm thay đổi tình hình ..Tổng thống Nga D.Medvedev kêu gọi tất cả các bên liên quan cuộc tranh cãi hiện nay về hệ thống tên lửa ở châu Âu tránh các "biên pháp đơn phương" và hướng tới một thỏa thuận quốc tế về an ninh châu Âu (PP 9).

4.2.2.3. Conditional subordination

Conditional sentences in Vietnamese have the structure as Nếu + subordinate clause, thì + main clause. Subordinate clause is filled with hypothesis or condition and signalled by nếu, giá mà, hé, miên, etc. Main clause shows the consequence as triggered by potential facts in subordinate clause and is signalled by thì. There is no distinction between three types of conditionals. There is only one form to express all three meaning of real, unreal at present and unreal in the past. (Ban, 2008)

Conditional subordination occurs less frequently in Vietnamese socio-political editorials, with a mean frequency of just 1.733ptws. It spreads on a small range of 5.00, with small SD of 1.413. Three of the texts (2, 5, 9) are deprived of this construction. It densely occurs five times in one text (9), but in another (text 1), there is only one instance of it. This construction consists of two clauses, If - clause and main clause whose verb has either
future time marker sẽ or none. When used with sẽ, the whole construction will have a function of prediction. This indicates the process of logical reasoning: form a potential situation and predict its result based on the author’s knowledge of the world and of cause-effect chain. E.g. Nếu không có “vòng kiểm tòa” bằng sáng dan của đội quân Mỹ, những nhóm sắc tộc ở I-rắc sẽ ngay lập tức lao vào cuộc quyết đấu tranh giành ảnh hưởng và lợi ích từ các mô đầu liễu (PA 4). In some cases (in texts 1, 7, 10), conditionals do not have meaning of prediction; conditional subordinates set up discourse context for the situation in main clause. E.g. Nếu chỉ nhìn từ góc độ này thì Nga chỉ chiếm ưu thế so với châu Âu,...(PP10). Especially, in only one case, conditional construction expresses the contrast between the propositions in the two clauses: Nếu La-pa-xơ và Caracas công kích Washington là điều không may ngay nhiên, thì thái độ của Buenos Aires đáng chú ý ...(PP6).

Graph 4.11

Uses of conditional subordination in Vietnamese data

Pre: Prediction  DC: Setting up discourse context  C: Contrast
No instance of conditionals is found to make thesis, just one instance is used to make conclusion, the rest are used to substantiate the thesis. In substantiation, conditionals express other sources’ or writers’ evaluation of the events, their prediction of what will likely happen, in order to support their claim. For example, in text 10 ‘Phương Tây bội rối trong quan hệ với Nga (Western countries are confused in dealing with Russia), five instances of conditionals are found. The writer demonstrates the point ‘Western countries are divided in their attitudes and reactions to Russia.’ Conditional sentences are used to express other sources’ and writer’s view that punishment on Russia will only backfire on Western countries, which serves as reasons why Western leaders hesitate in punishing Russia on Gruzia’ issue:

D.Medvedev cảnh báo phương Tây sẽ thiệt hại nếu áp đặt tình trạng phạt Nga vì Gruzia; Bơi lẽ, G8 sẽ hoạt động không hiệu quả nếu không có sự tham gia của Nga... Nếu điều này xảy ra (Nga hạn chế hợp tác với NATO trong vấn đề Afghanistan), hoạt động tiếp tế hàng hóa cho liên quân tại Afghanistan sẽ gặp khó khăn. ]...NATO sẽ thiệt hại nếu hạn chế quan hệ với Moscow. (PP 10)

In conclusion, conditionals are used to express writer’s evaluation on what will happen next as the result of a projected situation: Những nếu chính phủ mới không kịp thời đưa ra các đòi sách hợp lý, mà mục tiêu quan trọng hàng đầu là hợp lòng dân, chưa biết đường sống giờ sẽ tiếp tục lời với cường độ còn mạnh liêp hơn (PP3). Writer’s stance is not explicitly stated as to what should be done. But it implicitly suggests that the government should have reasonable policies in dealing with the situation; otherwise the situation will get worse.

Pragmatically, conditional constructions act as warning or recommendation when they project adversative consequences. However, these illocutionary forces are infrequent, just limited to three instances totally (text 3, 9). For example, in text 9: Quan hệ Nga - NATO không quá căng thẳng để nginstead hợp tác và NATO sẽ thiệt hại nếu hạn chế quan hệ với Moscow (PP9). The writer implies a warning against the punishment of Russia when he predicts its backwash impact on NATO. In text 3, conditional construction in the conclusion acts both as a warning and a recommendation: Nếu nếu chính phủ mới không
kip thời đưa ra các đối sách hợp lý, mà mục tiêu quan trọng hàng đầu là hợp lòng dân, chưa biết chúng sống giờ sẽ tiếp tục nổi lên với cuồng độ còn mạnh liệt hơn (PA3).

In short, conditional clause projects potential situations, the main clause predicts their possible results; or conditional clause sets up discourse context for the event in main clause. They are used to give other sources or writer’s comment on situation, supporting the claim. These constructions are not often used in thesis statement, but mostly in substantiation, and conclusion. Pragmatically, they can serve the function of warning or recommendation.

4.2.2.4. Nominal clauses

Nominal clauses is not a typical grammatical categories in Vietnamese, however, in Vietnamese, the phenomenon for this grammatical structure is câu xã ảnh (‘projection’). (Ban, 2008, p. 331). Projection clauses come after such verbs as reporting verbs like báo cáo, thuật lại, and mental verbs like nghe thấy, hiểu, cho rằng, nghĩ rằng. Projection clauses are introduced either implicitly or explicitly with particle rằng, là.

Nominal clauses have an average mean frequency of 8.371 ptws. They are present in all the ten texts. The use of nominal clauses is quite even across Vietnamese texts: texts 8, 9 have highest number of these constructions (9 and 10 respectively); texts 2, 5 have the lowest number (2 and 3 respectively). Nominal clauses occur mostly in verb complement position (87.61%); very few in adjective complement and subject complement (3.75% and 8.64 respectively), no instances are found in preposition complement or subject position. As a verb complement, nominal clauses are either implicitly or explicitly introduced by particle rằng when coming after reporting verbs, viz. tuyên bố, khẳng định, thông báo, cho biết etc; susasive verbs, viz. cáo buộc, kêu gọi, khuyến cáo, etc; intellectual and mental verbs, viz. thấy, cho rằng, tin, biết. They are introduced by là, rằng when occurring in subject complement position.
Verbal Complement: Verb Complement; Adjective Complement: Adjective complement; Subject Complement: Subject complement

The use of nominal clauses after reporting verbs, private verbs, or suasive verbs helps the author to display knowledge of the field or cite the evaluation from other sources, especially from authoritative sources. In subject complement position, nominal clauses allow the author to explain the idea more clearly and in a detached manner. These constructions can be used in thesis, substantiation, and conclusion. In thesis, using nominal clauses keep writers from being involved in the proposition. E.g. "Tiếng Nhật, điểm nổi bật tại hội nghị là hai bên thương luận và thống nhất nhiều vấn đề trong quan hệ song phương, cũng có lồng tinh tiếp tục thực duy hợp tác" (PP9). In this statement, nominal clauses in subject complement position provide the propositional content for the evaluating words in the subject 'điểm nổi bật'. In substantiation, nominal clauses elaborate information and evaluation from other sources, providing evidence and reasons for writer’s claim. For example, text 10 ‘Phương Tây bị rối trong quan hệ với Nga’ (Russia is confused in relationship with Russia) expresses the writer’s judgement of Western’s attitude toward Russia. Nominal clauses are used to provide evidence for the writer’s claim that Western
countries are divided in dealing with Russia. They are not used to steer readers to any stance: Anh cho rằng, [EU cần "phát đi một thông điệp mạnh mẽ và thống nhất", ủng hộ toàn vẹn lãnh thổ của Gruzia và lên án các hoạt động của Nga ở Gruzia...] Pháp và Đức khẳng định [Nga vẫn là đối tác quan trọng của EU...]. In text 6, the writer demonstrates that South American countries are getting divorced from US, he cites the comment from Bolivia’s President: Tổng thống Bolivia... cho rằng, [lấn đầu trong lịch sử các nước Nam Mỹ đã tạo quyết định những vấn đề của khu vực](PP 6). This adds validity to writer’s claim.

In conclusion (text 2, 6, 7, 8, 10), writers guide readers’ behavior by citing the viewpoint from authoritative or vague sources like giới phân tích, dự luận. E.g. Dự luận hy vọng cuộc khủng hoảng chính phủ ở Ukraine sớm được giải quyết ổn thỏa, đặc biệt trong bối cảnh tình hình khu vực có nhiều bất ổn (PP7). Writers’ viewpoint is not directly stated in these statements.

Pragmatically, nominal clauses are also used to give recommendation but in a blurring manner, and with weak effects. The propositional content is almost never specific and clear-cut in meaning, and they are attributed to vague sources, too.

To sum up, nominal clauses are often used in Vietnamese socio-political editorials as a linguistic device in argumentation to increase the validity of the argumentation. They can occur in subject complement, verb complement or adjective complement positions. In these positions, they function to elaborate information or provide evaluation in a detached tone, making claim, reasons for the claim, and conclusion. They are also used to express writer’s viewpoint, or influence readers’ behavior, but in a vague manner.

4.2.3. Subconclusion

Socio-political editorials in Vietnamese opt for both patterns: through-argumentative and counter-argumentative. Further look at the sub-arguments shows that counter-argumentation is not so popular as through-argumentation. In both patterns, tone-setters mostly provide background information, either to set the scene, or to set the tone for the argumentation. In thesis or thesis-cited-to-be-opposed, two sides of an issue are presented, but no stand is taken, no emotion is expressed, and no attitude is shown. Substantiation in
through-argumentation consists of pro-arguments, including reasons, which are not necessarily obligatory, facts and evaluations. In counter-argumentation, it is made up of both pro-arguments which are dominant, and contra-arguments. Conclusion restates the claim or counter-claim, makes further evaluation, or gives weak proposals. The process of argumentation is more for the presentation of analysis and evaluation of events, rather than for the manipulation of readers.

Persuasive languages in the framework are not very frequent: nominal clauses ranks the highest in the frequency list, then suasive verbs, necessity modals, probability modals, prediction modals in the middle, and conditional subordinations at the bottom. Nevertheless, suasive verbs and necessity modals are not used for persuasive effects in the texts. These linguistic devices are employed to express writers’ evaluation on the issue as neutral stance, rather than to take position. They are rarely used to influence readers’s behaviors or the influence is so blurring that it is hardly recognized.

4.3. Similarities and differences in argumentation in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials

4.3.1. Similarities

4.3.1.1. Argumentative patterns

Counter-argumentation and through-argumentation are both found in English and Vietnamese texts. Texts with through-argumentative macro-pattern in the two languages consist of four main parts: tone-setter, thesis, substantiation, and conclusion. Texts with counter-argumentative macro-patterns in the two languages consist of five main parts: tone-setter, thesis cited to be opposed, thesis, substantiation, and conclusion. Tone-setter in both English and Vietnamese represents some kind of background information. Thesis expresses writers’ comment on the issue. Thesis cited to be opposed in the two languages is introduced by the same connective: contrastive. Substantiation provides reasons, and evidences for the claim made in thesis. In both languages, texts with counter-argumentative pattern present contra-arguments in their substantiation. Conclusion in English and
Vietnamese texts is the restatement of the claim or counter-claim, prediction of near future behavior, and recommendations.

4.3.1.2. Argumentative linguistic devices

Almost all linguistic devices in the analytical framework, which occur in English texts, are found in Vietnamese texts: prediction modal, probability modal, necessity modals, conditional subordination, suasive verbs, and nominal clauses. They are used to express evaluation on the events in a moderate, tentative or detached manner, which make claim, evidence for the claim, or conclusion. Pragmatically, they make prediction or recommendation. Both English modals and Vietnamese modals spread on a wide range and are distributed with a marked variation across the texts. They express writers’ judgement of possibility, potentiality and necessity of an action. This would make illocutionary forces of prediction, recommendation or warning. Conditional subordinations are also used in English and Vietnamese texts for these functions. The use of conditional If makes these illocutionary forces softer, distancing the author from the commitment to the truth value of the proposition. Nominal clauses, which occur with high frequency in English texts, are also found in Vietnamese texts. They are often used to provide information and evaluation in an objective manner, which serve as the claim, reasons or evidence for the claim; or as conclusion.

4.3.2. Differences

4.3.2.1. Argumentative patterns

English and Vietnamese texts show different trends in using argumentative pattern, i.e. English texts strongly prefer counter-argumentation while Vietnamese texts can follow either of the types. Even in texts with through-argumentative macro-pattern, arguments against the author’s claim (contra-arguments) are also presented in the substantiation and in conclusion. The concession of the opponent’s arguments in English texts is seen to make the argumentation sound fair, thus more persuasive. On the contrary, in Vietnamese texts, five texts have macro-pattern of through-argumentation, and the other five have counter-argumentation as macro-pattern. Texts with through-argumentative macro-pattern contain
no contra-arguments in their substantiation. Contra-arguments are only found in texts with counter-argumentative pattern and they are mostly statements of facts imparted with writer’s comment. The inclusion of the other side’s arguments does not necessarily enhance the persuasive effect of the argumentation in Vietnamese. Through-argumentation, which can be deprived of contra-arguments, still has perfectly persuasive effect.

Moreover in English argumentation, the writer take the position in the thesis, which is then supported by reasons, facts and evaluations in the substantiation. The goal is to influence readers’ behavior – to encourage/discourage them to act, to change their way of thinking and behaving, to get things done to rectify current situation. Meanwhile, in Vietnamese, no standpoint is defined, the argumentation is to demonstrate the situation as described in the thesis. Little or no attempts made to manipulate readers’ behavior.

The realization of through-argumentation and counter-argumentation in English and Vietnamese texts is different to a certain extent. Tone-setter in both patterns in English texts is always imparted with or implied the author’s attitude. For example,

*Does this sound familiar? Muslim men are stripped in front of female guards and sexually humiliated. A prisoner is made to wear a dog’s collar and leash, another is hooded with women’s underwear. Others are shackled in stress positions for hours, held in isolation for months, and threatened with attack dogs. These atrocities were committed in the interrogation centers in American military prisons in Iraq, Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.* (IHT8)

It is clearly seen that the tone-setter implicitly shows the author’s frustration and opposition toward the event ‘Muslim prisoners being tortured by Americans’. We can tell this from such linguistic clues as value-laden words (atrocities, nightmare, sexually humiliated) and structures (passive construction). On the other hand, tone setter in Vietnamese text can just be pure background information. In the following tone-setter, no linguistic clues are found to tell about the author’s opinion toward the event ‘EU’s meeting to discuss about the conflict between Russia and Gruzia’:
Thesis in English editorials clearly states the writer or the other side’s position toward the event- whether they support or oppose an opinion. The rest of the text then serves to fight for the writer’s position. For example, the following claim made by the writer in text 10 clearly states his opposition toward the claim that increased religious orthodoxy promote violence and intolerance: *Our research on the haji pilgrimage to Mecca suggests this association is wrong* (IHT10). On the contrary, thesis in Vietnamese texts shows none of the author’s stance, just his evaluation or analysis of the situation from the perspective of a stand-by person. For example, the following claim made by the writer in text 8 indicates his comment on Zimbabwe’s crisis as ‘getting worse’, the rest of the text demonstrates how worse the crisis: *Trong bối cảnh ấy, việc Chính phủ bất chấp mọi sức ép, tuyên bố vận tien hành cuộc bầu cử Tổng thống vòng hai vào ngày 27-6 đã khiến tình hình Zimbabwe thêm căng thẳng* (PP8). As it can be seen, the writer does not take any stand on this issue.

Substantiation is differently realized. In English editorials, whether the pattern is through-argumentation or counter-argumentation, its substantiation consists of both pro-arguments and contra-arguments, which together serve to enhance the acceptability of the claim. Meanwhile, in Vietnamese editorials, texts with macro-pattern as through-argumentation rarely include contra-arguments; arguments against the claim are just found in texts with counter-argumentative macro-pattern, but with very few instances. For example, in English, text 8 ‘What FBI agents saw during US. Interrogations’ which has through-argumentative macro-pattern, but one contra-argument is still found: *Bush claims interrogations produced invaluable intelligence*. This argument counteracts the claim that US officials abuse Iraq prisoners, which should be denounced.

Conclusion in English socio-political editorials mostly reassert in a different way or make explicit writer’s standpoint on the issue, serving to overtly influence or control readers’ behavior. For example, text 7, Obama’s courageous speech on race and religion’, where the
writer praise the tactful handling of the sensitive issues in Obama’s speech, he concludes with a strong assertion: *What is evident, though, is that he not only cleared the air over a particular controversy—he raised the discussion to a higher plane* (IHT7). The strong effect of this concluding sentence, together with the demonstration throughout the text, has great influence on readers, who have probably not been convinced by Obama’s talent and skill and now will change their mind. Meanwhile, in Vietnamese texts, it just repeats the claim with a slight change, and expresses the evaluation of the issue by the writer or other sources without any explicit standpoint. Except for two cases where the manipulation is explicit, but the illocutionary force is weak and blurring. For example, in text 2 “Sân sau” nói sông” where the writer demonstrates the tense relationship between US and Latin American countries, the conclusion are statements of evaluation, writer’s standpoint is not explicitly displayed: “*Sự bày tỏ đoàn kết của một số nước trong khu vực với hành động của Vê-nê-xu-ê-la và Bô-li-vi-a cho thấy, Nam Mỹ đã không đơn độc trong xử thế đối đầu với Mỹ. Người ta vẫn đang chứng kiến một châu Mỹ-la-tinh đang đi ngược chiều với mong muốn của với Mỹ* (PA2).

Pragmatically, in English socio-political editorials, the use of through-argumentative pattern, where the other side’s views are not counted, violates the politeness norm of texts, so is unacceptable. Even in texts with through-argumentative macro-pattern, the opponent’s arguments are still represented at micro-level. However, in Vietnamese socio-political editorials, both patterns are acceptable. Admitting some merits of the opponent is also one way of creating fairness; however, it is not always the case. In general, through-argumentative pattern is still preferred, if considered at both macro-level and micro-level.

4.3.2. 2. Argumentative linguistic devices

In general, argumentative linguistic devices presented in the analytical frame score much higher. Prediction modals in English are more frequent than in Vietnamese by 2.62 ptws. In English they concentrates densely in most texts, but in Vietnamese, they scatter across the texts. Probability modals in English texts are twice as big as that in Vietnamese texts. However, necessity modals in English are less frequent than in Vietnamese texts by 2.69 ptws. Conditionals have higher frequency in English than in Vietnamese texts by 1.98 ptws. Nominal clauses represent a much higher frequency of 12.69 ptws in English socio-
political editorials compared with Vietnamese counterparts, 8.37 ptws. As suasive verbs occur with very low frequency in English; and when occur in Vietnamese texts, suasive verbs are used like reporting verbs, they will not be discussed here.

Table 4. Uses of linguistic devices in English and Vietnamese data (ptws)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic devices</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction modals</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>5.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability modals</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>5.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity modals</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional subordinations</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal clauses</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In English texts, these linguistic devices are used to explicitly express writers’ standpoint on the issue - whether he is in favor of or object to the issue, but in a moderate or tentative manner. English texts are pervaded with writer’s opinion on what will happen, what is possible to happen, and what is required to happen. They project potential situation more often than Vietnamese texts, which can be told from higher frequency of conditionals in English texts than in Vietnamese ones. In English texts, writers clearly state their attitude and stance while stay uninvolved. The evidence is that they use many more infinitive constructions and nominal clauses to provide information and evaluation to support the writer’s claim. The evaluation is often attributed to other sources rather than the writers, giving more validity and objectivity to writer’s claim. Besides, these two constructions can contain false subject or inanimate subject, which help express the writer’s viewpoint in a
detached way. Together, these linguistic devices interweave to gear readers to a certain direction which is favorable to writers’ stance. They persuade readers to adopt the writer’s viewpoint, or to shape readers’ future behavior.

On the other hand, in Vietnamese texts, modals are employed mostly to evaluate and analyze the events under the case; the force of persuading or manipulating readers is weak and only realized in conclusion, but not often. The discussion of future or possible events, the necessity of actions are not very frequent. Necessity modals are not often used to issue obligation from writer or the other side; but to communicate that the events are undesirable for the actor. Nominal clauses are also frequent, but less than in English texts. When used to persuade readers, nominal clauses express viewpoint from authoritative or vague sources to keep writers from responsibility for their statements.

Pragmatically, such illocutionary forces as recommendation, warning, or prediction are pervasive in English texts. They are realized by any of the linguistic factor in the framework, and they can be enacted in thesis, substantiation, and conclusion. However, these illocutionary forces are very rare in Vietnamese texts, restricted to two or three instances.

For example, in English text 2 ‘Playing the Games’, the writer aims to persuade readers that ‘A boycott of the Beijing Olympics would do assorted global causes more harm than good.’ He presents various potential future consequences of the boycott and possible arguments for and against the boycott of the Beijing Olympics; and finally makes the proposal that Beijing Olympics cannot be boycotted. Necessity modal should are used four times, together with conditional subordination to make and reassert the claim ‘if (the protests) are not handled correctly, we should boycott (the Olympics). Prediction modal would is used to make counter-claim...But a boycott would backfire miserably... . Prediction modals and probability modals together are used in the substantiation to provide reasons for claims ‘a boycott will gain support among Chinese liberals’ and counter-claims ‘a boycott will cost activists whatever ongoing leverage they have over China’, ‘activists almost surely would lose any interaction with Chinese officials’. ‘a boycott will only turn them against the West’, ‘Nepal has done the same, sometimes brutally, …will clear and secure the Everest route for the Olympic’. Probability modals are used to give writer’s
recommendation ‘Only a combination of tough public shaming, ...not ostracism, can produce results’, ‘Today, China can no longer be ignored’. Nominal clauses (sections in []) are used to cite evaluation from other sources ‘Press watchdog Reporters Without Borders’, ‘Some foreign activists’, ‘ill Savitt, director of the activist group Dream for Darfur’ to increase the validity of writer’s claim. As we can see, the combined use of these features provide the overall structure of the argument in the text, identifying possible alternatives and the author’s stance towards them, influencing and controlling readers’ behavior: Those who are impending a boycott should give up their intention, as a boycott will do more harm than good.

On the other hand, the example of Vietnamese text 3 ‘Sóng gió xung quanh thoả thuận thịt bò Mỹ’ (Rioting around US-Korea beef trade deal) indicates that these linguistic devices are used more for expository than persuasive function. They are used to express the writer’s evaluation and analysis of the event. They are not used to steer readers to the writer’s position. Writer’s own viewpoint on the issue is not displayed until the conclusion, where conditional sentence performs the function of giving recommendation. The text uses quite many modals to convey the writer’s judgement of the situation in Korea. Modal sẽ occurs three times to talk about the possible consequences of the demonstration and opposition against the deal, which provide evidence for the claim, and conclusion. Modal có thể, chưa chắc, chưa biết chắc occur five times together; however, four out of five are used to hedge the author’s claim. Modal phải occurs six times, but all of the uses are to express the undesirability of the events for the actor. Conditional ‘nếu’ construction occurs twice with the same propositional content. Together, these linguistic devices are used to draw a picture of the violent situation in Korea. Two instances of conditional nếu and modal sẽ serve as warnings and proposals; but these illocutionary forces are vague and weak. Nominal clauses occur just twice, providing evaluation in a detached manner – by using inanimate subject ‘Những diễn biến nóng böm hiện nay cho thấy’, or by attributing to other sources ‘Một số nhà phân tích’ (some analysts). Together, these linguistic devices are used to demonstrate that the situation in Korean after the beef trade deal with US is violent. Only in conclusion part, conditional subordination and prediction modal work together to express writer’s recommendation, with an aim to influence readers (Korean government), or just tell readers in general what will possibly happen next.
To sum up, English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials display significant differences in argumentation patterns as well as using linguistic devices. Counter-argumentation is a norm in these genres in English, but in Vietnamese, it seems that through-argumentation is preferred. Linguistic devices such as modals, conditionals, nominal clauses, and to-infinitives are frequently used in English to clearly express writer’s attitude, emotion, and opinion in a detached manner. They work together in the texts to serve the purpose of persuasion and manipulation. In Vietnamese, they are also used to give comment but to analyze and interpret the events, not to manipulate readers. The act of persuading, if any, is delayed until the conclusion but attributed to other sources. Socio-political editorials in both languages prefer languages of low and median value to moderate their claims, to avoid full responsibility from what are expressed. Vietnamese texts often refer to authoritative sources to increase the validity of argumentation, and to other vague sources like ‘đề luận’ to avoid commitment to the truth value of the proposition.
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Main findings and conclusion

My study is aimed to find out to what extent argumentation in English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials differ and resemble. That is, to investigate what argumentation pattern is preferred by the two languages; and what and how linguistic devices are frequently used for argumentation. For this purpose, a framework is made to include two argumentative patterns, through-argumentative and counter-argumentative, and five major grammatical devices: modals, suasive verbs, conditionals, nominal clauses, and to-infinitives. Twenty socio-political editorials in the two languages makes the corpus for the study. The findings reveal that, argumentation in Vietnamese socio-political editorials is much less persuasive than English counter-parts, if seen from English perspective.

5.1.1. Argumentative patterns

In English

- English socio-political editorials display a marked trend for counter-argumentation. The acceptability of one viewpoint is not just enhanced by pro-arguments, but contra-arguments as well.
- The process of argumentation persists in persuading readers to adopt writer’s viewpoint.
- Pragmatically, English socio-political editorials follow the norm of text politeness, avoid imposing and unfair in argumentation.

In Vietnamese

- Vietnamese socio-political editorials recognize both counter-argumentative and through-argumentative patterns as acceptable; but through-argumentative pattern is preferred.
• The argumentation is aimed to analyze the situation.
• Pragmatically, argumentation is not necessarily fair and unimposing. One-sided arguments can perfectly work.

5.1.2. Argumentative linguistic devices

In English

• Linguistic devices serving the persuasive effect include prediction modals, probability modals, necessity modals, conditional subordinations, nominal clauses, to-infinitives. They occur in English texts with high frequencies, except for necessity modals and conditionals with moderate frequencies.
• They are used to express writer’s stance and to argue for it in a tentative or moderate, detached manner. Together, these devices act to persuade readers to opt for a certain viewpoint, to alter their deep-rooted belief, and to take action.
• Pragmatically, these linguistic devices are frequently employed to produce warning, predicting or recommending effect.

In Vietnamese

• Linguistic devices in the analytical framework occur with low or average frequencies in Vietnamese socio-political editorials. Nominal clauses have the highest occurrences, followed by suasive verbs, necessity modals, prediction modals, probability modals, and conditionals.
• These devices are employed to indicate writer’s as well as other sources’ comment and evaluation on the events, in a tentative, moderate and detached manner. It is obvious that these linguistic devices are mostly used to evaluate and analyze the events, rather than inducing readers to take actions, or to change their mind.
• Pragmatically, these devices are rarely employed to create warning, recommending forces.
5.1.3. Similarities and differences

Similarities

- Both argumentative patterns are found in English and Vietnamese data.
- Tone-setter present background information, thesis expresses writer’s evaluation and evidence, substantiation provides reasons and evidences to support the thesis, and conclusion reassert the thesis or give recommendation.
- Linguistic devices occur in English texts are found in Vietnamese texts, to include: prediction modals, probability modals, necessity modals, conditional subordination, and nominal clauses.
- These linguistic devices express writer’s opinion on what will happen or possible to happen, communicate writer’s evaluation of the events in a tentative, moderate or, detached manner; or cite other sources’ comment to support writer’s claim.

Differences

- The marked difference in argumentation between English and Vietnamese socio-political editorials is that English texts always set aside some space for arguments of the other side, even in texts with macro-pattern as through-argumentation. On the contrary, Vietnamese texts can often exclude the opponent’s view in their argumentation while stays completely acceptable. It seems that through-argumentation is preferred, rather than counter-argumentation.
- Pragmatically, it is a cultural norm in English that the argumentation must be fair and unimposing; while in Vietnamese, it is not necessary.
- In English texts, the author clearly takes the stand on the issue, claiming it is right or wrong and justifies it, using linguistic devices as presented above. More illocutionary forces of recommendation, warning or prediction are found. The goal is to manipulate readers to support the writer’s position. On the other hand, in Vietnamese texts, the author avoids expressing her or his slanting stance, just
shows his or her comment and evaluation on the issue. The manipulative function is sometimes enacted in the conclusion but in a vague manner.

5.2. Implications

The findings of this study suggest that Vietnamese people, especially journalists, when writing in English, need to follow English argumentative styles in order to be persuasive. Therefore, in English class, teachers should draw learners’ attention to the marked differences between English and Vietnamese argumentative styles. These would also be of great importance in translation (Hatim, 1990). Last but not least, the findings of the study can inspire more works in cross-linguistic argumentation study.

5.3. Suggestions for further research

It is hard to generalize the findings of this study to all the instances of socio-political editorials in the two languages, as it is just a small-scale research based on randomly collection of twenty texts. Therefore, a much larger standard corpus of million words should be built so that a bigger project can be done to produce more representative reliable results. The study can be developed by further investigating into the uses of these linguistic devices to provide a more thorough and comprehensive picture of them. Furthermore, the scope of the study can be widen to include editorials in different fields such as economic, cultural, social, political etc; and to encompass lexical devices for argumentative purpose.
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