Argumentative Essay Patterns Produced by University Students

Siti Maria Ulfa
STKIP PGRI Bangkalan
sitimariaulfa@stkippgri-bkl.ac.id
Oikurema Purwati
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
pungki_unesa@yahoo.co.id
Corresponding email: sitimariaulfa@stkippgri-bkl.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to discover patterns in students' argumentative essays in writing class. As is well known, argumentative writing in higher education has been difficult over the years, with students performing poorly compared to other papers required by the curriculum. A qualitative survey was conducted to obtain in-depth answers about students' argumentative essays, and the participants were 28 students. Still, only 12 essays were considered due to the quality of the writing itself. As a result, the students' argumentative writing results in three different looks. The first is that it was discovered that there was good surface structure but poor quality of reasoning; failure to rebut all of the counterarguments; good surface structure but the poor quality of reasoning, particularly with non-aligned rebuttals; good surface structure but poor rebutting undermining the overall quality of reasoning; and essays that conformed well to surface design because they contained two or three reasons. To summarize, students' knowledge of text content is determined by their ability to construct their thoughts based on false facts and, as a result, claim figures and invent experts in making their arguments. Therefore, students need instruction on what they are expected to accomplish in their writing.

Keywords**:** Argumentative essay, patterns, writing, classroom

Introduction

Argumentative essays play a crucial role in developing students' critical thinking and communication skills. The ability construct coherent arguments, address counterarguments, and persuade the audience is essential for academic success and future professional endeavour. However, the process of writing argumentative essays can be challenging, particularly for university students who are still developing their writing abilities. At STKIP PGRI Bangkalan, a higher education institution committed to fostering excellence in teaching and learning, it is imperative to understand how students engage with and produce argumentative essay patterns in the writing classroom setting. By

exploring the specific patterns employed by students in constructing arguments, addressing counterarguments, and incorporating rebuttals, valuable insights can be gained into the students' writing practices and the effectiveness of the teaching methods employed.

Argumentative essays are difficult to write. When students begin to write an argumentative essay, they wonder what the topic will be and how they will organize it in words. Furthermore, the purpose of argumentative writing is to persuade the audience, and it is done in a circumstance where there is a conflict between the writer/speaker's and the reader/audience's opinions and attitudes (Dorothy & Lisa, 2003). Thus, an argumentative essay requires strong opinions for readers to debate the writer's argument or agree that the opinion is correct.

Some experts claim that writing is one of the most challenging skills to master, involving a complex combination of neurological, physical, cognitive, and affective abilities (National & Pillars, n.d.). It indicates that the writer should consider whether his or her writing is excellent and understandable. They must arrange the words correctly and make them understand that writing is different from speaking. As a result, many individuals believe that writing is an arduous activity. Writing an argumentative essay is chosen for this subject because it deals with a set of assumptions about the issue.

Argumentation is an essential aspect of field literacy. Students who recall much information from a historical book but need help understanding the author's main point, according to (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012), may be able to critique the author's reasoning or even construct their arguments from the facts. This allows teachers to use discourse methods to encourage "argue speak" in a variety of fundamental areas (Fletcher, 2015) and students must be adaptable to audience analysis since "students tend to identify distinct curriculum areas based on instructor personality, not differences in how different disciplines think and speak".

Discipline literacy pushes students to become highly literate thinkers, which is an important feature. A highly literate thinker poses questions, develops a logical argument, examines a topic from multiple perspectives, deals with ambiguity and differing ideas or tensions, seeks complexity rather than simple answers, challenges another person's opinions or insights, thinks in a flexible rather than rigid manner, and seeks out critical or silenced voices in and out of the text (Dorothy & Lisa, 2003). Students will improve their

writing skills if they are expected to write to learn, become strategic writers, encourage students to write to learn, plan their writing, educate students on how to write and teach students how to assess and rework. This is important for junior and high school teachers since it implies that the students' experiences must be tailored to their learning needs. The table below shows argumentative epistemologies.

Table 1. Argumentative Epistemologies

Argumentative Epistemologies: Adapted from Toulmin (1058), Hillocks (2011), Common Core State Standards (2010), Newell et al. (2014).

Structural Components of Argumentative writing	Ideational Components of Argumentative writing	Social Practice Components of Argumentative writing
• Introduction to the topic • Claim • Warrant based in evidence • Analysis of evidence • Rebuttal • Cite appropriately • Transition words • Use of argumentative vocabulary • Use multiple sources • Conclusion	• Explore your own idea • Use evidence to back up your idea • Tie your idea to the authors	• Recognize your audience • Comment on peers blogs • Use evidence to support counter arguments

From the table above, the components of argumentative writing should contain several points, as stated in the first column. However, this research has limitations in how something was found within the students' essays in writing class, focusing on claims, counterarguments, and rebuttals. From these three specific points, patterns were found.

This introduction acknowledges the difficulty of writing argumentative essays and highlight also the challenges faced by students in organizing their thoughts and persuading the audience. This recognition sets the stage for exploring the complexities

of argumentative writing. This also mentions that writing requires a combination of neurological, physical, cognitive, and affective abilities. This multidimensional perspective on writing adds depth to the understanding of the writing process and emphasizes the importance of considering various aspects when assessing the quality of writing.

Finally, when the patterns were found in students' essay related to claims, counterarguments, and rebuttals, other research were only focusing on the writing itself without finding out the patters and it becomes the gap for this research. Based on the gap mentioned earlier, this study would like to identify the patterns found in students' argumentative essays which also referring to how are their writing actually come up in writing class and the research question may go along with this is "how are the students argumentative essays look like in writing class". By shedding light on the argumentative essay patterns within the specific context of STKIP PGRI Bangkalan, this study contributes to the existing body of research on argumentative writing and pedagogy. The findings is hoped to inform educators and curriculum developers about the strengths and areas of improvement in the current writing instruction practices, enabling them to refine and enhance the teaching methods better support students in developing their argumentative writing skills.

Method

The purpose of this study was to describe the patterns of the students' argumentative writings. As a result, a qualitative approach was deemed appropriate for the research design of this study. Qualitative research is the best way to research human behavior because the variables must be observed and vocally documented for inductive analysis (Putri & Ahmad, 2022). It can be also stated that qualitative research entails observing, questioning, and attempting to characterize events or people in a very particular manner without using numerical data. Furthermore, it seeks a comprehensive comprehension of the topic under consideration. The qualitative technique was used in this study because it can clearly describe how individuals interact and their recent experiences.

Research Subject

The research subjects for this study were 28 writing students. The course is available for two credits in one week. Beginning with paragraph writing argumentative essays, the parts in writing class are merged.

Data and Source of Data

The data in this study were in written form due to their connection with students' essays, including their structure, cohesion, substance, and grammar; in the meantime, the source of data was obtained with the assistance of students in written English classes. It is critical to investigate further the term data and the source of data, which are the initial steps in research required to answer the problems given by this study.

Data Collection Technique

This study relied on observation and interviews (Bryman, 2012: 12). Through interviews, the researcher can gather contextual information about the writing classroom setting at STKIP PGRI Bangkalan. This include understanding the instructional approaches, strategies used by lecturer, students' prior knowledge and experiences, and any specific challenges they face in writing argumentative essays. Such information helps to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research context, enriching the interpretation of the findings. The use of interview and observation in the study allows the researcher to access rich qualitative data, capture contextual information, validate findings, explore the study well. It was chosen from a class of 28 pupils, but only 12 essays were chosen. The researcher then began data analysis. After analyzing the students ' essays, the writer did a follow-up interview to establish what happened during his writing session. On the other hand, the writer required devices to help with data collection. As a result, the primary instrument for this study was the writer, who was responsible for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. It agreed with what Latif said about qualitative data (2011:85). Valid data were collected using an adequate instrument to answer the research questions in this study. This inquiry makes use of field notes to observe class. Additionally, the writer utilized interview guidelines and questionnaires given to the students.

Data Analysis

It covered methods or techniques used in many procedures. According to (Creswell, 2014), he describes various phases, including dealing with data, organizing

data, breaking data into manageable chunks, coding data, synthesizing data, and searching for patterns. After completing these processes, the researcher can evaluate the data and answer the research questions. The essays of students were the primary subject of data analysis. The researcher reviewed the students' argumentative essays and examined their statements, counterarguments, and rebuttals.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The table below explains how claims, evidence, counterclaims, and rebuttals appear in students' argumentative essays. The researcher created a table containing numerous components to be explored in examining the students' writings, such as claims, counterarguments, and rebuttals.

Table 2. The occurrences of structural components found in students' argumentative essays

No	Essay Number and Title	Structural Components	Introduction	Body	Conclusion
1	E1/ The Need To Spending More Time Together With Families	Claims	v	-	v
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	v	-
2	E2/ Music Genres of KPOP	Claims	-	-	v
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
3	E3/ Students' Roles on Campus	Claims	-	v	-
		Counterargument Claims	-	-	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	v
4	E4/ Education for Women	Claims	-	-	v
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
5	E5/Environmental Problems in Indonesia	Claims	-	-	v
		Counterargument	-	v	-

No	Essay				
		Claims			
		Rebuttals	-	-	v
6	E6/Dream at Islamic Boarding School	Claims	-	-	-
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
7	E7/Social Media	Claims	v	-	v
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
8	E8/Electric Care	Claims	-	-	v
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
9	E9/Communication	Claims	v	-	v
		Counterargument Claims		v	
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
10	E10/ The Impact of Social Media Instagram on Students' Behaviour	Claims	v	-	-
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
11	E11/ Social Media	Claims	v	-	-
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-
12	E12/ The Influence of Social Media on Students	Claims	v	-	-
		Counterargument Claims	-	v	-
		Rebuttals	-	-	-

In E1, the author states their thesis in the second sentence of the same section after offering an overview of the counterargument at the beginning of the first paragraph. The remainder of the paper analyzes the opposing argument and illustrates why readers should believe her position. Although it is unusual for the thesis to emerge

very late in the essay, it works because once it is stated, the rest of the essay supports it. After all, the counterargument has already been explored earlier in the essay. Although having the thesis occur so late in the essay is rare, it works. The author's thesis is strong, and readers are likely to agree with it due to this essay's inclusion of different grounds to back up the case, but the piece needs more specific evidence to draw its conclusions. The author did not respond to the student's objections, which can be found here.

Next, in E2, the author begins with a counterargument, followed by the thesis at the end of the paragraph. The article then spends the entire paragraph deconstructing the counterargument and demonstrating simply the different types of music genres. Although it is unusual for the thesis to appear very long into the essay, near the paragraph's conclusion, it does not fully work because it needs to be more straightforward to discern what the essay is about to say. This essay provides multiple citation studies to back up its point, including the author's discussion of each type of music genre and how the music affects human hearing. However, there needs to be precise data to base this essay. There are no author's arguments.

Following that, in E3, the author begins by providing an outline of why students should join an organization. The essay then devotes the remainder of the article to describing the students' roles on campus. The claim appears in the essay's body. It does not work since the author should offer some counterclaims on the topic in the body. This essay contains various facts but does not cite studies to support its claims. The author utilizes what she has already experienced while working for a particular business. Having specific evidence to rely on strengthens the author's arguments, and readers are more likely to agree with her. The author discusses the pupils' roles in each section of the paragraph and makes no counterclaims. She makes a retort once, but it fails since any facts do not support it. This is a lengthy essay. It should include more samples and go deeper with them, such as detailing unusual cases of how students get into difficulties in organizations and how students gain from joining organizations.

This argumentative essay in E4 analyses each viewpoint, first outlining why education is vital for women. It concludes by emphasizing the importance of education for women's future. One side of the debate is thoroughly explored, with numerous connected reasons why education is critical for women. As a result, readers gain a more comprehensive comprehension of the argument and its nuances. Several statements

made by the author's side are challenged explicitly to emphasize where each side's strengths lie and provide a more complete and analytical look at the argument. Different from a paper, when the thesis is mentioned at the beginning and supported throughout, the thesis appears towards the end of this paragraph, giving the reader little time to be convinced that the arguments are factual. To improve this paper, the author should lengthen the final paragraph to clarify why he or she agrees with the conclusion more thoroughly.

This argumentative essay, E5, is similar to the last one in that it discusses each side, first putting forth many reasons why environmental concerns occur in Indonesia. It concludes by noting that the problems could be more solvable. One side of the debate is extensively developed, with numerous reasons why education is critical for women. It paints a complete picture of the argument and its nuances for the reader. Some of the author's assertions regarding the opposing side are immediately challenged to demonstrate the opposing side's strengths and provide a more complete and sophisticated understanding of the argument. When the thesis appears at the end of a paragraph, readers need more time to assess whether the argument is correct. In contrast, in a document, the thesis is stated at the start and then supported throughout.

In E6, the author begins by outlining boarding school life. The essay then spends the rest of the paper just recounting the day's events. The claim appears in the essay's body. It does not work since the author should offer some counterclaims on the topic in the body. This essay contains various facts but does not cite studies to support its claims. The author utilizes what she has already experienced while working for a specific business. By relying on more detailed evidence, the author's arguments become more robust, and readers are more likely to agree with her. The author discusses the pupils' roles in each section of the paragraph and makes no counterclaims. She makes a retort once, but it fails since any facts do not support it. This is a lengthy essay. It should contain more instances and go further with them, such as detailing more specific cases of how kids get into difficulties in organizations and how students gain from attending boarding school.

The first sentence of the first paragraph, E7, is an overview of the counterargument, followed by the thesis. After that, the essay deconstructs the counterargument and demonstrates why readers should believe her. Since the counterargument has already been addressed, the rest of the essay focuses on supporting the thesis. This essay offers

numerous reasons to support the case but needs specific figures. The author's thesis is compelling, and readers are likely to agree. The author disputed no student's comments. Debunk the opposition to build a strong case. This document is both shorter and longer than others. It may include additional instances and go into greater detail to meet the length requirement, such as outlining specific cases when people say family is essential in life. The author also discusses family experiences from living abroad.

The author of E8 begins by offering a general overview of how individuals invented new things, particularly in transportation. The remainder of the book is devoted to merely retelling the events that occurred daily. The assertion can be found in the essay's main body. It needs to function correctly because the author should offer some counterclaims on the topic somewhere in the article's body. In addition to its thesis, this article includes several facts. However, it does not cite any studies to back up its statements. The author draws on her previous experiences when joining a specific group. In fact, the availability of specific evidence on which the author's arguments can be based strengthens the author's arguments, and readers are more likely to agree with what she said as a result. Throughout the paragraph, the author mentions the students' role, and she offers no counterclaims. She attempts a response at one point but is unsuccessful because any facts do not support it. This is going to be an extended essay.

Before proceeding to the thesis, the author summarizes the counterargument in the first sentence of E9. The remainder of the essay is devoted to dissecting the opposing argument and demonstrating why readers should agree with her. Although it is unusual for the thesis to appear so late in the essay, it works because once it is provided, the remainder concentrates on supporting it. After all, the counterargument has already been addressed. Despite the lack of accurate figures, the author's argument is more robust, and readers are more inclined to agree with it due to the variety of justifications offered. The author made no response to the student's assertions. Deconstructing the opposition is an essential aspect of presenting compelling evidence. This paper, despite its length, is shorter than others. However, to meet the length requirement, it should include more instances and go into deeper detail with them, such as discussing specific cases in which people consider family the most valuable thing in life.

While in E10 addresses both sides of the argument, first detailing several distinct reasons why people believe social media has two different effects on student conduct

and then explaining why both are important. This, however, leads nowhere. There needs to be more progress on both sides of the debate, with few reasons why individuals should agree with either side's perspective. It stops readers from thoroughly comprehending the argument and its complexities. Certain comments from both sides of the debate are not instantly rejected to show where each side succeeds, falls short, and gives a more full and nuanced understanding of the topic. In this case, the thesis statement is introduced in the very first sentence of the very last paragraph.

In terms of writing style, E11 and E12 are similar. It examines both sides of the debate, first detailing why some believe social media has two unique effects on student behavior and then explaining why both are required. However, this leads nowhere. There needs to be more development on both sides of the issue, with few reasons why individuals should agree with either side's viewpoint. It prevents readers from gaining a complete understanding of the argument and its intricacies. Specific comments from both sides of the discussion are not immediately disputed to demonstrate where each side succeeds and fails and to provide a more complete and nuanced grasp of the topic.

Discussion

Based on the findings, the researcher dismantles students' argumentative writing ability in this conversation and identifies numerous patterns. The evaluated articles' apparent structure and level of reasoning provide information on the kind of patterns that could exist. Three unique patterns have emerged among the evaluated writings.

The first kind has a solid surface structure but needs to improve reasoning quality, failing to reject all counterarguments. The surface structure of this essay is adequate according to the criteria of the adapted Toulmin model because it contains all argumentation sections and various sets of supporting evidence (Pei et al., 2017). Nonetheless, the supporting evidence for the argument could have been better quality. Furthermore, the counterargument needed to be revised. Rebuttals, by definition, must refute the ideas expressed in a counterargument; however, in this rebuttal part, the student failed to refute one of the earlier counterarguments (Chason et al., 2017). In other words, the student planned to refute the counterarguments but did not. As a result, while this piece had a good surface structure, one part of that structure needed to be completed and needed more content. Although the other two counterarguments were

refuted, the total effectiveness of the refutations and the general quality of the essay were diminished (Golpour, 2014).

Another style is one that has a solid surface structure but needs more reasoning, especially with misaligned rebuttals. However, the substance of these structural pieces, especially the counterarguments and rebuttals, needed more internal logic, which diminished the overall quality of the argumentation (Srinawati & Alwi, 2020). This essay featured several data sets inside each aspect. However, the claims' supporting evidence quality could have been better. More troubling were the essay's rebuttals, which were not logically consistent with the counterarguments and failed to disprove them.

Some writings conformed to surface format as they featured two or three arguments but needed more rebuttals, compromising the overall argument quality. However, one of each script's two rebuttals was deemed irrelevant and unacceptable. It was a model essay since it contained all argumentative features and many sets of supporting evidence (Stapleton & Wu, 2015). Also paired well with counterarguments were rebuttals. Among the eight supporting reasons, only two data sets were deemed acceptable. In contrast, one piece of counterargument data was deemed irrelevant and unacceptable, and the remaining five were deemed weak. In conclusion, despite an exceptional surface organization and alignment between the counterarguments and rebuttals, this essay's reasoning level needed to be stronger (Cheong et al., 2021).

The final type has a solid surface structure and reasonable reasoning quality. Essay 1 was exemplary in terms of both its surface organization and the quality of its argument. The script contained the most significant amount of approved supporting arguments among the other submissions, with many data sets provided for each of the three argumentative elements. Moreover, none of the supporting justifications was ruled irrelevant or unacceptable additionally, the rebuttals aligned with the counterarguments. However, we ranked the reasoning quality of this screenplay as only good because five out of nine arguments were graded as weak.

This study, according to the author, has some flaws. First, the questionnaire was constructed so that the teacher could evaluate the strength of the arguments as independent support for each of the two positions: pros and cons of the program. When assessing counterarguments and rebuttals, these quality ratings may take time to reveal the logical superiority of rebuttals over counterarguments. While questionnaire ratings

were used in the analyses of the essays to assess the dimension of alignment and comment on the quality of rebuttals over counterarguments, studies focusing specifically on the strength of rebuttals over counterarguments may necessitate a questionnaire design or measurement instrument that pairs counterarguments and rebuttals. Second, if additional efforts were taken to comprehend and triangulate the questionnaire, a better knowledge of the reason's quality may have been acquired. If time and resources permit, it would be preferable to collect background information on questionnaire respondents (e.g., their prior knowledge and attitude on the topic) and perform post-questionnaire interviews with specific students in future studies of this type. Furthermore, lexico-grammatical complexity, organizational markers and hedging, and debate techniques can all influence the structure and quality of students' argumentative writing (Mercier, 2016).

Indeed, as previously indicated, the writer's background and discourse were eliminated by separating the structure and content of each argument and then reducing the body of each argument to its most basic premise for examination. In argumentative texts, writing scholars recognize the importance of the writer's presence (Liu & Braine, 2005) "authorial presence" or an authorial position, which results in a dialogical interaction with the reader. Because these elements were omitted in the current study, the writers' voices associated with the arguments and, in some cases, the authors' persuasiveness may have been weakened(Pei et al., 2017). This constraint should be considered, and future techniques for assessing the strength of arguments may need to account for it. These elements, however, are outside the scope of this inquiry. Last but not least, (Pessoa et al., 2017) also add that when there are no rebuttals found within the students' essays, it may come to mind that it is closely related to the culture of people around that having rebuttals is another level of being unkind or impolite, but this needs to be scrutinized further to see if such a culture affected students' way of arguing.

Writing an argumentative essay is also tricky. When starting an argumentative essay, students wonder what the topic will be and how they will structure their words . Furthermore, the goal of argumentative writing is to persuade the audience, and it is used when there is a disagreement between the writer/speaker's and the reader/audience's beliefs and attitudes (Zhu, 2001). Thus, an argumentative essay necessitates both critical

thinking and a strong opinion, as readers will either disagree with or agree with the writer's premise.

Writing takes time as well. When most people first begin researching a topic, they encounter difficulties. (Stab & Gurevych, 2014) identified three critical issues with writers' solitude. As writers, we face unique problems since we must create in isolation, with little opportunity for criticism or participation from others. To compensate for the lack of features, we must use our efforts to maintain the communication line and ensure that the text we generate can be comprehended on its own, thanks to the sentence structure we choose and how our words are connected and sequenced. Second, there are language issues. The fact that writing is taught in schools is a cognitive issue. To communicate effectively in writing, students must first become acquainted with the language's written form and the necessary grammatical structures (Wolfe, 2012).

When attempting to write in a foreign language, challenges will arise. According to (Schneer, 2014)an argumentative essay is constructed around a single statement (or major premise) that is highly contentious within the field of study. Furthermore, an argumentative essay is a type of response to a text. In that case, the conclusion may recall the initial concept to which individuals are responding, reminding the reader of the exact points on which they agree or disagree (Newell et al., 2011). An argumentative essay's content must also be logical. Writer should arrange their feelings when seeking not to criticize others. There are two types of argumentative essays. These are comparable to analytical and hortatory presentations but serve different functions. Analytical exposition explains why something is the way it is (Zhang, 2018). However, hortatory has the social objective of persuading readers or listeners that something should or should not be the way it is. The fundamental problem with essay writing is that students must learn to understand the first sentence. As a result, prior to writing, it is critical to organize (Sundari & Febriyanti, 2021).

Teaching writing is further complicated by a predominantly formalist mindset that emphasizes learning to draw inferences about the main idea of expository or narrative texts for reading, which is standardized examinations, or mastering the five-paragraph essay format for standardized writing evaluations (Sundari & Febriyanti, 2021). Reading and writing texts is difficult for many students because they cannot identify and provide

relevant, sufficient supporting evidence from a text, as well as the ability to make explicit their warrants or assumptions that link the thesis to the reasons and evidence (Kuo, 1995).

Regardless of how the essay is structured, the writer must persuade the reader to share their point of view and understand what they are saying (Kumar & Refaei, 2017). This is why Indonesians, particularly students at STKIP PGRI Bangkalan, find argumentative essays difficult (Roohani & Rad, 2022). As a result, feedback is required because it can help the L2 writer achieve the best text composition. Similar to this, (Lee & Deakin, 2016) also prefers that feedback is also critical in process-based classrooms, where it is an integral element of the student's growing control over producing skills, and genre-oriented classrooms that use scaffolding learning methodologies.

Conclusion

The ability of students to create their thoughts on the basis of false facts and, as a result, claim figures and invent experts in the course of developing their arguments determine their mastery of text content. As a result, it is critical that students receive guidance on what they should accomplish in their writing. Teachers should also remember that it is difficult for students to construct convincing arguments contradicting their world knowledge, logic, and sense of truth. Their options affect their students' relationship with the reader, logic, and sense of truth. Furthermore, teachers should remember that it is difficult for pupils to create convincing arguments that contradict their world knowledge, logic, and sense of truth. The student's awareness of the reader must be addressed on a regular basis in order for them to continue working toward sustaining the relationship with the reader throughout the duration of their writing.

Furthermore, it is critical to assist students in grasping the goal of each paragraph, as well as the tops and bottoms of paragraphs and the function of linking to material that appears earlier or later in the text. Furthermore, the cognitive aspect of writing encourages students to reflect on both the production and process. Students must be educated on paraphrasing, summarizing, citing sources, drafting, revising, meeting deadlines, getting feedback, and dealing with frustration. Since this study is limited only to a particular type of text that is argumentative text, the patterns were also restricted to this kind of writing ability. What come up with the writing style, will be only for the

consideration that students of STKIP PGRI Bangkalan have their own writing style that may be affected by the culture and academic background around or something else within.

References

Chason, L., Loyet, D., Sorenson, L., & Stoops, A. (2017). An Approach for Embedding Critical Thinking in Second Language Paragraph Writing. *TESOL Journal*, *8*(3), 582–612. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.288

Cheong, C. M., Zhu, X., & Xu, W. (2021). Source-based argumentation as a form of sustainable academic skill: An exploratory study comparing secondary school students' L1 and L2 writing. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *13*(22), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212869

Dorothy, E. Z., & Lisa, A. R. (2003). *College Writing from Paragraph to Essay* (p. 108).

Golpour, F. (2014). Critical thinking and EFL learners' performance on different writing modes. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *18*(1), 103–119.

Kumar, R., & Refaei, B. (2017). Problem-based learning pedagogy fosters students' critical thinking about writing. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, *11*(2), 5–10. https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1670

Kuo, C. H. (1995). Cohesion and coherence in academic writing: From lexical choice to organization. *RELC Journal*, *26*(1), 47–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829502600103

Lee, J. J., & Deakin, L. (2016). Interactions in L1 and L2 undergraduate student writing: Interactional metadiscourse in successful and less-successful argumentative essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *33*, 21–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.06.004

Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. *System*, *33*(4), 623–636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.02.002

Mercier, H. (2016). The Argumentative Theory: Predictions and Empirical Evidence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *20*(9), 689–700. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.001

National, G., & Pillars, H. (n.d.). *[9th] Annette T. Rottenberg - The Structure of Argument (2017, Bedford_St. Martin's)*.

Newell, G. E., Beach, R., Smith, J., & VanDerHeide, J. (2011). Teaching and Learning Argumentative Reading and Writing: A Review of Research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *46*(3), 273–304. https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.46.3.4

Pei, Z., Zheng, C., Zhang, M., & Liu, F. (2017). Critical Thinking and Argumentative Writing: Inspecting the Association among EFL Learners in China. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(10), 31. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n10p31

Pessoa, S., Mitchell, T. D., & Miller, R. T. (2017). Emergent arguments: A functional approach to analyzing student challenges with the argument genre. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *38*(November 2016), 42–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.10.013

Putri, D. R., & Ahmad, A. (2022). *An Analysis of Student s ' Argumentative Essay Writing Skill of Third Semester of English Language Education-UIR*. *1*(1).

Roohani, A., & Rad, H. S. (2022). Effectiveness of Hybrid-Flipped Classroom in Improving Efl Learners' Argumentative Writing Skill. *Teflin Journal*, *33*(2), 349–366. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i2/349-366

Schneer, D. (2014). Rethinking the Argumentative Essay. *TESOL Journal*, *5*(4), 619–653. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.123

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in Language Disorders*, *32*(1), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0b013e318244557a

Srinawati, W., & Alwi, R. (2020). Critical Thinking Ability in EFL Students' Argumentative Essay Writing: The Difficulties and The Strategies. *Jurnal Serambi Ilmu*, *21*(2), 200–210. https://doi.org/10.32672/si.v21i2.2194

Stab, C., & Gurevych, I. (2014). Identifying argumentative discourse structures in persuasive essays. *EMNLP 2014 - 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Conference*, 46–56. https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/d14-1006

Stapleton, P., & Wu, Y. (Amy). (2015). Assessing the quality of arguments in students' persuasive writing: A case study analyzing the relationship between surface structure and substance. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *17*, 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2014.11.006

Sundari, H., & Febriyanti, R. H. (2021). The Analysis of Indonesian EFL Argumentative Writing Using Toulmin's Model: The Structure and Struggles from the Learners. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching*, *5*(2), 67. https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v5i2.8544

Wolfe, C. R. (2012). Individual Differences in the "Myside Bias" in Reasoning and Written Argumentation. *Written Communication*, *29*(4), 477–501. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088312457909

Zhang, X. (2018). Developing College EFL Writers' Critical Thinking Skills Through Online Resources: A Case Study. *SAGE Open*, *8*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018820386

Zhu, W. (2001). Performing Argumentative Writing in English: Difficulties, Processes, and Strategies. *TESL Canada Journal*, *19*(1), 34. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v19i1.918

McClish, G. (2015). [Review of *Teaching Arguments: Rhetorical Comprehension, Critique, and Response*, by J. Fletcher]. *Composition Studies*, *43*(2), 225–228. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45157115