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Abstract- This study examined the syntactic and semantic aspects of argumentative essays of IELTS writing task 2 (AEIWT2) written by students at an English center in Da Nang from the perspectives of Martin's (2005) appraisal framework and Halliday's (2004) systemic functional linguistics. Besides, the study analyzed students' AEIWT2 in terms of theme and rheme in the sample texts collected. The data were gathered with the qualitative and quantitative method to determine the kinds of JUDGEMENT that students apply to their writing. Based on the research questions, the findings were discussed. First, a thorough analysis of each type of JUDGEMENT and its subcategories was conducted in order to assess the semantic features of the identified JUDGEMENT in the AEIWT2. Second, word groups and the theme-rheme structure of the linguistic items in the data that indicated judgment were discussed in relation to their syntactic characteristics. Through the data collected, the number of words of evaluative language belonging to subsystem JUDGEMENT used by students at the English Center for AEIWT2 was low. Besides, there was a large difference in quantity of linguistic items of JUDGEMENT used in students’ AEIWT2. Therefore, the ability to persuade readers to seek agreement on the points raised in AEIWT2 was not high. It was anticipated that the study helped educators and English language learners comprehend the appraisal framework better, and students were able to use their teachers’ teaching strategies to learn how to use appraisal resources when writing AEIWT2.
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I. INTRODUCTION
English writing is an important part among the four basic skills in English language learning and also a means to measure the language output. (Nie, 2005). There are various requirements for essay writing, one very important component of writing. The essays should be informative with appropriate vocabularies and well expressed. Moreover, they should reflect their writers critical voice manifesting their evaluation on the various aspects of the topics of essays. Technically, apart from making their essays informative, the writer should also perform their persuasive ability in their evaluation. Their skills of using evaluative language can be articulated in Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005), the one devired from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), referring to the ways that writers or speakers express approval or disapproval of things, people, behaviour or ideas. In addition, AEIWT2 develops essential skills and functions in the education of students. Argumentative essays written by students enable them to practice and perfect skills transferable throughout their learning into their profession. In this setting, the Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) is essential for fully understanding the language written, especially, Judgement provides a useful framework for understanding how they use language to express their attitudes and perspectives in their writing on a given topic. Examining the use of evaluative language in students’ AEIWT2 can reveal insights into how students position themselves in relation to the topic, how they establish their own authority or expertise, and how they attempt to persuade the reader. This encourages the author to carry out the study entitled “An appraisal analysis of the samples for ielts writing task 2”. It is expected to make some contribution to AEIWT2 writing teaching and learning in Vietnam.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW
Previous studies related to the research topic
Recently, the application of the Appraisal theory (or appraisal framework) (Martin & White, 2005) to writing has attracted the attention of many scholars worldwide. Tran and Thomson (2008) explored the nature of Reporter voice in a Vietnamese hard news story. The primary examination instrument utilized to examine the reporter's opinions and ideological stance in this piece was the Appraisal theory's Attitude and Engagement system. The study demonstrates that the reporter adopts a personal stance toward the incident under investigation in addition to the tactics employed to persuade other parties to agree with their point of view. Martin and Rose's (2008) argumentative genre model and Martin and Rose's (2005) appraisal theory were applied to fifty Pakistani argumentative essays retrieved from the International Corpus of Learners' English. The purpose of using two frameworks was to investigate the use of
appraisal language choices in each stage of the Pakistani argumentative essay. The results demonstrate that most undergraduate Pakistani English learners inappropriately deployed appraisal language choices that undermined the persuasiveness of the student writers’ arguments. In Wang and An’s journal article (2013), the co-authors examined the language and stylistic elements of seven Chinese academic book reviews using the Appraisal theory. The study conclusions imply that the appraisal theory systems is useful in helping book reviews negotiate their intersubjective positions with both book writers and readers at large. Wang (2017) explores the features of the top 30 appraisal words in students’ essays from the perspective of appraisal theory. The analysis of the features and distributions of the top 30 appraisal words reveals some issues related to the use of appraisal resources in writing, and the paper attempts to provide some suggestions for both students and teachers. Refnaldi (2018) tries to describe how appraisals are used by the writer in using the language components for the purpose of developing discussion essay which is a type of the argumentative genres. The focus of the analysis is how the three appraisal sub-systems, including attitude, engagement, and graduation, are taught to students. In brief, all of the above studies have been explored the use of the Appraisal theory in the writing of essays by university students. However, it seems that a few have been done to examine the challenges students face with their application of this theory and point out the particular approaches in teaching to help them develop their ability to use the Appraisal theory effectively in their essay writing, especially argumentative essay writing Therefore, it is expected that the study will contribute to helping teachers and learners of English to better understand the appraisal framework, and students can learn how to use appraisal resources for AEIWT2.

**Theoretical background**

An overview of the Appraisal theory

“The Write It Right” project, headed by Martin and White and their colleagues in the 1990s and 2000s, initially gave rise to appraisal theory. Rather than analyzing the clause level of interpretation, such as mood or modality, this theory tends to analyze whether the speaker's or writer's opinion conveys positive/good or negative/bad parameter. Appraisal is a part of the grammar of interpersonal meaning in the study of Systemic Functional Grammar. The Appraisal framework comprises three primary resources: ATTITUDE, ENGAGEMENT and GRADUATION. The assessment framework is arranged according to these three semantic systems. However, within the scope of this study, the following part outline a framework for mapping feelings as they are construed in English texts, referring to this system of meanings as **judgement**, one of the three subcategories of **affect** which is, in turn, one of the three broad meaning systems in the Appraisal theory.

**Judgement**

The term “judgement” can mean different things and be used in different contexts in academic settings. However, the definition and use of it in this study are connected to the Appraisal theory, which was developed in the 1990s by Martin and his associates. Along with engagement and graduation, the Attitude framework, of which JUDGMENT is a subcategory, is a component of the Appraisal theory.

Broadly speaking, **judgments** fall into two categories: those focused on "social sanction" and those dealing with "social esteem." Judgements of sanction deal with "veracity" (how true someone is) and "propriety" (how ethical someone is); judgements of esteem deal with "normality" (how unusual someone is), "capacity" (how capable someone is), and "tenacity" (how resolute someone is).

In oral cultures, social esteem is typically maintained through conversation, gossip, jokes, and stories of all kinds; humor frequently plays a crucial role in these interactions (Eggins & Slade 1997). On the other hand, social sanction is more frequently codified in writing and takes the form of laws, rules, and regulations about acceptable behavior that are monitored by the state and church. Illustrative realisations for social esteem and social sanction are presented in Tables 1 & 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Positive (admire)</th>
<th>Negative (criticise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normality &quot;how special?&quot;</td>
<td>lucky, fortunate, charmed normal, natural, familiar cool, stable, predictable in, fashionable, avant garde celebrated, unsusg</td>
<td>unlucky, hapless, star-crossed odd, peculiar, eccentric erratic, unpredictable dated, daggy, retrograde obscure, also-ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity &quot;how capable?&quot;</td>
<td>powerful, vigorous, robust sound, healthy, fit adult, mature, experienced witty, humorous, droll insightful, clever, gifted balanced, together, sane</td>
<td>mild, weak, whimpy unsound, sick, crippled immature, childish, helpless dull, dreary, grave slow, stupid, thick flaky, neurotic, insane naive, inexpert, foolish illiterate, uneducated, ignorant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Judgement – social esteem (Martin & White, 2005, p.53)
Social Esteem

Positive (admire)
- sensible, expert, shrewd
- literate, educated, learned
- competent, accomplished
- successful, productive

Negative (criticise)
- incompetent; unaccomplished
- unsuccessful, unproductive

Tenacity

“How dependable?”
- plucky, brave, heroic
- cautious, wary, patient
- careful, thorough, meticulous
- tireless, persevering, resolute
- reliable, dependable, faithful
- loyal, constant
- flexible, adaptable, accommodating

Illustrative realisations for social sanction are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social sanction “mortal”</th>
<th>Positive (praise)</th>
<th>Negative (condemn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veracity (truth)</td>
<td>truthful, honest, credible</td>
<td>dishonest, deceitful, lying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“how honest?”</td>
<td>frank, candid, direct</td>
<td>deceptive, manipulative, devious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrete, tactful</td>
<td>blunt, blabbermouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety (ethics)</td>
<td>good, moral, ethical</td>
<td>dishonest, deceitful, lying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“how far beyond reproach?”</td>
<td>law abiding, fair, just</td>
<td>deceptive, manipulative, devious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sensitive, kind, caring</td>
<td>blunt, blabbermouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unassuming, modest, humble</td>
<td>bad, immoral, evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>polite, respectful, reverent</td>
<td>corrupt, unfair, unjust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>altruistic, generous, charitable</td>
<td>insensitive, mean, cruel, snobby, arrogant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting with propositions, we are able to build a sequence of realizations for capacity, probability, and usuality. These realizations start out as congruent ones and progress through metaphorical ones to lexis, which is obviously approaching in nature. Mood's modalisations of probability can be linked to lexicalised assessments of truth in this manner:
- It’s true, honest, credible, authentic, bogus, etc. [judgement: veracity]
- Similar relationships exist between normalcy judgments and modalities of usuality:
  - It’s normal for him to be naughty.
  - It’s normal, average, fashionable, peculiar, odd, etc. [judgement: normality]
- Likewise for ability and capacity:
  - He’s strong enough to go.
  - He’s healthy enough, mature enough, clever enough, etc. [judgement: capacity]
- Modulations in inclination can be connected to lexicalized tenacity in proposals:
  - I’m intent on going.
  - I’m resolute, steadfast, unyielding, unflinching, etc. [judgement: tenacity]
- Additionally, lexicalized judgments of propriety can be linked to modulations of obligation:
  - It’d be unfair for you to go.
  - It’d be corrupt, insensitive, arrogant, selfish, rude, etc. [judgement: propriety]
- By reasoning in this way, we can put interpersonal grammar (both mood and modality) and appraisal on a continuum, with Halliday's modality metaphors constructing meaning in between grammaticalized realisations and lexicalised realisations at one end of the spectrum (Martin 2000b).

Systemic Functional Linguistics

According to Mathiessen and Halliday (1997), Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is an "applicable" linguistics theory, that is, it can be used to address issues that come up in communities all over the world. The goal, according to Halliday (2008, p. 189), is to create a logical tradition of language that is "applicable," meaning that it can help a lot of people who use language in their line of work.

SFL has proven beneficial in a variety of fields, including educational linguistics (Christie & Martin 1997), critical
discourse analysis (Bloor & Bloor 2007), media discourse (Iedema 2003), child language development (Painter 1999), history (Iedema 2003), and administrative language (Iedema 2003). Moreover, SFL has been used to decipher the grammar of various semiotic media, including visuals (Kress & Leeuwen 2001) and art (Ballantyne 1996). As a result, the SFL tradition is regarded as a remarkable global one, as evidenced by the quantity of SFL publications and conferences that occur worldwide.

In SFL, a text is analyzed in four ways. They are as follows: Context, Semantics, Lexico-grammar, and Phonology. Context is classified as one of the central concerns. It will relate to or is linked to a number of contexts. They are the Context of Culture [genres] and the Context of Situation [the technical term for this is Register].

Discourse-Semantics has three metafunctions. They are: Interpersonal metafunctions, Ideational metafunctions, and Textual metafunctions.

Lexico-grammar includes both grammar and vocabulary in one stratum and represents the view of language in both lexis and grammar. Phonology, orthography (or graphology) which refers to the sound system, the writing system, and the wording system.

Distinct (sub)systems that shape contextual variables to create generalized meanings or metafunctions are described by SFL at both the lexico-grammar and discourse semantics levels. Experiential meanings (clause as representation), interpersonal meanings (clause as exchange), and textual meanings (clause as message) are the three generalized meanings that human language has evolved to make (Eggins 2004, p.58-59).

The representation of reality and the grammatical tools available to us for deriving meanings from it about what is happening, who is involved, when, where, and how it is happening are all part of the experiential meanings of the words. According to Matthiessen and Halliday (1997), transitivity is one of its main grammatical systems. There are several facets to transitivity:

A- The processes [in the verbal group]
B- The participants (human/non-human) who are participating in these processes [in the noun group].
C- The circumstances in which the processes occur and the when, where, and how they take place [in the prepositional phrase and adverbial group]. For instance: [Circumstance] in the open glade [participant] the wild rabbits [Process] danced [circumstance] with their shadows (Matthiessen & Halliday 1997).

The process of creating text and how we arrange our meanings to create a comprehensible text are the topics of textual meanings. Theme and Rheme is one of the primary textual systems (Matthiessen & Halliday, 1997). For example: In the open glade, the wild rabbits danced to the music of their shadows and the theme.

**Argumentative Essays in IELTS Writing Task 2**

Language tests, like the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), are used in a variety of settings and are regarded as crucial components in professional settings. As Leung and Lewkowics (2006) put it, "one of the household of the professional circle" is this test (p. 222). The academic essay test is administered to individuals who wish to continue their education at a postgraduate level in a nation speaking English. As a result, the IELTS typically consists of four sections: speaking, writing, reading, and listening.

One of the hardest writing assignments to complete is argumentative essays (Crasnich & Lumbelli, 2005; Gárate & Melero, 2005). The primary challenge when composing argumentative essays, like those given on the IELTS, is structuring the argument in a way that makes it as effective as possible given the essay's word count limitations (IELTS, 2017).

Essay arguments are crucial because they support points and persuade readers through language. Furthermore, the writer needs to understand how to develop and assess arguments in order to represent, start, or mimic various forms of textual and interpersonal interaction for the reader to think about (Wu & Allison, 2003).

In Starkey’s view (2004), arranging the ideas into a coherent and understandable format is a crucial part of writing a good essay. Starkey continues, "For the benefit of readers, the structure of an essay will direct and organize the writing processes." It will be simpler for test takers to arrange the essay's content and present their subject-matter expertise to the reader if they have a clear idea of how the essay should be structured. In addition, proficient use of a variety of evaluation languages with sufficient frequency of use of semantics and systematic functional grammar will help writers become masters in this kind of essay, which was highly appreciated by the examiner.

**III. METHODOLOGY**

To fulfill the aims of the study, the study has tried to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the semantic features of the JUDGEMENT in students’ AEIWT2 in light of Appraisal theory?
2. What are the syntactic features of the JUDGEMENT in students’AEIWT2 in light of Systemic Functional Linguistics theory?
3. What are the recommendations for the students in effectively applying the judgement framework to AEIWT2?

The stratified sampling was done according to the range of scores of students on the collected samples of AEIWT2.
written by the students at an English center. The scores were given by teachers in the Center. The number of samples collected was 50 and coded from AE1 – AE50. The passing grade was 85. Two sample groups were collected: 85 points or more and 80 points or less. 25 items were picked up for each group.

The data collected for the study was based on the answer sheets for AEIWT2 written by the students at an English center. Because the writings were collected manually in class, no other instruments were needed to collect this data.

The study applied both quantitative and qualitative approaches with the aim of exploring the students’ use of JUDGEMENT in terms of syntactic and semantic features in argumentative essays in the collected samples of AEIWT2 written by the student at an English center in order to discover the challenges students face in their writing. The study employs the theoretical framework of Appraisal Theory by Martin (2005), with a focus on the category of Judgement of Attitude. The qualitative method was employed to collect the data and identify the types of JUDGEMENT that writers/students use with the given topics. The quantitative approach was also used to analyze to the frequency of use of the lexical units in the judgement framework by Martin (2005).

Procedure of Data Collection
To carry out the study properly, the study followed these steps:
Firstly, 50 students at the English center did the AEIWT2 in their final written exam.
Then, teachers collected their answer sheets at the end of the exam.
Next, collecting appraisal lexical units used in IELTS writing task 2 by students at an English Center. A tally sheet, which is a data collection instrument (see in the appendix), was used to collect these appraisal lexical units.
Next, Picking out different types of appraisal lexical resources according to their semantic, and syntactic characteristics;
In the end, analyzing and discussing the results of data collection in terms of linguistic features of the evaluation used in the students essays and their perception of using evaluative language.

Data analysis
First, the types of judgement were tabulated to show their frequency and percentage. Based on the appraisal theory, a quantitative conclusion was then drawn.
Second, the syntactic feature data was tallied and subjected to both quantitative and qualitative analysis in light of the Functional Grammar theory.
Thirdly, the semantic feature data was tallied and examined using both quantitative and qualitative methods in accordance with the Appraisal theory.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS
Semantic features of the judgement in the argumentative essays of IELTS writing task 2.
In the current study the AEIWT2 that students at an English center complete are where the linguistic resources for JUDGEMENT are taken from.
The samples were examined in terms of the JUDGEMENT of the Appraisal framework system. With the aid of the Tally sheet (see in Appendix), a thorough data analysis was conducted to identify the linguistic features of the JUDGEMENT manifested in AEIWT2.
The Appraisal theory was applied to the sentence context in order to determine whether or not a word that was identified as potentially denoting judgment (apart from grammar words such as articles, demonstratives, auxiliary verbs, conjunctions, personal pronouns, indefinite pronouns, relative clauses, question words, and proper names) was used.
If a word functioned as JUDGEMENT, it was recorded and the sentences containing this word were extracted from the writing samples. This procedure helps create a list of word denoting JUDGEMENT, accompanied by a list of the sentences containing this word list. These words and sentences were then grouped, counted and analyzed. Here are several examples extracted from the data.
(4.1) Many young people work on a volunteer basis, and this can only be beneficial for both the individual and society as a whole. (AE-1)
(4.2) Most young people are already under enough pressure with their studies, without being given the added responsibility of working in their spare time. (AE-1)
(4.3) On the other hand, I accept that it is important to help our neighbours and fellow citizens. In most communities there are people who are improverished or disadvantaged in some way. (AE-27)
(4.4) Many people, and children in particular, enjoy playing computer games. While I accept that these games can sometimes have a positive effect on the user, I believe that they are more likely to have a harmful impact. (AE-30)
Examples (4.1) and (4.2) contain social esteem and social sanction JUDGEMENT with positive meaning.
In (4.1), the word ‘benefical’ was used as a JUDGEMENT and is uttered to appraise the good things for both the individual teenager and society as a whole. With the meaning of the word ‘benefical’, it belongs to the veracity item of
social sanction. And it is used in the argumentative essay entitled ‘Some people think that all teenagers should be required to do unpaid work in their free time to help the local community’. When using the word ‘beneficial’, the writer evaluated and emphasized the benefits for both individuals and the community when teenagers do volunteer work. Therefore, in terms of the semantic aspect of the word, the adjective ‘benefical’ showed the teenagers charity work with a positive meaning.

With the meanings of the word 'responsibility' used in (4.2), it is a property item of social sanction. The noun 'responsibility' is exploited to oblige young people to do unpaid work in their spare time. When using the word 'responsibility', the writer evaluated the morality of teenagers. This means the writer wanted to convey that this age group should have responsibility towards their community. Obviously, the semantics of this word shows teenagers’ positive moral qualities for that the writer identified.

In contrast, (4.3), (4.4) contain the lexis, which represents the negative judgment. The adjectives ‘improverished’ or ‘disadvantaged’ in (4.3) were used to appraise the difficulties of people in neighborhood and fellow citizens that need help. The author communicated to readers his thoughts regarding the suffering and impoverishment of a particular group of people in society by employing two negative terms of normality in judgment. Additionally, the writer also aided readers in picturing the situation and persuaded them with the semantics of the two adjectives used.

The word 'harmful' in (4.4) belongs to the veracity item of social sanction, which is uttered to appraise the bad effect of video games on some people. With the semantics of the adjective used, the writer accurately assessed the negative effects of playing video games. Obviously, by knowing how to choose the right type of judgement with the right semantics to evaluate the given context, the essay will be highly appreciated and highly convincing to the reader.

The similar analysis procedure of the data figured out a large number of the examples composing of the linguistic items which realize the JUDGEMENT, with their total number and the percentage distribution presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Social Esteem</th>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Total number of Judgement found in the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that the JUDGEMENT in students’ AEIWT2 come from all the two subcategories – social esteem and social sanction. However, the number of items showing these two types of JUDGEMENT is unevenly found in the data. To be precise, the social esteem and social sanction are extensively occurred in AEIWT2; the total number items of each type are 381 and 81 respectively. Together with this, the numbers of items demonstrating positive JUDGEMENT and negative JUDGEMENT are unevenly distributed in the samples with the rate of 8:2. These findings explicate that AEIWT2 often use the two categories social esteem and social sanction of JUDGEMENT to appreciate the writer’s specific perspective on a particular situation. In addition, the abundance of items denoting the positive JUDGEMENT found in the writing implies the writer’s favourable view of the given topics or his/her attempt to generate a similar view from the readers. The following sections focus on a detailed discussion about the JUDGEMENT found in this study with respect to their semantic features.

Social Esteem

In oral culture, jokes, gossips, conversations, and a variety of stories are used to police social media, with humor frequently playing a significant role (Egginns & Slade 1997). Thus, under reaction, the product/process is evaluated in terms of the impact it makes or its quality. The statistics shows that the use of this type of appraisal is unbalanced, with a much higher frequency of occurrences of positive NORMALITY. Here are the examples of this type of appraisal.

(4.5) Some hobbies are relatively easy, while others present more of a challenge. Personally, I believe that both types of hobby can be fun, and I therefore disagree with the statement that hobbies need to be difficult in order to be enjoyable. (AE-25)

(4.6) In my case, it took me around two years before I became competent at this activity, but now I enjoy it much more than I did when I started. I believe that many hobbies give us more pleasure when we reach a higher level of performance because the results are better and the feeling of achievement is greater. (AE-25)

(4.7) On the other hand, difficult hobbies can sometimes be more exciting. If an activity is more challenging, we might feel a greater sense of satisfaction when we manage to do it successfully. (AE-25)

(4.8) It overseas tourists stopped coming due to higher prices, there would be a risk of insufficient funding for the maintenance of these important buildings. (AE-18)

(4.9) In conclusion, I believe that every effort should be made to attract tourists from overseas, and it would be
counterproductive to make them pay more than local residents. (AE-20)
In the above examples, the positive JUDGEMENT is used in the sentences 4.5-4.9. In example (4.5), the adjective ‘enjoyable’ is uttered to appraise that people can enjoy all kinds of hobbies even when they are easy hobbies or difficult hobbies, and people’s ability and feeling in their hobbies is appraised by the lexical items ‘competent’ and ‘pleasure’ (4.6). Similarly, the positive results that people can reach with their hobbies which are appraised by the lexis ‘exciting’ and ‘successfully’ in (4.7). Actually, using the semantics of positive adjectives of social esteem helped the writer evaluate the nature of the situations presented in the topics of AEIWT2. Thanks to that, the writer was able to convey his message and opinion to the reader in a profound way. Furthermore, the writer helped readers better understand the issue, and from there, they also made their own judgement on whether they should agree or disagree with the writer’s point of view.

Based on the statistics in Table 3 above, the number of social esteem words is higher and the frequency of repeated use is higher than the social sanction words. However, it could be seen that the diverse use of the semantic vocabulary of social esteem was still limited. The writer only used vocal language with these semantics at the common vocabulary level. If the writer knew how to use vocabulary with this semantics at a more advanced level in AEIWT2, their writing would be evaluated more highly by the examiner.

In contrast, the negative JUDGEMENT is exploited to describe the negative affects of prices that foreign visitors should be charged more than local residents to visit important sites and monuments in (4.8) and (4.9) by the adjectives ‘insufficient’ and ‘counterproductive’. With the semantic use of these two adjectives, the writer reflected on and evaluated the unfavorable situation happening in the tourism service industry.

According to the statistics in Table 3 above, the number and frequency of use of negative judgement in students’ AEIWT2 is much less than positive judgement. It seemed that writers tended to use positive words to evaluate the given topic. However, if they knew how to expand and exploit more diverse vocabulary level with negative meaning at a more advanced level and use them with appropriate frequency in their essay, it would be certain that their arguments and comments would be sharper and more specialized for a specific topic. From there, they would receive higher consensus from readers as well as examiners.

In the data, the subtypes and status of all the social esteem found in the data is tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Esteem Found in the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical data in Table 4 reveal that linguistic elements of the social esteem come from three of its subcategories: normality, capacity and tenacity with 181 items demonstrating the normality outnumber that of the capacity (144 items) and tenacity (56 items). Also, the percentage of the items in positive social esteem outweighs that of the negative social esteem, with 89.4% and 10.6% respectively. This difference shows the ability to use social esteem vocabulary is not high. Students only grasp the majority of semantic words containing normality and capacity, while not many semantic words of tenacity. The linguistic realisations of all the social esteem found in the data would be discussed in detail in the following parts.

Normality
This type of the Judgement deals with how ‘special’ someone is. It can be positive or negative. All the linguistic items of this type of the Judgement are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortunate, happy, happiness beneficial, exciting, successfully, pleasure, enjoyable, entertaining, important, interesting, attractive, fashionable, creative, potential, interactive, glamorous, luxury, creative, interactive, academic, cool, lucky, stable, natural, famous, normal, unlucky, predictable, odd, celebrated, old-fashioned, informative, historical, flourished, significant, optimistic, useful, detrimental, overcrowded, stressful, pointless, incompatible, harmful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The linguistic items related to normality listed in Table 5 were found in 50 AEIWT2 written by students at the English center. Students used vocabulary with the semantics of normality to evaluate their writing the most and also used them with the highest repetition frequency compared to the semantics of the other parts of judgment. It can be seen
that the semantics of normality are suitable for making assessments of given topics. Therefore, students used this aspect of assessment with much more vocabulary and frequency of use than others.

It is obvious that students at the English center often employ the adjectives which deals with the appraising on a variety of things, most of which evaluate or comment on the specialness of a given phenomenon or specific situation. To be precise, the normality found in this study were employed to appraise typical features such as the salary of a job, the fame of celebrities, happiness in life, some of the difficulties of living in a city, average life expectancy, people’s hobbies, different types of music in the world, the state education system, teenagers’ activities in the local community. The normality found was also used to describe other situations, such as playing video games as harmless fun or as a useful educational tool, the paying of foreign visitors and local visitors for cultural and historical attractions, humans’ damage to the environment, the extinction of several languages, wild animals in the 21st century, and courses on the Internet. The following extracts illustrate the normality, which exists in the samples:

(4.10) It is true that ex-prisoners can become normal, productive members of society. I completely agree with the idea that allowing such people to speak to teenagers about their experiences is the best way to discourage them from breaking the law. (AE-41)

(4.11) There are various reasons why people believe that universities should only offer subjects that will be useful in the future. They may assert that university courses like medicine, engineering and information technology are more likely to be beneficial than certain art degrees. (AE-45)

(4.12) In conclusion, the economy is obviously a key marker of a country’s success, but social, environmental and health criteria are equally significant. (AE-17)

(4.13) It is true that some celebrities are known for their glamorous lifestyles rather than for the work they do. While I agree that these celebrities set a bad example for children, I believe that other famous people act as positive role models. (AE-24)

The JUDGEMENT in the instances above is inscribed in term of positive valuation. They are uttered to appraise the ex-prisoners can become normal, productive members of society in (4.10). The adjective ‘normal’ is used to express a non-special meaning. The writer used it to evaluate something that is not special and outstanding enough to have an impact on society. Using the correct semantics of judgement helped writers express the exact ideas they wanted to evaluate for a specific topic.

In (4.11), based on the meaning of the adjective ‘beneficial’, the writer wanted to convey to readers that he was evaluating the benefits of some subjects such as medicine, engineering, and information. The writers also used a comparative sentence structure to evaluate these courses as more beneficial than certain art degrees.

With the word ‘significial’ in (4.12). The writer wanted to assess the significant importance of social, environmental and health criteria. And in (4.13) to evaluate the lifestyle of famous people, the writer used the adjective ‘glamorous’.

Knowing how to correctly use the normality semantics of judgment helped writers clearly express their opinions and convey them to readers with high persuasiveness. The positive valuation of specific situations was effectively evaluated by the writers in the above samples.

Besides, the negative normality also occurs in the data. This type of JUDGEMENT is exploited to appraise a mountain-hiking journey, immigrants or artificial storms. Examples of this type are (4.14), (4.15) and (4.16).

(4.14) Many people, and children in particular, enjoy playing computer games. While I accept that these games can sometimes have a positive effect on the user, I believe that they are more likely to have a harmful impact. (AE-50)

(4.15) It is true that many older people believe in traditional values that often seem incompatible with the needs of younger people. While I agree that some traditional ideas are outdated, I believe that others are still useful and should not be forgotten. (AE-41)

(4.16) In conclusion, the selection of university students should be based on merit, and it should be both impractical and unfair to change to a selection procedure based on gender. (AE-42)

These examples show that the negative normality is skilfully used in students’ writing, which aims to show their perspective on a given situation. Although they are negative in nature, the JUDGEMENT of this type does not evoke negative effects on the readers. Instead, it could touch the readers’ recognition and agreement. Take (4.14) as an example, the lexical item ‘harmful’ could help readers recognize how video games negatively affect children. The word ‘incompatible’ in example (4.15) could evoke the readers’ attention to have more thought about traditional values for older people and younger people, while the adjective ‘impractical’ in (4.16) might supply the readers with the writer’s actual perspective about the affects of the numbers of male and female students in every subject at universities. Thanks to the use of semantics on the negative aspect of Normality in the above samples, the writer reflected and evaluated the nature of given situations based on her or his perspective.

Capacity

Capacity is related to ability, which means how capable something is being brought about. This type of JUDGEMENT occurs with a quite high frequency in the date collected. The capacity which presents this type of JUDGEMENT are listed in Table 6.
Table 6. Linguistic Items Denoting CAPACITY Found in the Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong, strongly, valued, successfully, competent, vital, potential, productive, educational, professional, affordable, independent, successful, competitive, possible, impossible, sound, healthy, sensible, applicable, valuable, accomplished, sensible, independence, powerful, maximising, fit, competent, incompetent, slow, experienced, clever, insightful, able, unable, minimise, renewable, unhealthy, unsuccessful, unstrong, weak, huge, minority, majority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows all the linguistic items denoting capacity found in the 50 AEIWT2 written by students at the English center. Based on Table 4.2 statistics on the number of words of capacity of judgement found in the writings, as well as the vocabulary of this type in Table 4.4 above, it can be seen that students used capacity with the second highest number and number of repetitions among the types of judgement. This may show that, like the normality above, capacity is used a lot by students for their writing because the semantic aspect of this type is more suitable for students to use to evaluate the topics given than other types of Judgement.

The appraisal of these linguistic items are of great diversity to evaluate the capacity of a given object, problem, or phenomenon such as the disappearance of several languages, the effects of technology on interaction among people, the importance of the salary factor when choosing a job, the people’s independence in the modern world, protecting wild animals in the 21st century. The following are the examples of the positive capacity extracted from the data.

(4.17) They could impose ‘green taxes’ on drivers, airline companies and other polluters, and they could invest in renewable energy production from solar, wind or water power. (AE-28)

(4.18) While adolescents are often indifferent to the guidance given by older people, I imagine that most of them would be extremely keen to hear the stories of ex-offender. The vivid and perhaps shocking nature of these stories is likely to have a powerful impact. (AE-32)

(4.19) Education is an important factor with regard to personal success in life. I believe that all children should have access to free schooling, and higher education should be either free or affordable for all those who chose to pursue a university degree. (AE-44)

In sample (4.17), the dominant feature of the energy production from solar, wind and water power is appraised by the lexis ‘renewable’, and in the other examples. The adjective ‘powerful’ in (4.18) shows how much impact adolescents have when they hear the stories of ex-offender. The reasonable tuition fees that students must pay when pursuing their education is appraised by the lexis ‘affordable’ (4.19). Thanks to the use of words of the capacity type with positive semantics in the above samples, the students evaluated the outstanding capacity of a specific situation in their writing and also helped readers recognize and evaluate contrary to the writer’s perception for that matter.

Like the negative normality, capacity’s counterpart is used with a lower frequency. The linguistic resources of this type of JUDGEMENT are exploited to appraise the limiting properties of the abilities of a given situation. The examples from (4.20) to (4.22) represent the capacity found in the data in its negative status.

(4.20) If a company is unable to pay its bills or meet the changing needs of customers, any concerns about social responsibilities become irrelevant. In other words, a company can only make a positive contribution to society if it is in good financial health. (AE-18)

(4.21) While I support regulations and safety measures, I believe that it would be wrong, and almost impossible, to ban extreme sports. (AE-21)

(4.22) Furthermore, the air quality in cities is often poor, due to pollution from traffic, and the streets and public transport systems are usually overcrowded. As a result, city life can be unhealthy and stressful. (AE-29)

In the above samples, the lack of financial capacity to pay a company’s bill is appraised by the adjective ‘unable’ in (4.20). The lexis item ‘impossible’ in (4.21) is employed to appraise that banning extreme sports is not feasible. It is also easily recognizable that the negative CAPACITY appears not to establish a negative view of the given topics. Instead, it aims to inform the readers that they can definitely experience a look in the writer’s perspective. The sample (4.22) expects to convey the message that there is a lack of health capacity for city life with the effects of pollution, which is appraised by the adjective ‘unhealthy’. In general, contrary to Capacity, which has a positive meaning, using negative capacity of judgement helped students evaluate the limited capacity of a given case.

Tenacity

Tenacity refers to how dependable someone or something is and how well they are disposed emotionally or in terms of their intentionality. It does not appear regularly in the samples compared to the other types; however, it can greatly contribute to the establishment of the students’ view in their writing. The linguistic realizations of tenacity found in the data was summarised in the following table.
Table 7. Linguistic Items Denoting TENACITY Found in the Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carefully, flexible, convenient, adapt, accommodate, pleasurable, adaptable, accommodating, patient, disciplined, content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 above cites the adjectives with tenacity belonging to Judgement found in the students’ writing. Along with the statistical data in Table 4.2, it can be seen that the number of vocabulary with Tenacity semantics is used by students the least as well as the least repetition frequency compared to Normality and Capacity of Social Esteem. Thereby, two aspects that can be given to explain the low use of this type of assessment language by students include: First, the semantics of tenacity are not suitable for the topics given in 50 AEIWT2 at the English Center. Second, students didn’t grasp all the vocabulary with tenacity semantics to use in their assessment.

The tenacity found in this study are employed to appraise typical features such as driver’s required characteristics for improving road safety, the advantages of online courses for students, and human adaptability in modern society. The following examples of the positive tenacity can support this point.

(4.23) The aim of these punishments is to show dangerous drivers that their actions have negative consequences. As a result, we would hope that drivers become more disciplined and alert, and that they follow the rules more carefully. (4.24) Despite the negatives mentioned above, I believe that online university courses are a positive development for various reasons. Firstly, they allow learners to study in a flexible way, meaning that they can work whenever and wherever is convenient, and they can cover the material at their own pace.

(4.25) In recent years, parents have had to adapt to various changes in our societies. Equal rights movements have made great progress, and it has become normal for women to gain qualifications and pursue a career. These linguistic resources denoting tenacity in the above sentences aim to intensify the characteristics of the appraised. The lexical items ‘disciplinary’ and ‘carefully’ in (4.23) appear to show driver’s carefulness and compliance with rules when travelling to reduce traffic accidents. It appears that, by exploiting the tenacity, the students in English center expect to strengthen the readers’ impression on the appraised. The lexis items ‘flexible’ and ‘convenient’ in (4.24) is employed to appraise that flexibility and convenience are the advantages that online university courses can bring to students. Sample (4.25) expects to convey the message about the adaptability of parents to the changes in our society today, which is appraised by the lexical item ‘adapt’. Tenacity’s positive semantic vocabulary that students used helped them evaluate the resilience, flexibility, accommodating, and adaptable aspects of the situations mentioned in their writing.

Besides, there were not any linguistic resources of negative tenacity found in the data. This shows that students at the English Center did not study the words with this semantics to include in their topics given to increase diversity and be more convincing for readers in their use of evaluation language.

**Social Sanction**

Social sanctions are social reactions that represent judgement on others behaviour and can be as subtle as a nod or smile for conformity or a shake of the head or a look of disapproval for nonconformity. Social sanctions are often considered to be punishments, like legal sanctions. Social sanctions enforce a standard of behaviour that is deemed socially acceptable and this is essential for society to regulate itself and maintain order. The data indicate that there is an imbalance in the application of this kind of appraisal, with a significantly higher frequency of positive social sanction occurrences. These are some instances of this kind of evaluation.

(4.26) In my opinion, anyone can take interesting pictures without knowing too much about the technicalities of operating a camera. Despite being straightforward, taking photos is a satisfying activity. (AE-42) (4.27) On the one hand, there are clear ethical arguments against animal experimentation. To use a common example of this practice, laboratory mice may be given an illness so that the effectiveness of a new drug can be measured. (AE-33)

(4.28) Opponents of such research argue that humans have no right to subject animals to this kind of trauma, and that the lives of all creatures should be respected. They believe that the benefits to humans do not justify the suffering caused, and that scientists should use alternative methods of research. (AE-30)

(4.29) Personally, I agree with the banning of animal testing for non-medical products, but I feel that it may be a necessary evil where new drugs and medical procedures are concerned. (AE-29) (4.30) Inequality, on the other hand, would be more likely to demotivate people because they would know that the odds of success were stacked in favour of those from privileged backgrounds. (AE-21) (4.31) Apart from the practical concerns expressed above, I also believe that it would be unfair to base admission to university courses on gender. Universities should continue to select the best candidates for each course according to their qualifications. (AE-12)

In the above examples, the positive social sanction is used in the sentences (4.26) – (4.28). In example (4.26), the adjective ‘straightforward’ is uttered to appraise the frankness in evaluating photography activities, and the ethics of...
experimentation on animals is appraised by the lexical item ‘ethical’ in (4.27). Similarly, the justified characteristic mentioned in causing suffering to the lives of creatures through research methods is appraised by the lexis ‘justify’ in (4.28). In contrast, the negative social sanction is exploited to describe the negative affects such as the evilness of testing for non-medical products, new drugs, or medical procedures on animals that is appraised by the adjective ‘evil’ in (4.29). The lexis item ‘inequality’ in (4.30) is used to appraise if the inequality occurs, it will demotivate people. Like in (4.31), the lexis item ‘unfair’ is also used to appraise the inequality that will happen if admission to university courses is based on gender. In the data, the subtypes and status of all the social sanction found in the data is tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sanction</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
<th>Veracity</th>
<th>Total number of Social Sanction found in the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>F 52</td>
<td>% 86.7</td>
<td>F 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Social Esteem, the Social Sanction showed an unbalance within its subcategories: propriety and veracity, with the figures of items being 60 and 20 respectively. Nevertheless, there exists an unbalanced distribution relating to the positive-negative status both in the Social Sanction and its subtypes. Statistics show that students at the English center didn't learn much about vocabulary with Social Sanction Semantics to evaluate given situations in order to increase diversity in the use of evaluation to increase persuasion to readers and receive high appreciation from AEIWT2 examiners. Details of its subcategories will be presented in the following sections.

Propriety

Propriety involves the way we evaluate the state or quality of conforming to conventionally accepted standards of behavior or morals. All the linguistic resources of this subcategory of appreciation are collected in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Lexical items denoting the PROPRIETY found in the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair, ethical, justify, evil, equal, inequality, unfair, bad, equally, equality, justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 above shows all lexical items denoting the Propriety found in the Data. From the table, it can be seen that students use the number of semantic words of Propriety to evaluate the situations in their AEIWT2 not much in both quantity and frequency. This shows a lack of vocabulary with this meaning in students. Therefore, they are not able to exploit and build evaluation ideas with this meaning for aspects appearing in their writing.

The positive propriety in student’s writing under consideration aims to appraise the fairness, equality of a particular social aspect is given. (4.32) In particular, we should consider the area of social justice, human rights, equality and democracy itself. (AE-21)

Sentence (4.32) is the example of positive propriety, which were extracted from the samples. These linguistic items, which are used in (4.32) intensify the characteristics of the equality and fairness in economic progress. It appears that with the use of the semantics of propriety the writer expects to strengthen the readers’ impression on the appraised.

The negative propriety has a wide range of the appraised though its use is less than that of the positive one. This type of Judgement is exploited in the sample data to appraise the bad things and unfairness in a social phenomenon. (4.33) Currently, the difference between normal and top salaries is huge, and this can demotivate workers who feel that the situation is unfair. (AE-27)

Sentence (4.33) contains the negative propriety. In (4.33) the word ‘unfair’ is used to appraise the unfairness of the pay-gap between bosses and employees, which can demotivate workers who feel that the situation is unfair. These linguistic items of propriety contribute to the promotion of the ethical improvement of aspects in a specific social situation, which they appraise despite their negative nature. If students at the center have a more diverse vocabulary with propriety semantics, they will develop richer and more convincing evaluation ideas for their topics.

Veracity

Veracity involves the quality of being true, honest, or accurate. The veracity occurs with the lowest frequency in AEIWT2 under investigation. All the linguistic items of this subcategory of JUDGEMENT are collected in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Lexical items denoting the VERACITY found in the Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veracity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward, true, honest, wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of these lexical items that indicate the veracity present in the data are listed in Table 4.7 above. Students at the English Center used too little of this semantic vocabulary to evaluate topics and express their opinions in their AEIWT2. This student's lack of vocabulary in this aspect of judgment actually lacks diversity in their evaluative semantics. This led to their AEIWT2 lacking the persuasiveness to achieve agreement or appreciation from the examiner.

The positive veracity in the student’s writing under consideration aims to appraise how truthful someone is in a particular social aspect.

(4.34) In conclusion, it is true that we cannot help everyone, but in my opinion national boundaries should not stop us from helping those who are in need.

The sentence (4.34) is an example of positive veracity, which was extracted from the samples. The lexis item ‘true’ which is used in 4.34 intensifies the truth about the mentioned situation according to the writer’s view.

The negative veracity was used less than the positive one under investigation. This type of JUDGEMENT is used in sample data to assess a situation's lack of truthfulness, honesty, or accuracy.

(4.35) For a variety of reasons, it would be wrong to reduce taxes for families who pay for private education.

The sentence (4.35) is an example of positive propriety, which was extracted from the samples. The lexis item ‘wrong’ is uttered to indicate that reducing taxes for families who pay for private education is not right. Finding the negative and positive semantics of the two types of veracity and propriety evaluation of JUDGEMENT in students AEIWT2 indicated that this kind of judgment is really necessary for students to evaluate the aspects of the semantics of morality and authenticity of particular situations.

**Syntactic features of the judgement in the AEIWT2.**

This study examines the linguistic elements which function as JUDGEMENT in the AEIWT2 in light of the Theory of Functional Grammar (Halliday, 1985). This theory states that each linguistic element can be considered in terms of a variety of key concepts including: functions and systems, hierarchical ranking of units, word orders, word groups, functions of the sentences, theme, mood, transitivity, and the clause complex (Feng, 2013). However, the present study only focuses on the Theme - Rheme structure due to its crucial role in communication, in which themes and rhemes help us understand how information is conveyed in clauses. Downing (1991) asserts that the Theme - Rheme structure is an important concept of the Functional Grammar; together, these elements make up the functional configuration of the clause as message. Theme is “the starting-point of the message... what the clause is going to be about” (Halliday, 1985: p.39). Martin,

Together with the attempt to clarify the Theme - Rheme structure in which the linguistic elements denoting JUDGEMENT, this study also aims to analyse these themes and rhemes at a deeper level in which the linguistic elements constituting these themes and rhemes were considered in terms of the word groups classified by Functional Grammar: noun groups, verb groups, adjective groups, and prepositional groups (Martin, Matthiessen & Painter, 1997). The Theme - Rheme structure of JUDGEMENT found in the samples is tabulated as follows.

**Table 11. The JUDGEMENT in the Theme and Rheme Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme - Rheme structure</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Rheme</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 11 illustrates, 712 out of 804 items, or 88.6 %, occur in the Rheme position, which accounts for the majority of the JUDGEMENT found in this study. This indicates that the linguistic items acting as JUDGEMENT are frequently used in the AEIWT2 under consideration to appraise the thorough assessment of the mentioned aspects. Further information about the argumentative essay portion of IELTS writing task 2 that is frequently evaluated using JUDGEMENT is covered later in this chapter. Our primary focus is on analyzing the word groups that make up the JUDGEMENT within these themes and rhemes.

**Structure of the JUDGEMENT in Theme**

The statistical analysis in Table 4.8 shows that Theme is not often appraised in the AEIWT2, with only 11.4 % of the JUDGEMENT found in the samples placed in the Theme position. Further, the collected data indicate that the types of word groups functioning as JUDGEMENT is quite restricted in the Theme position in this type of writing. The statistics for these word groups is presented in Table 12.

**Table 12. Structure of JUDGEMENT in the Theme Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme structure</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun groups</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verb groups 0 0%
Adverb groups 3 3.3%
Adjective groups 0 0%
Prepositional groups 1 1.1%
Total 92 100%

Table 12 above indicates all groups functioning as judgments in the theme position found in the data. It can be seen that there is a large difference in the number of functional groups. Noun groups denoting judgment in the theme position occupy the largest percentage, with 88 out of 92 items occupying 95.6%. This shows that students have a tendency, or it may be more convenient for them, to express the semantics of judgment in the theme position in the noun functional group than in other groups. The examples of noun groups denoting as JUDGEMENT in the Theme position are below.

(4.36) However, an even stronger argument against such a ban would be the difficulty of enforcing it. (AE-11)
(4.37) Having a good manager or friendly colleagues can make a huge difference to workers’ levels of happiness and general quality of life. (AE-17)
(4.38) Strict punishments can certainly help to encourage people to drive more safely. (AE-21)
(4.39) On the other hand, reliable alternatives to animal experimentation may not always be available. (AE-43)
(4.40) Equal rights movements have made great progress, and it has become normal for women to gain qualifications and pursue a career. (AE-31)
(4.41) Firstly, a healthy economy results in job creation, a high level of employment, and better salaries for all citizens. (AE-19)
(4.42) In conclusion, simple hobbies can be fun and relaxing, but difficult hobbies can be equally pleasurable for different reasons. (AE-26)
(4.43) The vivid and perhaps shocking nature of these stories is likely to have a powerful impact. (AE-25)
(4.44) In recent years, extreme sports have become increasingly popular, and some people argue that governments should prohibit them. (AE-14)

In these examples, the phrases including ‘an even stronger argument against such a ban’, ‘having a good manager or friendly colleagues’, ‘strict punishments’, ‘reliable alternatives to animal experimentation’, ‘equal rights movements’, ‘a healthy economy’, ‘simple hobbies’, ‘the vivid and perhaps shocking nature of these stories’ and ‘extreme sports’ give the readers the points of departure for the development of the sentences containing them, whose further details are provided in the remaining part of the sentence. In other words, these phrases include the Given unit of information, followed by the New which presented in the rest of the sentence (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). These phrases represent the themes of the sentences in the language of functional grammar, and in the sentences above, each theme is modified by an adjective that indicates JUDGEMENT. Furthermore, since these themes are all the subjects of the sentences that begin in the initial position, none of them are marked in the examples (Downing, 1991, p. 123). As a result of their function as the subject in the first position in the sentences, all of the noun groups in the Theme position found in the data are actually "unmarked," according to the data analysis. The adverbs denoting JUDGEMENT in the Theme position has three occurrences, with the examples extracted from the data collected presented below.

(4.45) Equally, it seems only fair that men should be free to leave their jobs in order to assume childcare responsibilities if this is what they wish to do. (AE-21)
(4.46) Inequality, on the other hand, would be more likely to demotivate people because they would know that the odds of success were stacked in favour of those from privileged background. (AE-7)
(4.47) Honestly, teenagers are more likely to accept advice from someone who can speak from experience. Reformed offenders can tell young people about how they became involved in crime, the dangers of a criminal lifestyle, and what life in prison is really like. (AE-3)

It is easy to recognise that the propriety ‘equally’ in (4.45), ‘inequality’ in (4.46) and the veracity ‘honestly’ in (4.47) are all adverbs in the Theme position, and they are unmarked since the adverbs can occupy the initial position in the sentence structure. (AE-48)

The JUDGEMENT in the form of a prepositional group in the Theme position has only one occurrence. Now let's look at example (4.48). (AE-2)

(4.48) In my opinion, this trend could have both positive and negative consequence in equal measure. (AE-3)
The preposition group ‘in equal’ is still in the Theme position though it occupies the final position in the sentence structure. Accordingly, unlike the others, the prepositional group in the Theme position is marked since it belongs to the subject which coincides with the second constituent of the mood structure (Halliday, 1985).

**Structure of the JUDGEMENT in Rheme Position**
The JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position occupies the majority of the total items denoting JUDGEMENT found in the data, with 712 occurrences occupying 88.6 % (see a comparison with the JUDGEMENT in the Theme position in...
The parts of speech of the items denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position are presented in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rheme Structure</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun groups</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb groups</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb groups</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective groups</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositional groups</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 above indicates all groups functioning as judgments in the Rheme position found in the data. Although they are unevenly distributed, the items denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position occur in a variety of word groups, including noun, verb, adverb, adjective, and prepositional groups. It can be seen that there is a large difference in the number of functional groups. Like the JUDGEMENT in the Theme position, noun groups expressing JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position occupy the larger percentage, with 514 out of 712 items occupying 72.1%. The second largest percentage is the adjective group, with 104 out of 712 items occupying 14.6%. The third largest percentage is the adverb group, with 45 out of 712 items occupying 6.3%. This shows that using adjectives with evaluative semantics in the functional groups of nouns, adjectives, and adverbs in the Rheme position is more convenient for students than the other groups. Furthermore, these word groups are often core functional groups that carry the main semantics of the sentences. Therefore, the readers often focus more on the semantic evaluation of the essay in these groups.

The following are some examples, followed by their analysis.

(4.49) For example, a company owner will need well-qualified and competent staff, and a well-funded education system can provide such employees. (AE-17)

(4.50) Governments and local councils should pay creative artists to produce this kind of art, because without their funding our cities would be much less interesting and attractive. (AE-23)

(4.51) On the other hand, there are clear ethical arguments against animal experimentation. (AE-46)

(4.52) However, I do not agree with the idea of accepting equal proportions of each gender in every university subject. (AE-15)

(4.53) In this way, museums can play an important role in teaching people about history, culture, science and many other aspects of life. (AE-19)

(4.54) A language has a vital connection with the cultural identity of the people who speak it. (AE-21)

(4.55) It is truly an honest way to ban testing on animals for vital research until equally effective alternatives have been developed. (AE-26)

(4.56) Firstly, universities supply a flexible method of study for learners, meaning that they can work whenever and wherever they want, and they can cover the material at their own pace. (AE-30)

All the above examples contain noun groups whose modifiers denote JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position (the word groups in bold). The noun group of example (4.49) has the capacity ‘competent’ and ‘well-qualified’ which appraises the outstanding capabilities that a company needs in their employees. Similarly, the noun groups of the other examples express the JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position: the normality ‘creative’ in (4.50), ‘important’ in (4.53), and ‘vital’ in (4.54), the propriety ‘ethical’ in (4.51) and ‘equal’ in (4.52), the veracity ‘honest’ in (4.55) and the tenacity ‘flexible’ in (4.56).

Despite the fact that adjectives are the major resources of JUDGEMENT, the frequency of adjective groups denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position just come second, with 104 items (14.6%). These adjective groups are usually modified by an adverb and come after the linking verb “be”. The examples for the adjective groups denoting JUDGEMENT include (4.57) - (4.60). Specifically, in (4.57), the capacity ‘successful’ appears in the Rheme position to appraise the success of students in their careers if they continue their studies beyond school level. In examples (4.58) and (4.59), the normality ‘important’ (modified by the adverb ‘vitally’) and ‘counterproductive’, the propriety ‘unfair’ in (4.75).

(4.57) For the reasons mentioned above, it seems to me that students are more likely to be successful in their careers if they continue their studies beyond school level. (AE-11)

(4.58) Firstly, it is vitally important to educate people properly before they start to drive, and this could be done in schools or even as part of an extended or more difficult driving test. (AE-33)

(4.59) In conclusion, I believe that every effort should be made to attract tourists from overseas, and it would be counterproductive to make them pay more than local residents. (AE-44)

(4.60) It would be unfair to change to a selection procedure based on gender. (AE-12)
The third largest group contributing to the resources of JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position is the adverb groups with 45 items occupying 6.3%. With examples from (4.61) to (4.63), the propriety ‘especially’ (4.61), the normality ‘especially’ and ‘dramatically’ in (4.62), the capacity ‘successfully’ in (4.63) are all in the Rheme position to describe different themes.

(4.61) Equally, it seems only fair that men should be free to leave their jobs in order to assume childcare responsibilities if this is what they wish to do. (AE-7)

(4.62) Firstly, life is more complex and difficult, especially because the cost of living has increased so dramatically. (AE-19)

(4.63) On the other hand, difficult hobbies can sometimes be more exciting. If an activity is more challenging, we might feel a greater sense of satisfaction when we manage to do it successfully. (AE-11)

Next, with 37 items making up 5.2% of the resources for the JUDGEMENT found in the study, is the verb group. The examples that follow are taken from the data that was gathered, the verb groups that indicate JUDGEMENT are bolded.

(4.64) In recent years, parents have had to adapt to various changes in our societies. (AE-18)

(4.65) We do not need to exploit or destroy every last square metre of land in order to feed or accommodate the world’s population. (AE-48)

(4.66) In other words, equality does not mean that people lose their motivation to succeed, or that they are not allowed to fail. (AE-50)

The least popular resources of JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position is the prepositional groups, with only 12 items (1.8%) found in total samples collected. Actually, the examples from (4.67) to (4.69) reveal that the prepositional groups denoting JUDGEMENT follow a fixed pattern: a preposition followed by a noun preceded by an adjective.

(4.67) This will result in a well-educated workforce, and in turn a more productive and prosperous nation. (AE-11)

(4.68) In our globalised world, young adults can expect to come into contact with people from a huge variety of backgrounds, and it is more important than ever to treat others with respect. (AE-15)

(4.69) In conclusion, although it might seem sensible for universities to focus only on the most useful subjects. (AE-25)

**V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS**

**Conclusion**

This study examined the manifestation of subsystem JUDGEMENT in the system of attitude in the appraisal framework. Fifty AEIWT2 written by students at the English Center were analyzed in terms of their syntactic and semantic features.

Semantically, the linguistic items expressing JUDGEMENT cover all the two subcategories – social esteem and social sanction. However, the number of these items denoting three types of JUDGEMENT is unevenly distributed. Precisely, the social esteem and social sanction are extensively exploited in AEIWT2, with the total number of each type (413 and 49 items respectively). Besides, the number of items denoting positive JUDGEMENT and negative JUDGEMENT are imbalanced; nearly 89.4% of the total items denoting JUDGEMENT found in the study is positive and only 10.6% is negative.

Within the subcategory of social esteem, the linguistic items denoting normality outnumber those of the capacity and tenacity, with 181, 144 and 56 items respectively. Also, the percentage of the items denoting positive social esteem outweighs that of the negative social esteem, with 89.5% and 10.5% respectively.

Like the social esteem, the social sanction showed an imbalance within its subcategories: propriety and veracity, with 60 and 21 items respectively. Therefore, there exists an unbalanced distribution associated with the positive-negative status both in the social sanction and its subtypes. The positive social sanction has 72 occurrences in the samples while the figure for its counterpart is only 9.

Regarding the appraised, the JUDGEMENT found in the present study appraises a variety of social topics such as the state education system for children, helping everyone in the world or just only people in our communities and countries, the traditional music of a country is more important than the international music, teenagers should be required to do unpaid work in their free time to help the local community, hobbies need to be difficult to be enjoyable, average life expectancy in the developed world, videos games are having an adverse effect on the people who play them, foreign visitors should pay more than local visitors for cultural and historical attractions, governments should give financial support to creative artists such as painters and musicians, animal experiments are widely used to develop new medicines and to test the safety of other products, there has been growing interest in the relationship between equality and personal achievement, some of the ways in which humans are damaging the environment, universities should accept numbers of male and female students in every subject, museums should be enjoyable places to entertain people, etc. It is interesting that readers won't likely experience negative effects from the use of the negative JUDGEMENT discovered in this study. Rather, it might pique the readers’ interest, focus, and concern. To put it another way, the samples under consideration's negative JUDGEMENT indicates that they skillfully used social
aspects of writing tests to draw readers in spite of their negative meaning.
Syntactically, the vast majority of the items denoting JUDGEMENT found in this study occurs in the Rheme position, with 712 out of 804 items, which occupies 88.6%; only 11.4% of the items denoting JUDGEMENT found in the samples placed in the Theme position. The reason most evvaluative words appear in the Rheme position is because Rheme plays an important role in developing the ideas of the sentence. Therefore, Rheme contains much more words with evaluative semantics than Theme. It is statistically evident that, in the AEIWT2, the JUDGEMENT is regularly exploited to appraise the new issues that deserve attention in today’s modern society. Further, the data reveal that the types of word groups denoting JUDGEMENT is quite restricted in the Theme position in this type of writing. In the samples collected only noun groups, adverb groups and prepositional groups which are used to denote JUDGEMENT can be seen in the Theme position, with 88 occurrences (95.6%) being noun groups, 3 ones (3.3%) being adverb groups and only one occurrence (1.1%) being prepositional group.

Unlike the Theme structure, the items denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position occurs in all the word groups: noun groups, verb groups, adverb groups, adjective groups and prepositional groups though they are unevenly distributed. Noun groups items denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position occupy the larger percentage, with 514 out of 712 items occupying 72.1%. The frequency of adjective groups items denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position just come second, with 104 items (14.6%). The third largest group contributing to the items denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position is the adverb groups, with 63%. The verb groups for the JUDGEMENT found in the study come next, with 37 items occupying 5.2%. The least popular items denoting JUDGEMENT in the Rheme position is the prepositional group, with only 12 items (1.8%) found in the total of data collected. The prepositional groups which can work as JUDGEMENT follows a fixed pattern: a preposition followed by a noun preceded by an adjective.

This study’s findings reflect the nature of AEIWT2. It is a genre of academic writing that requires the student to investigate a topic, collect, generate, and evaluate evidence, and establish a position on the topic in a concise manner. The writers attempt to convince the reader of a particular standpoint based on logical reasoning, facts, and evidence. By using the Normality, students strengthen the reader’s feeling about special features of a particular thing. Students describe in detail the specific capacity of something by using the Capacity and provide the reader with detailed descriptions of how dependable someone or something is by extensively using the Tenacity. These argumentative essays will be convincing and highly appreciated if writers can provide rigorous arguments through skillful and diverse use of evaluative language with reasonable frequency.

Through the data collected above, the number of words of evaluative language that belong to subsystem JUDGEMENT in the system of attitude in the appraisal framework used by students at the English Center for AEIWT2 is low. Besides, there is a large difference in quality when using the linguistic items of JUDGEMENT in students’ AEIWT2. With two subcategories of JUDGEMENT, the frequency of using social esteem is greater than social sanction. This distinction also exists in each type of social esteem and social sanction. Specifically, with social esteem, the normality is used much more frequently than capacity and tenacity. Propriety, like social sanction, is used more frequently than veracity. Therefore, the ability to persuade readers to seek agreement on the points raised in argumentative essays for AEIWT2 is not high.

**Implications for teachers**
With knowledge of the judgment in the AEIWT2 found, teachers can design some kinds of exercises such as exercises on vocabulary referring to the subsystem of judgment, exercises on language functions, and exercises for applying the semantic and syntactic features of JUDGEMENT language in writing argumentative essays to help students write AEIWT2 more effectively.

**Implications for students**
The study gives language learners access to a wealth of linguistic materials from JUDGEMENT, which they can utilize in the AEIWT2. However, In other words, a solid grammatical knowledge is not able to ensure successful communication, but they should pay much attention to language functions the purposes in which they use language to convey their thought and perspective.

Owing to the complexity and diversity of the subsystem of judgment, the content and structures of judgment are not easy for all English learners. Nevertheless, the solid knowledge gained from the judgment is of great help in writing in a foreign language. Of all the language functions, judgment could be the most important linguistic resource that allows language learners to express their intention, opinion, feeling, emotion, and attitude so that they can gain more effectiveness in writing. On the other hand, good knowledge of the judgment system that writers use to express their intention, opinion, feeling, emotion, and attitude when the linguistic elements functioning as judgment occur in their written language. By practicing exercises on vocabulary referring to the subsystem of judgment, practicing writing the argumentative essays with the JUDGEMENT subsystem within the Appraisal Framework's ATTITUDE subsystem, and doing types of exercises on language functions given by teachers, students at the English Center will improve their writing of the argumentative essays of IELTS Writing Task 2.
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APPENDIX
Appendix. Tally Sheet
Sheet No.: ………………………… Date: ………………………
Sample name:………………………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Esteem</td>
<td>Social Sanction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normality (+/-)</td>
<td>Capacity (+/-)</td>
</tr>
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<td>----------------</td>
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