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Abstract

Name: Abdalla Mahmoud Arabi Adam

Title: Expository Writing Problems Encountered by Sudanese EFL Graduate Students: A Contrastive Rhetoric Approach

This study aims to investigate Sudanese EFL graduate students’ expository writing problems in terms of the contrastive rhetoric approach. As the contrastive rhetoric approach is concerned with the study of aspects of differences and similarities between the L1 and L2 writing techniques, this study attempts to explore Sudanese EFL graduate students’ English expository writing difficulties from both linguistic and cultural backgrounds perspectives. To achieve this purpose, the researcher has reviewed extensively the theoretical framework of the study as well as the previous related studies and in the light of this literature review six hypotheses have been formulated.

To conduct this study, the researcher has used a descriptive analytic method. The sample of the study consisted of two groups: the first group consists of Sudanese English language and linguistics teachers in some Sudanese universities, and the second group consists of Sudanese EFL graduate students (i.e. MA English, MA translation and postgraduate diploma students majoring in English) studying at some Sudanese universities. The sample of the study consists of 110 Sudanese English language and linguistics teachers in thirteen Sudanese tertiary institutions and 110 Sudanese EFL graduate students studying at five Sudanese universities during the academic year 2008-2009.
The data of the study was collected through two instruments: teachers’ questionnaire and students’ English expository writing test.

Upon analyzing the collected data statistically by using SPSS program, the study revealed some important results. One of the results shows that, a great deal of the students exhibited instances of unnecessary repetition in writing an English expository text. Moreover, the results of the questionnaire reveal that 73% of the respondents believe that Arabic writing technique of repetition seems to be one of the principal obstacles that face most Sudanese EFL graduate students in English writing. The results also indicate that in writing an English expository text, students encounter problems of logical organization such as failure to provide a topic sentence, accumulation of several central ideas in one paragraph, absence of supporting evidence and failure to draw an effective conclusion. In addition, the results of the study confirm that many Sudanese EFL graduate students face great difficulties in achieving both cohesion and coherence in English writing. On the one hand, the results indicate that there are no significant differences between the MA English students and MA translation students with respect to overall English writing performance. On the other hand, significant differences are noticed between the MA (English and translation) and postgraduate diploma students in terms of Arabic interference and coherence. Finally, the results prove that 88% of the Sudanese university teachers assume that EFL reading proficiency could enable Sudanese EFL graduate students to improve their English writing abilities, particularly in terms of rhetorical techniques development.
مستخلص

الأسم: عبد الله محمود عربي آدم

عنوان الرسالة: مشكلات كتابة العرض و التحليل باللغة الإنجليزية لطلاب الدراسات العليا السودانيين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في ضوء نظرية التحبير التقبالي.

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى الكشف عن مشكلات كتابة العرض و التحليل باللغة الإنجليزية لطلاب الدراسات العليا السودانيين (ماجستير اللغة الإنجليزية، ماجستير الترجمة، الدبلوم العالي في اللغة الإنجليزية) الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في ضوء نظرية التحبير التقبالي. و بما أن هذه النظرية تتعلق بدراسة أوجه الاختلاف والتشابه في أساليب (طريقة) الكتابة بين اللغة الأم واللغة الثانية، فإن هذه الدراسة تتحاول الكشف عن مشكلات كتابة العرض و التحليل باللغة الإنجليزية بالنسبة لطلاب الدراسات العليا السودانيين (ماجستير اللغة الإنجليزية، ماجستير الترجمة، الدبلوم العالي في اللغة الإنجليزية) الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية من منظور الخلفية اللغوية والثقافية. و لتحقيق هذا الهدف، لقد استعرض الباحث على نحو واسع الاطار النظري للدراسة بالإضافة إلى الأبحاث والدراسات السابقة ذات الصلة بالدراسة وبناءً على ذلك تمت صياغة ست فرضيات.

لإجراء هذه الدراسة، اتبع الباحث المنهج الوصفي التحليلي. تتكون عينة البحث من فئتين، الفئة الأولى تتكون من أساتذة اللغة الإنجليزية و اللغويات ببعض الجامعات السودانية، والفئة الثانية تتكون من طلاب الدراسات العليا السودانيين (ماجستير اللغة الإنجليزية، ماجستير الترجمة، الدبلوم العالي في اللغة الإنجليزية) الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، حيث بلغ حجم العينة 110 أستاذًا و 110 طالبًا وطالبة للعام الدراسي 2008-2009م.

جمع الباحث بيانات الدراسة بواسطة أدواتين هما استبيان الأساتذة و اختبار كتابة العرض و التحليل باللغة الإنجليزية للطلاب.

بتحليل بيانات الدراسة إحصائياً باستخدام برنامج الحزمة الإحصائية لعلوم الإحصاء (SPSS)، توصلت الدراسة إلى عدد من النتائج أهمها، فيما يختص بمشكلات داخل اللغة العربية في النتائج أظهرت العديد من حالات التكرار غير الضروري عند كتابة الطلاب لنص العرض وتحليل باللغة الإنجليزية كما أوضحت نتائج استبيان الأساتذة أن 73% من الأساتذة يعتقدون أن أسلوب التكرار
في الكتابة في اللغة العربية يبدو واحدًا من العوائق الرئيسة التي تواجه معظم طلاب الدراسات العليا السودانيين (ماجستير اللغة الإنجليزية، ماجستير الترجمة، الدبلوم العالي في اللغة الإنجليزية) الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية. وأوضحت نتائج الدراسة أنه عند كتابة الورقة والتحليل باللغة الإنجليزية، يواجه الطلاب صعوبات في التنظيم المنطقي وذلك مثل فشلهم في إبراز جملة الموضوع، تراكم عدة آراء أساسية في الفقرة الواحدة، غياب المعلومات المساعدة وفشلهم في استخلاص الخاتمة المؤثرة. كما أوضحت نتائج الدراسة أن العديد من طلاب الدراسة واجهوا مشكلات في تحقيق الربط والتساوق في الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية. بالإضافة إلى أن نتائج الدراسة أظهرت بأنه لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين طلاب ماجستير اللغة الإنجليزية وطلاب ماجستير الترجمة في الأداء العام بالنسبة للكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية، بينما توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين طلاب الماجستير (اللغة الإنجليزية + الترجمة) وطلاب الدبلوم العالي في اللغة الإنجليزية بالنسبة لمشكلات تداخل اللغة العربية والتساوق. أخيرًا خلصت نتائج الدراسة بأنه تقريباً 88% من أساتذة اللغة الإنجليزية واللغويات بالجامعات السودانية يعتقدون بأن الكفاية في القراءة باللغة الإنجليزية قد تمكن طلاب الدراسات العليا السودانيين الدارسين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في تحسين مقدراتهم الكتابية في اللغة الإنجليزية، خاصة فيما يختص بتطوير أساليب الكتابة.
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>English for specific purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Foreign language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELTS</td>
<td>International English language testing service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1/L2</td>
<td>One's first and second language respectively.</td>
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<tr>
<td>LSA</td>
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<tr>
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<td>NES</td>
<td>Native English speakers.</td>
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<td>NGOs</td>
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<td>SL</td>
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</table>
TESL = Teaching English as a second language.
TESOL = Teaching English to speakers of other languages.
TSA = Topical structure analysis.
T- Unit = is a means of sentence development. Hunt (1965:20) defines it as "one main clause with all subordinate clauses attached to it".
TWE = Test of written English.
WPA = Writing programme association.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

No matter how one’s language functions, writing is thought to be a challenging task for many people throughout the world. In fact, this challenge seems to be more evident when someone tends to write in a foreign or second language (FL or SL), which requires awareness of multifarious language parameters that go beyond a sentence level's knowledge. This means that FL/SL writing as a means of communication demands a number of linguistic, rhetorical and cultural factors that would enable an EFL writer to communicate his/her intended meaning clearly and effectively. Thus, because of its (i.e. writing) complex nature, many EFL learners, although they seem to have a good grasp of English language aspects, are often apt to put off engaging in EFL writing tasks.

Broadly speaking, EFL writers normally come across various difficulties when writing an English expository text, probably because they might be influenced by their L1 rhetorical techniques which are different from those adopted in Western writing styles, or even they might feel that their written work will be erroneous and slipshod due to lack of appropriate English writing skills. From this perspective, then, it is fair to argue that apart from grammatical problems that EFL writers usually face, writing seems to spin around culturally embedded hindrances, the reason why too many Sudanese EFL graduate students encounter serious problems when writing in English. Indeed, failure to understand the writing techniques of a foreign
language may result in uncontrollable rhetorical overlaps, ambiguity and distortion of the written text. Connor (2002:493), for example, maintains that contrastive rhetoric shows that language and writing are cultural phenomena in the sense that each language has its own rhetorical techniques, and the linguistic and rhetorical patterns of the L1 interfere with the writing techniques of the L2. In her view, EFL writers irrespective of their literacy levels need to be aware of various rhetorical styles and understand that each writing system is a result of culturally acquired values. Of course, this suggests that, as stated earlier, being aware of writing basics such as grammar, vocabulary, spelling and so on, is not enough since a piece of good writing goes beyond these elements. For instance, it needs one to understand that English writing requires a clear and concise introduction, which leaves a lot on the body of the topic, well structured sentences, logical organization of ideas, presence of tone, etc. Therefore, the chief realm of this study is to investigate the effect of Arabic rhetorical techniques’ interference in Sudanese EFL graduate students’ English expository writing. In other words, their constant transfer of Arabic rhetorical features into English writing will weaken the overall meaning of their written English discourse.

In general, written communication in terms of contrastive rhetoric (CR) has been the focal point of many researchers (Atkinson, 2004; Canagarajah, 2002; Kubota, 2004, among others) who point out that the analysis of a written text is a relatively new research area. It appeared over the past thirty years based on sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, applied linguistics, cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence research, all of which will pertain to the concept of textual variation which is one of the principal concerns of this study. Likewise, Cahil (2003) and Beach (2005:1)
report that rhetoric must go through different stages of discourse features before the intended meaning is achieved. They contend that writing is no longer seen as it was used to be (i.e. it was conceived as a manipulation of grammatical rules to establish meaning). Rather, writing is supposed to be seen as a means of generating and organizing ideas in an accurately and coherent manner.

The medium of writing can be practiced for a wide variety of purposes, mainly those related to today’s writing settings such as writing letters, articles, essays, reports, novels, books, etc. Thus, it has been argued (Kuen, 2001) that the present rapid developments such as information technology, globalization and business transactions, have led to an enormous need for writing as a vital tool of communication worldwide. Furthermore, as global activities continue to increase, writing activities seem to be increasingly necessary and consequently, call for a new perception of writing skills. This makes us say that although previously it was thought that a written language is secondary and derivative in the sense that speech is acquired before writing, but observing today’s waves of communications, one can claim the opposite view. This is because, writing has become an inevitable prerequisite in most fields of people’s life, such as in education, politics, international affairs, mass media and so forth. Sudanese EFL writers, including the graduate students, therefore, should have a good level of proficiency of both linguistic and rhetorical techniques which would enable them to cope with the different writing genres of the 21st century. For example, one could say that many Sudanese EFL writers lack a good command of written English and therefore, they may not be able to secure competitive jobs and play an active role in the business community both at
home and abroad. That is to say, in many cases, effective written English is made as a precondition for most vacant posts.

For the most part, a lot of Sudanese EFL writers, in particular those at university level, lack English writing abilities because their exposure to Western writing traditions is very limited. Thus, they find themselves faced with English writing problems at different levels such as stating the topic sentences plainly, an expression of the main ideas, evidence to support the main ideas, and so on. What they may be good at is grammar-based writing and mostly a sentence-level transfer to English. Given this view, as reported earlier, linguistic aspects' understanding is not the whole picture of L2 writing. In addition, EFL/ESL writers need to be acquainted with the rhetorical techniques that will complement and reinforce these linguistic aspects so as to meet the expectations of the native English speakers. Of course, this does not mean that the other languages' writing techniques have to be conceptualized on the basis of English writing style, because each language is distinguished by its distinctive characteristics. Kubota (1997), for instance, suggests that there are different types of rhetoric (multiplicity of rhetoric) and that any type of rhetoric inclines to reveal its inherent potential for all forms of writing. Again, this indicates that writing reflects differences that might occur between the discourse techniques of different languages and cultures.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

For years, if not decades, there is a general feeling among the Sudanese EFL educational practitioners, linguists and researchers that although English has been taught and learned in most, if not all, Sudanese educational institutions, the overall performance of the Sudanese EFL
learners in all writing settings is relatively poor and unconvincing at all. More importantly, dealing with Sudanese EFL undergraduate students and observing some English essays, articles and theses written by some Sudanese EFL writers, the researcher has noticed that most of them, especially the university students confront serious rhetorical problems when writing in English. So, as a result of these problems, the effectiveness of their written work seems to be blurry. For example, it is worth saying that in some Sudanese EFL writers’ essays one might notice more than one central idea in one paragraph. Perhaps surprisingly, sometimes there are two or even three central ideas in the same paragraph, as a result of which difficulties would merge prohibiting the likely favorable theme of the written text to be understood. That is to say, in despite of their good knowledge of other English language aspects, they are still unable to come up with a meaningful and satisfying written text due to obstacles stemming from the lack of training in EFL writing and interference of Arabic language writing habits.

Therefore, in the view of this problem, this is an attempt to investigate some writing difficulties that Sudanese EFL graduate student writers encounter, most probably due to differences in writing techniques between English and Arabic. Having argued that, the researcher intends to explore whether the observed appalling deterioration of Sudanese EFL graduate students’ writing performance in English is relatively attributed to rhetoric variations or not. To put it simply, this study is sought to examine these students’ English writing problems which are believed to be related to a wide range of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural influences at both the paragraph and textual levels. With this purpose in mind, some attempts need to be made so as to investigate Sudanese EFL writers’ confusion of
expository rhetorical techniques of Arabic with those of written English's discourse patterns.

1.3 Research Objectives

The major objectives of this research are thought to:

1- provide the differences between two writing techniques: English and Arabic.
2- raise the awareness of various cultural and linguistic trends in L2 writing.
3- Shed light on the cohesion and coherence problems in Sudanese EFL writing context.
4- display the great importance of genres in the teaching of academic EFL writing.
5- draw attention to the negative impact of L1 rhetorical techniques' transfer among Sudanese EFL writers in general and Sudanese EFL students at university level in particular.
6- investigate the relationship between EFL reading competence and EFL writing ability in terms of rhetorical techniques improvement.

1.4 Significance of the Research

Although there is a growing concern about the studies that dealt with ESL/EFL studies conducted in Sudan and elsewhere in some Arab countries, there were very limited studies into writing problems resulting from the impact of cultural background. Therefore, this study is unique in the sense that it focuses on an area likely to be of great importance and interest to most Arabic-speaking background writers and graduate students majoring in English, linguistics, and Arabic. The study is also thought to be of extreme value to language experts, writing tutors and other writing professionals,
such as journalists, translators, administrators, politicians and others. Thus, its significance comes from the fact that it elucidates various cross-linguistic and cross-cultural factors that influence L2 writing. That is, all beneficiaries will come to know that writing whether in L1 or L2 is not only restricted to mechanics, but also to cultural background norms of the language. Moreover, the significance of this study derives from the fact that it propels the importance of organizing linguistic forums by researchers and scholars, obtaining publications on L2 writing, holding annual ELT conferences, and making EFL teaching journals available. Furthermore, the importance of the current study also lies in the fact that it tends to associate the concept of genre with rhetorical techniques: although it focuses mainly on English expository writing, it also sheds light on the fact that contrastive rhetoric is theoretically related to the view that each type of a written text can be structured differently.

On the whole, since a greater emphasis has been devoted to the potential poor performance of Sudanese EFL learners in most learning settings, the significance of this study centers around the fact that it attempts to investigate unexplored causes of some Sudanese EFL graduate students’ weaknesses in achieving communicative competence in written English.

1.5 Research Questions

In this study, the following research questions are posed:

1- Does the transfer of Arabic rhetorical techniques into English writing have a negative impact on Sudanese EFL graduate students’ expository writing performance?
2- To what extent do Sudanese EFL graduate students face logical organization problems in writing an expository text?

3- To what extent does lack of cohesion characterize Sudanese EFL graduate students’ expository writing performance?

4- To what extent does lack of coherence characterize Sudanese EFL graduate students’ expository writing performance?

5- To what extent can extensive EFL reading improve Sudanese EFL graduate students’ writing abilities in terms of rhetorical techniques?

6- Are there any significant differences between the M.A. and postgraduate diploma students in terms of English writing problems?

1.6 Research Hypotheses

This part of the study is designed to provide some hypotheses which are thought to be the relevant answers to the research problem; they include:

1- Transfer of Arabic rhetorical techniques into English writing has a negative impact on Sudanese EFL graduate students’ expository writing performance.

2- Sudanese EFL graduate students face logical organization problems in writing an expository text.

3- Lack of cohesion characterizes Sudanese EFL graduate students’ expository writing performance.

4- Lack of coherence characterizes Sudanese EFL graduate students’ expository writing performance.

5- Extensive EFL reading improves Sudanese EFL graduate students’ writing abilities in terms of rhetorical techniques.
There are significant differences between the M.A. and postgraduate diploma students in terms of English writing problems.

1.7 Research Methodology

As far as the methodology of the study is concerned, the researcher will use a descriptive analytic method. The data will be collected through two instruments: teachers’ questionnaire based on Likert scale and students' English expository writing Test, which will be evaluated by an analytic scoring method. That is to say, each essay will be marked according to four main parameters. Furthermore, to ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments used for data gathering, a pilot study will be conducted to a randomly selected sample of the research subjects. The subjects will be consisted of Sudanese EFL university teachers in thirteen Sudanese universities and Sudanese EFL graduate students which consist of M.A. English, M.A. Translation and postgraduate diploma (English) students studying in five Sudanese universities. Apart from this, the pilot study’s results will be analyzed, in particular the statistical techniques of Pearson correlation coefficient and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient will be applied to verify the levels of consistency in rating the test: the inter-rater reliability. For more detailed information regarding the methodology of the study, see chapter four.
1.8 Limits of the Research

The overall results of the current study are assumed to be confined to the following perspectives:

1- The study is limited to the investigation of Arabic and English rhetorical differences that Sudanese EFL graduate students encounter in writing an expository text.

2- The subjects of the study are the graduate students of M.A. English, M.A. translation and postgraduate diploma students majoring in English studying at Khartoum, Juba, Sudan, al-Fashir, and Nile Valley universities during the academic year 2008-2009. The subjects also consist of Sudanese university teachers of English language and linguistics in thirteen Sudanese universities. For more detailed information, see 4.2.1.

3- The type of writing in this study is related to English expository writing. This is because, expository writing becomes extremely important to all graduate students irrespective of their disciplines, i.e. they deal with writing longer texts which require a good knowledge of rhetorical techniques.

4- The type of questionnaire in this study is a close-ended questionnaire which will be administered to Sudanese university teachers of English language and linguistics.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is basically designed to explore the principal concepts of the study which could pave the way for a better understanding of the essence of EFL writing as a whole. Thus, the emphasis in this chapter will be given to the investigation of the nature of EFL writing, discussion of some significant ELT approaches to EFL writing teaching and contrastive rhetoric. Furthermore, aspects of cohesion and coherence will be reviewed. Finally, the relationship between EFL reading and L2 writing techniques will also be highlighted.

2.2 The Nature of EFL Writing

In all parts of the world, the study of EFL/ESL writing has become the focus of attention of most contemporary researchers, language teachers, applied linguists and rhetoricians. As a result, there is a widespread tendency for teaching EFL expository writing in most worlds’ higher education institutions (e.g. colleges and universities) in order to meet the urgent needs and growing challenges of the modern world. Kroll (2003:1), for example, argues that taking part in the world community, especially within interconnected economic, technological and geographical realities, requires a fluency in English that expands beyond the spoken language and includes various uses of the written language too.
Generally speaking, L2 writing research had begun in the late 1960s and early 1970s in the USA and some Western countries, including the UK due to the increasing number of overseas students joining tertiary-level institutions (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996:23). More importantly, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) put a great emphasis on the importance of second language writing and as a result of that L1 and L2 writing issues were considered as different areas of study. Some researchers such as Martinez (2005), Silva and Matsuda (2001b) and Thorson (2000) point out that L1 writing strategies are different from those of the target language writing. Thus, a great deal of researchers, including Kroll (2003:2) argue that over the past quarter of a century, colleges and research centers around the globe have noticed that teaching English writing skills to tertiary level learners whose mother tongue is not English, has become an important part of the higher education system. So, the growing focus on L2 writing as an academic discipline has been made evident by the large number of writing courses designed for EFL/ESL learners at various institutions: ranging from community colleges to the most famous graduate institutions. At the same time, the area of EFL writing has witnessed an increase in the number of papers published in books and specialized journals, the number of presentations delivered at regional and international conferences, and the widespread of scholarly journals which deal with the most current issues in second language writing teaching (Fujieda, 2006:59). It is natural, then, that in many places today, there is a notable increase in the number of specialized ELT forums, and ELT scholarly Journals focusing on debatable issues of EFL/ESL writing.
Furthermore, several studies were carried out in EFL writing settings. Some of them, for example, have discussed how Western writing pedagogies are introduced, negotiated and received in non-English dominant countries, such as China, Turkey, Russia and Thailand (Clachar, 2000; Cummings, 2003; Tarnopolsky, 2000; You, 2004; cited in You, 2006:3). Some studies examined how English is taught in European traditions, whereas others have studied the socio-political processes of English writing in EFL perspectives, such as in China, India and Serilanka (ibid. p :3).

EFL/ESL writing as an educational phenomenon seems to occur in different ways, especially the ones that are related to socio-cultural dimensions. Matsuda (2005), for instance, points out that ESL writing in the USA, as indicated earlier, began in response to the needs of the increasing number of international students in American tertiary institutions. In contrast, Grabe & Kaplan (1996:23), maintain that any concern of L2 learners’ writing requirements should be based on the wide diversity among L2 learners. Thus, it can be said that EFL/ESL writing teachers should bear in mind that L2 writing entails different contexts. For instance, Arabic writing is linguistically and rhetoricly different as opposed to German, French, or Chinese writing. Each language leads its speakers to conceptualize the world differently from the speakers of other languages, and so writing can be perceived in the same way.

Yet, a distinction can be made between EFL writing and ESL writing. The former pertains to learners who intend to learn English to write in it, particularly scholarly writing and who live in a territory in which English is not dominantly spoken or written as a language of the community. Such
situations can be found in countries such as Sudan, Chad, China, Indonesia, France, etc. On the other hand, the latter includes those learners who intend to learn English to write in it and live in territories where English is a language of the community. Examples of this category can be found in countries such as Nigeria, Zimbabwe, India, Ghana, South Africa, etc. However, ESL writing is also taught in English speaking countries such as the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc. It is expected that in an ESL writing context, FL writers can practice their English in real life situations such as shopping and exchanging written documents (e.g. letters, e-mails) with the native speakers. Therefore, they may not face serious problems in improving their English writing in comparison to EFL writers whose writing practice may not go beyond the classroom practices. That is, in most cases, EFL writing is considered as part of the department curriculum.

Grabe and Kaplan (1996:25) argue that L2 writing learners differ disproportionately in terms of the necessity for writing abilities. EFL learners might need English writing skills that range from a simple paragraph writing to scholarly essays and professional articles. On the other hand, in ESL contexts, they contend that the extent of writing necessity is greatly diverse, despite the fact that the needs here tend to be more academically oriented. Hence, it can be added that due to these variations in learners’ writing needs, EFL/ESL writing theme and implementation might turn to be uneasy, the fact that EFL/ESL writing teachers should take into account the different factors involved in L2 writing area. That is, besides learners’ grammatical and lexical awareness, L1 linguistic influence, cultural thinking and genre perspectives should be determined too. In this respect, Connors and Glenn (1999:392) point out that teachers’ concerns about rhetoric should be
related to matters of how to develop and arrange arguments in order to persuade readers, how to select and organize ideas to support arguments, and how to use logical, ethical, and pathetic techniques appropriately to convey the intended message. Apparently, it is important to notice that EFL/ESL writing instruction needs more than one element and that researchers and teachers should take into consideration most of these different elements.

Generally speaking, writing has not received much attention during the early years of second language studies, probably because of the dominance of the audio-lingual approach in mid twentieth century. This negligence was evident in the USA between the 1940s and 1960s when the concept of language as speech became increasingly dominant under the influence of the attempts made by Leonard Bloomfield and Chales C. Fries (kroll, 2003:17). Nevertheless, L2 writing teaching became a major issue at the annual gathering of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), which was convened in 1949 as the first specialized forum at which teachers and scholars met to discuss issues related to L2 writing. Consequently, writing issues were grouped into L1 and L2 levels, and the latter’s level issues were included in the field of Teaching English as a Second language (TESL).

L2 writing as an area of applied linguistics appeared in the early 1980s. It received much attention as an essential field of investigation with its own disciplinary infrastructure in the 1990s. That is, L2 writing appeared as an interdisciplinary field, incorporating various views rather than a single view. This also made many L2 researchers believe that social, cultural and educational dimensions would influence L2 writing, and as such, it becomes
clear that no mere theory or pedagogical approach that can describe the hidden perspectives of L2 writing (Fujieda, 2006:66).

Following the above initiatives, the number of studies exploring EFL/ESL writing has increased tremendously. For example, articles on L2 writing issues have become available in journals such as College ESL, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), Language Learning and TESOL Quarterly. Other journals in composition studies such as College Composition, Teaching English in the Two-Year College, WPA: Writing Programme Administration, and Written Communication, have also appeared to tackle problems of L2 writing. Furthermore, owing to the interest in research on L2 composition, the Journal of Second language Writing was found in 1992, providing scholarly insights into in the field (DeLuca et al., 2002).

Pedagogically speaking, L2 writing instruction takes different ways throughout the world. For example, in some countries’ rhetoric, EFL/ESL writing is taught as a scientific subject, and it is analyzed at different stages of the language structure. In other words, a written text is categorized into exposition, narration, description and argumentation. However, some countries’ doctrine tends to value a written product over a writing process which is considered as a linear process in writing instruction (You, 2006:2).

To conclude, it has been reported that L2 writing, whether in English or other languages, stemmed from composition studies and applied linguistics aspects. Based on this assumption, various views, such as structural aspects, contrastive rhetoric, error analysis, social and cultural features, have substantially contributed to the understanding and expansion of ESL/EFL writing as an area of research study (Wurr, 2004:16).
2.2.1 The Situation of EFL Writing in Sudan

EFL writing situation in Sudan can be traced back to the early days of the colonial era (1898), during which considerable attention had been attached to the teaching of English at different educational levels. That is to say, Sudanese EFL writers were exposed to English rhetorical techniques of writing, and encouraged to write free and guided compositions. A great emphasis was laid on English literature and composition studies which made Sudanese EFL writers familiar with the basic Western rhetorical traditions of writing along with other skills of the language – namely oral fluency. At that period, most schools, including intermediate and secondary ones relied heavily on reading and composition textbooks mostly donated by the British. Therefore, when Sudanese EFL writers entered the tertiary level, they did not encounter serious problems of writing in English.

The general standard of English writing among Sudanese EFL learners from the 1930s up to the end of the 1960s was up to the expectations as opposed to the deterioration that resulted from the Arabization of the secondary level curriculum in 1965, after the 21st October 1964 political change which ended the first military regime in Sudan. Indeed, in 1937 (Sandell, 1982:2), the Sudan Education Department reviewed Sudanese students’ standard in English, and compared it with those recognized elsewhere and accordingly, a special version of Cambridge School Certificate Examination was suggested. In addition, new English syllabi were directed toward reading and composition courses which were intended to deal with sentences of extreme complexity. Focus was also put on the ‘Art of Essay Writing’ which reviewed notions such as (1) arrangement, (2) beginning,
middle and end, (3) style, (4) balance and rhythm, (5) illustration and color, (6) descriptive writing, and (7) types of essays (ibid.).

In 1948, attempts were made to revive English language in the intermediate schools, especially following the appointment of John Bright as the Head of English Section at Bahkat al-Ruda institute. Prior to his appointment, EFL writing had been taught by using West’s oral composition, which according to him, proved to be ineffective, because the main emphasis was on the vocabulary. Bright’s another argument was that while the learners were expected to be spending a lot of time enhancing their writing performance, the idea of writing individual printed capital and small letters in which they were involved had little influence on writing. Therefore, it was decided to solve that setback by suggesting a new model of writing based on Marian Richardson's Script which was largely applied in British schools (Sandell, 1982:30).

The Arabiczation movement in the secondary level in 1965 had placed an enormous impact on the standard of English writing in Sudan. Therefore, since 1970 onwards, ELT status in Sudan had witnessed a series of dramatic changes due to unstable, unplanned, and extemporaneous educational policies. Most importantly, it was thought that the process of Arabiczation in higher education in 1990 in which Arabic replaced English as a medium of instruction in some Sudanese tertiary institutions would enable Sudanese EFL learners to understand the college subjects and, then, gain a better knowledge. Yet, this attempt turned out to be unsuccessful in some universities. In other words, it was found that a great deal of Sudanese EFL university students lack proficiency even in Arabic, besides the fact that
most of the university textbooks have been written in English, especially science-based ones.

In general, it seems clear that in the past, mainly during the period between 1936 to the late 1960s, the standard of Sudanese university students in written English was very high and noticeable. They were able to engage in a variety of writing activities such as writing paragraphs, assignments, essays, reports and so forth. Moreover, they were well acquainted with a wide range of writing models and genres which made them familiar with different rhetorical techniques of L2 genres such as registers of sport, military, judiciary, astronomy and the like. Comparatively, at present, if Sudanese university students, for instance, are asked to write a short paragraph in English about the Sudanese premiere league, no doubt, they will find it difficult to do that, most likely, because of lack of knowledge (e.g. vocabulary, spelling, rhetorical abilities, etc.) in that particular area. Therefore, it looks clear that a large number of Sudanese EFL writers of the 1930s and 1960s seemed to be aware of the rhetorical differences that might be found between the written discourse of different languages and genres.

Unfortunately, there is often a misconception of proficiency in both spoken and written English among many educated Sudanese. Nevertheless, in real life, such beliefs are largely mistaken as recent observations may provide strong evidence that in comparison to older Sudanese EFL generations, nowadays Sudanese EFL learners’ standard of written English has deteriorated to the extent that the strong power of English standard in Sudan seems to be questioned. A standard was once seen as nearly equivalent to that of the native speakers. Of course, it quite often happens
that individuals talk about their glorious days of something, but not to forget
to face their present challenges. Having argued that, they suppose to ask
themselves where they are as EFL learners in comparison to the rest of the
EFL world, in particular other Arabic- speaking EFL countries. Of course, one
way of looking at the problem can lie in the fact that as Sudanese EFL
learners, they have to admit that there is a serious problem in their standard
of English language skills, especially writing skills. In line with this, the
researcher believes that an attempt of rethinking is highly needed, because
the sooner we face the deteriorating situation of English language, is the
better.

Another problem that current Sudanese EFL student writers
encounter is lack of self-confidence in their ability to produce a well
organized EFL written text. This causes them to become unable to generate
ideas to structure their sentences logically and effectively. Of course, this is
very noticeable in some Sudanese EFL university students' exam papers that
they only write down what they have been offered by their teachers, rather
than stating their own viewpoints which characterize them as self-
dependent writers. Perhaps one of the reasons for the worse picture of
writing in the Sudanese EFL context, namely in higher education settings can
be attributed to policies of Sudanese educational bodies, in particular the
Departments of English. That is, most Sudanese universities do not devote
much attention to the role of written English in students' academic life. For
example, there is a wide gap between the number of writing-oriented
courses provided and provision of other courses such as grammar,
vocabulary, phonetics, phonology, and so forth. Therefore, much attention
should be placed on the improvement of Sudanese EFL learners' writing
proficiency in order to enable them to cope with the needs of academic settings. Nevertheless, integration of EFL writing into the curriculum needs different tools and resources, in particular financial resources should be made available for EFL writing programmes, writing labs and research centers. Without such support, Sudanese EFL learners’ writing development and goals cannot be yielded. Yang (2001:156), for example, argues that for language learners to learn a FL, it is best to be provided with opportunities to use and create, and further, to own the language. These sources could furnish EFL learners with real opportunities for practicing English language, especially through a variety of channels: listening, writing, reading and communicating (ibid.).

Over the past few decades, EFL writing in Sudan has been characterized as being controlled/guided composition at the basic level, both controlled and free-composition at secondary level and free-composition at tertiary level. The predominant feature of Sudanese EFL writing is often centered on the traditional writing perceptions which place a great emphasis on a sentence-level structure and the final product. In fact, this indicates that writing as a social communicative phenomenon seems to have been ignored by many EFL writing instructors. However, in recent years, there is a growing trend for change in EFL writing teaching strategies: some Sudanese tertiary institutions started employing genre-based and process-based principles in EFL writing courses so as to meet their EFL learners’ various educational and future needs.

As elsewhere in the EFL/ESL speaking countries, a large number of goals can be articulated as possible reasons for the teaching of EFL writing in Sudan. First, EFL writing would help Sudanese EFL learners, both at
secondary and college levels, pursue their academic studies as some faculties’ (e.g. medicine, engineering and pharmacy) courses require sufficient proficiency in written English. Therefore, it seems that EFL writing instruction could make a tremendous contribution to the writing ability of the students. They can easily be involved in a variety of writing activities, namely English for specific purposes which is believed to cater for the particular needs of the learners in some fields as stated above. Second, due to the fact that English is used as a ‘lingua franca’ for global communication, Sudanese EFL writers need to put a premium on the communicative value of EFL writing, as that would make them get in touch with the rest of the world, and in the meantime express their own views, values and culture. In such a way, EFL writing can be seen as a tool for knowing different rhetorical styles of speech communities.

A third rationale for the teaching of EFL writing is that it enables Sudanese EFL writers, especially scholars and researchers to take part in linguistic forums, academic publications, annual ELT conferences, and ELT journals. In general, the 21st century's rapid growth of information makes writing in English one of the most fundamental skills of intercultural communication. Tribble (2002), for example, maintains that writing in English seems to be a very demanding factor for global communication, especially ‘computer-based communication’. Finally, it is generally expected that EFL writing in Sudan tends to assist EFL writers, in particular university graduates to meet their academic as well as occupational needs. In other words, it can be said that following the ‘Comprehensive Peace Agreement’ (CPA) and ‘Darfur Crisis’, both written and spoken English appear to be of great importance for those who seek employment with the UN agencies and
NGOs – non-governmental organizations. Again, this also indicates that writing in English plays a significant role in achieving EFL writers’ personal motives, i.e. the ability to perform well in EFL writing settings could open the doors for better opportunities of employment.

Having mentioned the above objectives of EFL writing, one can argue that the rhetoric behind the teaching of EFL writing in Sudan can be of myriad purposes.

2.3 Approaches to EFL Writing Teaching

There are numerous approaches to EFL/ESL writing teaching. In Raimes’ (1983:5) view, there is no one example of how to teach writing in ESL classes. Rather, there are many examples since there are teachers and teaching styles or learners and learning styles. In general, since the 1970s up to the early 1980s, the EFL/ESL writing studies placed a great emphasis on the ways in which learners produce a written text. Having argued that, the following four approaches will be discussed to show that to what extent they have contributed in the domain of EFL writing instruction.

2.3.1 The Cognitive Approach to EFL Writing

The cognitive approach as an effective method to writing had appeared in the early 1970s as a reaction to the drawbacks of the controlled composition and current-traditional rhetorical approaches. Most writing scholars (e.g. Cushing-Weigle, 2002; Paltridge, 2004) think that controlled composition did not help EFL writers express their thought adequately, and that the focus on linearity as well as prescription of current-traditional rhetoric did delineate EFL learners from effective writing tasks. Thus, the
main concern of this theory is about the cognitive processes that take place in writers' minds when composing a text.

Researchers, such as Kennedy (1998) and Carson and Longhini (2002) think that Braddock, Lloyd-Jones and Schoer were believed to be the pioneers in the USA to call for the application of the cognitive writing process approach. Similarly, Emig’s (1983) idea of protocol analysis has provided a perception that writing has to be seen as a recursive phenomenon rather than a linear sequence. She raised the significance of pre-planning and editing as ongoing tasks, and also the importance of writers’ errors as a basis for data. As such, it seems that writing is a complex process which requires a series of cognitive abilities, such as planning, organizing, drafting, revising, brainstorming, all of which demand a writer's thinking ability to handle them adequately. Raimes (1983: 261), also asserts that “composing means expressing ideas, conveying meaning... thinking”. According to him, focus should be shifted to the stages of producing a text and the course of transforming views rather than to the final outcome of the written text. Both Emig’s and Raimes’ views had contributed remarkably to the development of L2 writing process studies and accordingly, many researchers such as Flower and Hayes started examining cognitively related writing models.

Thus, Flower and Hayes (1984:370) consider writing as a thinking process in which writers incline to organize while composing. This writing process (also known as a comprehensive model of composing) later became to be known as the ‘Flower–Hayes Writing Process Model’, which is based on the assumption that writing theory is a highly complex, goal-directed, problem-solving and recursive task as shown in Figure 2.1 below.
According to the above Figure 2.1, the model divides the composing process into three main operational levels: the writer’s long memory, the writing processes and the task environment. The first level incorporates knowledge of topic, audience and writing plans. The second level includes three components: planning, translating and reviewing. The third level consists of two components: the rhetorical problem and the text produced. However, the major part of the ‘Flower–Hayes Model’ is the second level, i.e. the writing process which consists of three stages. The first stage is planning which incorporates three sub-processes: generating ideas, organizing and goal setting. Concerning generating ideas, writers evaluate information in their memory and then, the evaluated information will be organized under the control of the goal setting. Following this, the second
stage of the writing process (translating) will take place in terms of writing down the information obtained from the planning. In the last stage (revision), the outcome of the translating is properly evaluated and revised.

In the course of the cognitive view of writing process, writers are free to move from one stage to another: move back or forward as they wish. In addition, writers' major focus in this model is dependence on long-term memory for information about the topic while the anticipated readers look for ways in which the written text is produced. Writers will concentrate on knowledge about the writing environment (reader and the task) which will make them plan and organize their writing carefully.

Although Flower and Hayes’ model of writing is considered to be one of the highly developed models that examines recursive writing behavior, it has been criticized on a number of perspectives (Talebinezhad & Negari, 2007:73). Some researchers (e.g. North, 1987) point out that the model is too vague on the ground that there is no a clear reference to how texts are actually produced. In addition, they think that this model is too generalized in the sense that it provides an unvarying process for all writers instead of proposing a model that may differ from one writer to another. Another criticism comes from Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) who claim that the model should have included two sub-processes (i.e. a knowledge-telling model for novice writers and a knowledge-transforming model for expert writers), rather than one process. The final criticism has been made by Grabe and Kaplan (1996:316) who acknowledge that although one of Flower and Hayes’ views deals with the differences between good writers and less-skilled writers, their model failed to prove any recognition of these differences, it focuses on the similarities that most writers make when get
involved in composing. However, despite of their observations, Grabe and Kaplan state that apart from the criticisms directed toward the writing process model proposed by Flower and Hayes, it seems to be sufficient for its valuable findings in the sense that it:

1- Raised some new views for public debate.

2- Raised the importance of understanding recursion in composing to a new stage. Indeed, it has added to writing the concept of interaction among processes in parallel.

3- Tended to model writing stages and accordingly, writing research has become more explicit and testable in terms of hypotheses.

Therefore, following ‘Flower-Hayes Writing Model’, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) proposed their type of cognitive model of writing (Figures 2.2& 2.3).
Figure (2.2): Bereiter and Scardamalia’s Model of Knowledge-Telling Process (1987)
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As indicated in the above Figure 2.2, Bereiter and Scardamalia’s views (knowledge telling and knowledge transforming) show processes that writers follow when composing a text. Based on that, the former process is used by less-skilled writers who tend to write what they know about a particular topic. As for the latter, it is used by the skilled writers who get involved in more complicated forms of writing such as description, argumentation and exposition. Moreover, Bereiter and Scardamalia maintain that unskilled writers, who rely on the knowledge-telling method of writing, revise at local level, whereas skilled writers engage in global revision which requires transformation of ideas. However, some researchers, including Flower (1994), point to the limitation of Bereiter and Scardamalia’s notion of novice and skilled writers on the assumption that the idea does not seem to focus on the impact of context in composing. In other words, the whole matter is entirely cognitive in nature and there is no sign of social determinants which are believed to influence the course of writing.

It has been suggested that revision is one of the major components of instruction in a cognitive-based model, because it deals with the roles of both the writer and reader. That is to say, the writer is expected to review the text taking into account what problems s/he may encounter, what possible answers s/he may offer toward his/her text (Allami and Nodoushan, 2007:71). In an attempt to give a wider interpretation of revision, Becker (2006:26) reports that Carl Bereiter and Marlene Scardamalia attempted to augment the evaluation and revising process models provided by Flower and Hayes in 1981 by adding a compare, diagnose and operate (CDO) planning method in their 1983 model, which was later modified in 1985. In fact, the
essence of this planning stage is that as majority of writers read their own cognitive version of what they have planned to write, they initially “compare” their mental text with what they have composed. Then, if they face any problem, they “diagnose” what needs to be modified, and after bearing in mind revision options, “operate” on the text to complete the revision (ibid.).

It seems that, Bereiter and Scardamalia’s CDO-oriented views are worth of studying, because they show how complex the reviewing process is, and also elaborate on the need for further investigations into how different cognitive processes occur, vis-à-vis if the writers come across L1 thinking processes.
It has been argued that in the knowledge-transforming process, while generating the text, writers can change what they intend to write. Thus, the process needs an interaction between the writer's representation of ideas and the text representation. In other words, the process involves reviewing the text to see how it sounds in terms of ideas and therefore, rethinking attempts might be made in case of dissonance (Kellogg, 2008).
Furthermore, it can be added that a cognitively-based model of writing has increasingly influenced the way in which EFL/ESL writing can be performed. Learners, for example, can become familiar with various techniques of paragraph development. Also, EFL writing instructors can simply implement this model (despite the fact that it takes up a great deal of learners’ time) to enhance their students’ writing ability. This is because, the recursive nature of such a model gives writers unrestricted opportunities to produce a well accepted written text. In line with this view, Hairston (1982) contends that teachers could only intervene through the process of assisting EFL writers in generating ideas, setting goals and translating their ideas into a written text. Similarly, Allami et al. (2007:67) hold that the cognitive method orientation aims to develop a deductive approach to the process of writing and make writers find out solutions as they compose: particularly ways of interacting with the readers.

However, a cognitive process in EFL writing should not be at the expense of the significance of linguistic aspects. Instead, EFL writers have to come across activities that associated with the linguistic knowledge as well as activities related to the cognitive thinking. Agreeing with this viewpoint, Allami and Nodoushan (p .68) state:

*In fact, linguistic knowledge affords the building blocks out of which the learner’s thought is shaped. The learner, however, needs to get the blocks into shape. He needs to learn how to think logically, and how to develop his ideas convincingly.*

What can be learned from their views is that the two levels: linguistic and cognitive levels act as complimentary components, especially the latter reinforces the former. Thus, emphasis should be focused on the writer’s
cognitive abilities as well as ways of enhancing syntax and vocabulary aspects, all of which could lead to the production of an accurate written text based on communicative purpose.

2.3.2 The Social Approach to EFL Writing

This approach came into existence when studies into sociolinguistics, Hallidayan functional linguistics, elementary education research, socially-oriented rhetoric and the sociology of science, criticized the previous models of the writing process on the ground that they neglected the important clues to social context. That is, writing as a process of communication will have no value outside the social context (Jones, 2006:26). More importantly, Candlin and Hyland (1999:9) claim that cognitively oriented research into writing failed to interpret writing socially, and related it to writers' purpose in almost general terms. They disclose that, to understand a writer’s independent activity, does not necessarily mean understanding the mental analysis of that writer’s inner feeling and beliefs only. Rather, a cognitive perspective must place the writer within a given social context of the writing environment, rather than to restrict him/her within the boundaries of meaning processes. Taking these views into account, Candlin and Hyland (ibid.) suggest that, first, the realization of a cognitive concept on writing process lies as much in an understanding of the social ties between the writer and reader in the given situation. Second, the other perspective of the writing process depends on the writer’s awareness of the social context which clearly interprets the purpose and meaning of the written text.

The importance of social aspects of writing has led researchers to investigate the social nature of EFL writing in terms of discourse communities. Bruffee (1986:770) asserts that social construction involves
the presence of “reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, and so... as generated by communities of like-minded peers” (p. 774). This means that writing reality can be perceived through social relations within the discourse community. He also demonstrates that since communication is socially oriented, individuals may use writing so as to be members of communities in order to determine their position within the discourse community. Keeping this in mind, writing as a social phenomenon shows that writers do not compose in isolation, rather as members of discourse community. Those who intend to join a certain writing field need to be aware of the forms and techniques that members of the disciplinary community use. Faigley (1986:536), for example, proposes that when learners get involved in academic domains, they write in reference to texts that pertain to the scholarly tasks which interpret and provide features of that domain. Similarly, Schwandt (1997, cited in Jiang, 2001:27) stresses that social constructionism is considered as the way human beings individually or collectively explain and shape their social and psychological world.

Discussing the notion of social constructionism, Carson and Longhini (2002) also report that the social idea of writing can occur only when writers use language to interact with the target discourse community: when a clearly defined context and audience, the knowledge, the language and the nature of discourse are decided by the writer in order to be able to communicate with the discourse community. Moreover, Edelsky et al. (1991) add that learners will become good readers and writers when literacy learning is given to them in terms of whole, meaningful texts with authentic social purposes made clear. In this perspective, it is clear that Edelsky et al.
emphasize the significance of the social nature of language and literacy learning, and they write:

*People learn to write by attending to what they have to say in contexts where writing has particular meanings and where the writer has particular social relationships with others. What is learned is thus a huge bundle - how to write plus what writing means plus what social relations accompany writing.*

From the above quotation, it becomes clear that the cognitive views of L2 writing are increasingly dependent on the writer’s internal cognitive ability, whereas the social views of L2 writing consider writing as a matter of social interaction with values and customs of the writing community. One of the most famous advocates of the social constructionism view of writing is Vygotsky (1978), whose notion of educational practice is that most learning occurs as a result of social interaction. He links writing to the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), the stage at which a writer can learn new ideas with the help of acknowledgeable person or with the assistance of cultural resources. This acknowledgeable person can be an expert, or a competent peer who acts as a mediator between the novice writer and the knowledge that the novice writer intends to achieve. So, without the assistance of this mediator, the writer may not be able to reach the intended goals by himself/herself (Swain, 2000:101). Thus, Vygotsky’s concept is simply collaborative in the sense that knowledge building is a participatory role between the learner and the assistance of someone else. That is to say, knowledge is made available via the processes of shared experiences, negotiation, dialogue, etc. In line with this view, Wertsch (1991, cited in Jones, 2006 :27) also suggests that in a social learning situation, writers are involved in meaningful contexts through reflection on
what has been learned and through interaction with other learners. However, Vygotsky’s ZPD concept has come under a critical scrutiny as some researchers, among them his colleague Leontiev, argue that learners will naturally interpret tasks subjectively. That is, some learners are believed to have individual motives which might not match with those of mediators: colleagues, or instructors (Parks, 2000:67). Therefore, it becomes necessary that these mediators should not ignore the writer’s goals when offering assistance, because writers may focus on the social meaning embodied in the activity, while the mediators may emphasize on other language features, as a result of which a contradiction of goals may emerge.

Chandrasegaran et al. (2007:7) provide how a socio-cognitive theoretical view of writing is perceived in pedagogical texts and classroom activities for carrying out expository essays. Their major concern lies in the fact that the instructional materials are based on the notion of encouraging learners to take part in goal-directed thinking writing. So, during this process, awareness of the socio-cultural context of the writing task can be attained. Indeed, the integration of cognitive and social views of writing is said to be applied in group tasks demanding writers to get involved in goal-directed thinking aimed at achieving meaning for the performance of the genre practice which elaborates and justifies the writer’s position in the text (ibid.).

Flower (1994:33) also proposed a social cognitive view of literacy (Fig. 2.4) which focuses on the diversity and complexity of literate action located in the social world.
Figure (2.4): Flower’s Model of Discourse Construction (1994)

Flower’s social cognitive model indicates that both the writer and reader form meaning within the framework of social and cultural contexts of language and discourse. This will constitute an outer body of influence in conjunction with a body of purposes, specific goals and activated knowledge that are related to the writer’s text. As Figure 2.4 shows, both the writer and reader are socially shaped and individually formed (Krampetz, 2005:19). The mental representations are thought to account for evident differences in the ways individual writers and readers perceive shared social expectations; or
the ways learners perceive a task or a teacher’s response. On the other hand, awareness is a characteristic feature that reveals in what way writers or readers may become aware of their own composing processes and the variables operating on it and within it (Flower, 1994). The arrows linking the writer and reader entail the non-linear process of understanding the goals and meaning of the writer/reader and knowing new methods to create and interpret a text in a more socially composed context. Accordingly, Krampetz (2005) suggests that this model is useful in terms of understanding the importance of social factors that enhance learners’ writing abilities across different academic settings. He also adds that the model is efficient in explaining why EFL writers coming from different social backgrounds, discourse conventions and language traditions, might differ in their ways of composing a text.

To conclude, one can argue that writing as a social phenomenon can have a profound impact on EFL writing proficiency. Thus, to teach EFL/ESL writing process, teachers should not neglect the social aspect of writing and focus only on language classes in terms of grammatical aspects. To put it another way, EFL learners have to be encouraged not to act as solitary writers, but as members of a discourse community. This would aid them to improve their writing abilities in terms of sharing knowledge and techniques of writing with their teachers and peers (as readers). As such, writing can be seen as an act of communication which takes place between the writer and his anticipated readers based on a social situational context.
2.3.3 The Genre Approach to EFL Writing

In some situations, EFL writers are often required to be familiar with certain characteristics of a piece of writing they intend to compose. Such a form of writing is normally being categorized as “genre-based writing.” Swales (1990), insists on the need for genre knowledge as a fundamental factor of learners’ knowledge about writing if they are to be academically competent. Similarly, Grabe and Kaplan (1996:132) go far to state that genres indicate techniques that a group of writers adopt to solve problems in writing, which are compatible with the general expectations.

Broadly speaking, the emphasis on the genre-based approach was raised in the 1980s in New Zealand and Australia by the opponents of the process approach who stress that oversimplification of the process approach’s application has led to impractical results (Derewianka, 2003 & Paltridge, 2002). They argue that the negligence of formal aspects of writing and the problem-solving required by different genres of writing will narrow learners’ writing abilities. In other words, it is important to students to engage in a variety of tasks which will broaden their cognitive ability. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the genre-based supporters minimize the significant role that writing process plays in writing research, but they think that dependency on the process approach only will limit the scope of writing (Johns, 2003:210). So, they see that the inclusion of form will result in a balance between form and process in a more functional manner to writing development. Therefore, a genre-based pedagogy can be regarded as a complement to process ideas by "emphasizing the role of language in written communication” (Hyland, 2003b:17). Pedagogically, teachers who get involved in a genre-based writing instruction consider writing as a tool to
communicate with readers than just focusing on subject content, composing stages. As such, they attempt to teach learners how to utilize certain registers to achieve a coherent and purposeful text (ibid.). The main point here is that the writer does not only write; he/she writes in order to accomplish some purpose following certain social norms for shaping his/her purpose as the reader expects a well organized text. In this sense, it is imperative that a genre view includes both discoursal and contextual elements of language use. For example, Johns (1991; cited in Kroll, 2003:198) points out that those genre theorists who deal with issues of writing process, while focusing on social practices, ask questions such as the following:

1- How do writers from one language group write texts in a second language? Do their second language processes differ from their first one?

2- What particular aspects of a rhetorical situation are foregrounded when a person is writing for identified audiences or communities?

3- How do processes differ depending on the timing and pressure involved in the task? Do individuals process texts differently when they have sufficient time to revise, for example?

4- How do writers’ culture and past experiences influence the ways in which they approach a writing task?

5- How can students successfully process assigned texts while continuing to value the oral and writing practices in their first cultures?

6- How do students vary, or fail to vary, their writing processes when enrolled in classes from different disciplines?
7- What theories about texts and processes do students bring to writing tasks, and how can these theories be expanded or become more flexible?

8- What social and contextual elements of tasks do novice and advanced students consider in their initial planning as they prepare to write a text?

According to Yun (2005:20), the genre approach to writing includes three levels: (1) the target genre is specified for the learners, (2) a text that is collaboratively constructed by the teacher and learners and (3) a text is independently constructed by the learner. Taking these levels into account, writing can be performed in a social environment that pertains to a particular purpose, as well as that can take place in terms of imitation and analysis, which develop explicit instruction.

By contrast, it has been argued that the genre-oriented approach relates to Halliday's functional systemic views of language and the social semiotic theory of language development. Indeed, Halliday's concept addresses the relationship between language and its social functions and tends to show how language is a system from which writers make choices to express meanings (Halliday, 1978:19). Here, unlike the viewpoint of American generative grammarians - in which language form is perceived as independent of language use, Halliday considers language form and meaning as interlinked components to interpret functional purposes.

Besides the general writing context, genre is also extended to include an area of English for Specific Purposes' (ESP) contexts. In the early 1980s a great deal of theorists of EFL/ESL writing came to argue that writing should not be seen as only a cognitive process as it involves components of a social-cultural context. Based on this idea, they started calling for preparing
EFL university students to be familiar with academic English in various disciplines. In achieving this goal, Swales (1990) recommends the importance of genre as providing functional purposes in advanced writing development in the sense that the ability to use genre structure properly will reinforce students’ abilities to learn and perform competently in academic writing contexts. According to Kroll (2003: 206), an ESP genre is normally meant for mature learners (e.g. undergraduate and graduate students) who are encouraged to learn rapidly specific language registers and discourse types in order to succeed in their work. That is, to be successful, EFL writers must take into account how language functions to convey content through various genres. They are required to be aware of the techniques of shaping different sorts of knowledge, besides formulating different types of information. Pedagogically, this is possible if the student writers are made familiar with various kinds of writing tasks based on different ways of making meaning.

However, the categorization of genres may differ, relying on various theoretical aspects of each type. That is to say, on certain occasions, genre is perceived as synonymous with text type, whereas in some cases a distinction is drawn between them. In terms of a difference, genre is considered as a written text related to a specific social or cultural context. Such types incorporate, for instance, newspapers, essays, reports, recipes, e-mail messages, stories and so forth. On the other hand, text types may include the major forms of writing such as exposition, description, narration, argumentation, persuasion, etc. (Lin, 2006: 1).

In spite of different categories of genre, it seems that the main point is what each category seeks to convey socially using certain patterns.
Accordingly, as noted earlier, a genre-based approach is found to be useful in teaching writing as it equips EFL writers with insights into knowledge of different discourse types aimed at achieving social purposes. Paltridge (2001) proposes that using the genre-based approach, instructors are expected to get learners to write or produce a text or composition (academic essay) on the basis of purpose, organization and audience. As such, a genre-based method to the teaching of writing can be perceived both as a process and product of the whole process of writing. Moreover, because of its dual function, many teachers of writing prefer to apply it in the classroom. Widodo (2006:174), for example, prefers to incorporate a genre-based approach into writing courses for the following reasons. First, the approach complements the process-based approach that he used to employ it in terms of explicit teaching about the genre structures and grammatical elements of written texts. This step is much recommended as it provides the students with features of texts that they will write. Second, the approach encourages a joint text construction in which both the teacher and students take part in the composition of the text. In fact, as mentioned earlier, this step is in line with the Vygotsky’s concept of ZPD. Finally, the approach encourages students to write essays with regard to specific purpose, audience and organization. This reason also seems to be in line with Paltridge’s (2001) view which has been discussed above.

Given the reasons above, Widodo proposes a genre-based writing cycle for writing courses as shown (Fig. 2.5) below.
The above Figure shows that there are two major teaching-learning cycles in a standard genre-based writing teaching: writing with the class and writing independently. Each cycle is related to specific tasks of writing in the class. Writing within the class, for example, includes building knowledge of the field, exploring the genre and joint text construction. Writing independently, on the other hand, includes building knowledge of a similar field, drafting, revising and conferencing, editing and publishing. In general, Widodo’s concept appears to be useful as it creates a social interaction in the language class. That is, EFL learners can learn from their teachers and competent peers, different types and techniques of writing and then, employ that knowledge in their own writing.

To sum, a genre-based approach is significantly important since it helps EFL writers to participate in various writing tasks within and beyond
the classroom writing. It will enable them to distinguish a broad range of
different social purposes when composing in English. At the same time, it
will assist the students to choose certain specific types of writing which are
believed to meet their academic needs, i.e. research essays, proposals,
assignments, graduation theses and so forth.

2.3.4 The Communicative Approach to EFL Writing

The ability to write meaningfully and communicatively in English is
considered one of the main functions of written English in people’s
contemporary life. In fact, writing whether in English or other languages, is
an attempt to express one’s idea to others, i.e. writing is perceived as a tool
of achieving meaning. Petter (2000:5) suggests that “each piece of writing is
in essence a piece of communication as well as writing is usually no one-
way-street.” According to him, the primary aim for engaging in writing tasks
is to communicate. That is, most writers tend to communicate with one or
more readers for various informational purposes, such as writing letters,
memos, reports, and so on.

In general, the main emphasis of the communicative approach, as far
as writing is concerned, is on the purpose and audience. That is to say,
writing for communication is meant for a particular recipient, e.g. writing an
e-mail to a friend, or writing an expository essay whereby the outcome is
supposed to be read by an intended audience. Raimes (1983:8), for instance,
points out that student writers are encouraged to behave like writers in real
life and to ask themselves the crucial questions about purpose and
audience, i.e. why are they writing this? And who will read it? Moreover,
Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) emphasize the need to develop a reader-
based approach to writing in order to facilitate the communicative power of
the text. According to them, the writer has the responsibility of creating a text which accommodates the potential reader’s needs in the sense that the writer has to use language, content and techniques of writing in a way that will enable the reader to comprehend the intended meaning easily. In addition, as meaning remains the central point in writing, Xin (2007:22) also takes a position that in writing, before teachers guide the learners to write, the purpose, and the reader’s expectations should be made the primary concerns of their writing. Relatively, Moss (1998:149) adds that "promoting writing for real audience is one of the most important means to attract students’ attention to technical and presentational issues which will make the communication effective". In his view, the communicative approach seeks to focus on EFL writers’ perspectives in terms of expressing their opinions and attitudes fluently, especially in areas of their interest. In reality, being able to predict the reader’s expectations or needs is considered one of the most significant characteristics of a successful writer as opposed to a less-skilled writer who always faces serious difficulties when formulating his/her semantic point of view in order to be communicated effectively.

Although EFL writers are required to have a considerable knowledge of appropriate grammatical structures and vocabulary when attempting to get involved in written English communication, writing is not limited to these aspects. What is important here is to relate these aspects to meanings so as to confirm a claim that language forms pertain to certain communicative functions. In general terms, functions are the means for reaching the purposes of writing (Hyland, 2003:6). Therefore, EFL writers are advised to understand how to develop meaningful paragraphs through the
formation of topic sentences, supporting sentences and use of transitions. Of course, each of these units would stand for a certain function, all of which will result into a whole communicative essay such as exposition, narration, description, persuasion and so on.

As the matter in some approaches to EFL teaching, the communicative approach to EFL writing teaching is also associated with some linguistic and cultural differences which seem to be serious obstacles of meaningful written communication. EFL writers, for example, need to gain control of culture-based rhetorical differences as well as other elements of the language which will enhance the notion of communicative purpose. This also would make us argue that, in most cases, aspects of the language seem to be inseparable from each other, and they should all be assigned equal importance, especially in terms of written communication.

Some researchers argue that due to the fact that writing reflects a communicative function, theories of communicative language use, or communicative competence, should account for the importance of developing writing models. Therefore, some alternative communicative conceptualizations had been suggested for promoting these models. Flower (1994), for example, as noted earlier in 2.3.2, proposes a socio-cognitive model, which comprises contextual impacts into the cognitive processing of the writer (see Figure 2.4). Martin (1992), based on a Hallidayan functional concept, provides a model for discourse which is relevant to writing in particular instances. Witte (1992) also proposes a social semiotic concept which explains the needs for linking social, cognitive and textual factors in writing aimed at establishing a more comprehensive communicative point of view. In the same vein, Chapelle et al. (1993), suggest a model of
Communicative Language Use (CLU) to writing performance as shown in Figure 2.6 below.

Figure (2.6): Chapelle et al.'s Model of Writing as Communicative Language Use
In general, Chapelle et al.'s (1993) CLU model deals with academic language performance in all four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). As far as writing is concerned, the processing system of the model begins with an initiated activity/motivation derives either from the internal motivation of the writer in ‘internal goal setting’ or from the ‘context.’ Examples of writer-initiated motivation might include a diary entry, a letter, or a summary of an essential academic text. Examples of situation-initiated tasks, on the other hand, might incorporate an essay assignment, a memo, a revision of an essay and so on. In both cases, the initial move would activate the goal setting for writing activities (ibid.).

According to Grabe and Chapelle (1995), despite the fact that this communicative model tends to be tentative in nature, it does attempt to discuss three important clues which are not generally considered in the previous models of writing. First, it comprises issues related to the social context, to cognitive processing, and to the textual product. From their point of view, this tripartite integration is unique as opposed to the previous reviewed models of writing. Second, as the model is based on a concept of communicative competence, it is believed to be capable of incorporating reliable language components, rather than it has been assumed in other models of writing. This deliberate concentration on the language components could create more opportunities for learning the patterns of variation displayed by different writers. Third, the model is also capable of including the ideas explained in some ethnography of writing and classification of writing skills. Again, this also indicates that the model is adaptable to a wide range of matters investigated by applied linguists as compared to composition researchers.
With the development of Internet writing phenomenon in recent years, computer-mediated communication has been regarded as an effective means of written English communication. As a result of this, the communicative approach to EFL writing has taken a new dimension. Evans and Tuzi (2001:132) suggest that Web-based writing has tremendous advantages for the educational field by motivating EFL learners to get involved in English writing activities relating to matters of everyday live needs such as sending congratulation greetings, personal letters and workplace-related reports. By so doing, EFL writers would feel more confident in what they compose as well as acquire rhetorical techniques necessary for written English communication.

Furthermore, the communicative approach to EFL writing can have an enormous effect on the business domain. This means that business circles, in particular companies and multinational firms are likely to adopt written communication principles to motivate interest of their customers on the services they tend to offer. Indeed, without effective and regular written communication means, for example, through the Internet, ties with genuine customers may break down. That is because, today’s customers, namely in the modern world, would prefer persuasive and authentic information. According to Penrod (2005), there are four aspects that pertain to rhetorical techniques used in most situations of electronic composition:

1- Writers demonstrate a practical analysis of how electronic writing is shaped and received by readers of different cultural perspectives.
2- Electronic writing is a communicative process that relies on a writer's implementation of certain techniques and choices aimed at creating the message to be communicated to the audience.

3- Writers focus on various types of genres in an electronic communication as a result of which they may learn the basic techniques and ways of particular forms of writing.

4- Writers develop the rhetorical and technological strategies and procedures necessary to compose and communicate their ideas.

Based on Penrod’s remarks, it seems obvious that engaging in electronic writing requires one to be aware of various techniques of written communication. Nevertheless, it has been argued that, sometimes, task-based e-mail writing has some disadvantages. Li (2000), for example, thinks that although audience interaction is fundamental in writing, some writers deliberately tend to compose grammatically and lexically complex texts in e-mail writing tasks. In fact, one can add that there is no denying the importance of both grammar and vocabulary in written communication, but grammatically and lexically vague texts might prevent the reader from understanding the intended meaning with ease.

Broadly speaking, the communicative role of the language can be achieved through writing with a view to facilitate communication across various communities. As a result, written communication in recent years has increased the crucial significance of writing skill in various domains. Accordingly, the main focus of writing teachers has been shifted to the encouragement of EFL learners to engage in EFL writing activities which would provide them functional communicative opportunities. That is, EFL writing has been directed toward communication of goals that satisfy the
learners’ academic and even career needs. In such a way, EFL learners will become more aware of the role that a written text can play in their life, and then, conceptualize a positive perception about the nature of English writing.

2.4 Contrastive Rhetoric

Contrastive rhetoric is one of the most influential and debatable areas of research in applied linguistics that deals with ESL/EFL writing issues in recent years. The concept was appeared in the 1960s as a result of Kaplan's (1966) seminal work "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education", which later became to be known as the "doodles article“ in which he discussed the notion of cross-cultural writing variations. Since then, the area of contrastive rhetoric (henceforth CR) has become an interdisciplinary area of research on both ESL and EFL writing contexts.

Kaplan's (1966) work (see Figure 2.7 below) provides that people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, organize their written discourse differently due to the influence of their L1 and culture. That is, different cultures seem to reveal different thought patterns and different rhetorical styles. This view was strongly clear when he noticed that the writing production of overseas students who had come to study in the USA were extremely different from the writing techniques of their American counterparts. Of course, prior to 1966, L2 researchers acknowledged the influence of the cultural factor on non-native speakers in L2 learning, but their recognition was confined to the grammatical level: diction and sentence structure. In Kaplan's view, analysis of ESL students' written paragraphs need to be included in CR (Yue, 2009). Accordingly, he compared some ESL written texts (based on cultural differences) with those written by
English speaking writers and noticed various rhetorical differences. For example, Student writers from Anglo-European (or Anglo-American) languages seemed to use linear developments, whereas student writers from Oriental languages inclined to adopt a more indirect style, and achieving the principal points only at the end of writing. The paragraph organization in writing produced by ESL writers from Semitic languages appeared to focus on a series of parallel constructions, rather than subordinate clauses. It was also found that ESL writers from Romance and Russian languages tended to include extraneous materials which were considered irrelevant in the view of a linear concept (Connor, 2002:494). See Figure 2.7 below.

**Figure (2.7 ): Kaplan`s (1966) Cross – cultural Differences in Paragraph Organization**

In line with Kaplan's view, Atkinson (2000:319), for example, in examining the impact of contrastive rhetoric in the field of EFL writing, he writes:

*The contrastive rhetoric hypothesis has held perhaps its greatest allure for those in nonnative-English-speaking contexts abroad, forced as they are to look EFL writing in the eye to try to understand why it at*
least sometimes looks “different” – often subtly out of sync with what one might expect from a “native” perspective.

Given Atkinson’s viewpoints, it also seems that, in addition to ESL writing contexts, contrastive rhetoric compares rhetorical patterns of EFL writers’ written texts with those of native speakers of English on the assumption that the cultural backgrounds of each group will play a significant role in the way of shaping the ideas. Therefore, it can be argued that L1 cultural background remains a very powerful element that influences the way both EFL and ESL writers structure and organize their English texts.

However, Kaplan's early concept of CR came under criticism. First, it has been considered that it was too ethnocentric and in favor of the writing of native English speakers (NES). It examines only L2 written texts, without paying much attention to the educational and developmental process elements among different language learners (Mohan & Lo, 1985). Moreover, Hinds (1983) states that Kaplan's "traditional" CR disregards the linguistic and cultural variations in writing among related languages, for labeling Chinese, Thai and Korean speakers as one "Oriental" group; and for assuming transfer from L1 as a negative impact on L2 writing. More importantly, Kaplan (1987) himself later confessed that his early attempt was just an idea, acknowledging that different rhetorical techniques of thinking may take place in any written discourse. However, he adds that it can be assumed that one cultural thought strategy tends to be dominant as a result of social, cultural and linguistic factors. Based on this argument, he proposed the notion of linguistic relativity (the Sapir-Whorfian hypothesis), which shows that different languages affect perception and thought in
different ways. It has been suggested that this hypothesis holds two versions: the strong form, which maintains that language controls both thought and perception, whereas the weak form considers that language only influences thought. However, the latter version seems to regain acceptability in linguistics, psychology, and composition studies, as it focuses on renewed attempts in the area of cultural differences (Connor, 1996:10).

Other objections came from Grabe and Kaplan (1996:98) who provide more evidence to support the standpoint that the early CR research has some negative sides. That is, first, the early CR research failed to draw a clear distinction between the students' writing and writing of professional writers. Second, it failed to indicate whether the writer being investigated is indeed capable of producing a meaningful written text in his/her L1. In other words, they assume that a writer with a limited ability in his/her L1 will not be able to overcome writing difficulties in L2. Third, in the early CR research, deductions were made by focusing on the deviation of English only without examining the discourse of L1. Relatively, these views show that there are always rhetorical variations in the written discourse of several languages, which need to be handled adequately before one can be made understand what he/she is supposed to know in order to produce a more perfect Western-like written text.

Although some studies such as of Kaplan tend to relate the origin of CR to the Sapir–Whorf Hypothesis of linguistic relativity, but some researchers vow to oppose this view. Ying (2000:260), for example, contends that “the claim that the origin of CR lies in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is untenable because the latter is usually rooted in German perceptions on linguistic determinism”. Such perceptions, according to him,
are inconsistent with Kaplan's (1966) view of rhetoric and culture. Furthermore, he mentions that Kaplan did not consider language and rhetoric as factors of thought patterns. Instead, he viewed that language and rhetoric seem to come up out of a culture: language and rhetoric are culture specific.

Whatever opinions about the origin of CR, one can say that Kaplan's earlier model, which was meant for paragraph development, can be seen as the foundation for identifying cultural differences in texts produced by university students for academic purposes. Obviously, it brought the American linguistic point of view to the rest of the world and raised the importance of rhetorical variations among ESL/EFL writers. Similarly, Matsuda (2001) also states that the origin of CR can be traced back to Kaplan's initiatives, which overshadowed three different intellectual concepts: contrastive analysis, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, and composition and rhetoric. Nevertheless, Matsuda (ibid.) has called for a more comprehensive model of second language writing by suggesting that emphases should be devoted to new composing fields, especially following some radical changes occurred in two major developments. That is, first, there has been an increase in the types of written discourse that are thought to be the essence of L2 writing around the world. In addition to college writing, other genres, such as academic research articles, research reports, and specific proposals have been proposed. Second, the idea of social factors in L2 writing has become a central point among language researchers and teachers.

Although the above trends in CR tend to be dominant, but still now, text analysis is considered as the primary concern of many L2 writing
researchers. That is, CR setting seems to focus on two disciplines: contrastive text linguistics and its related factors, and writing as literacy (as a socio-cultural and rhetorical task). As far as the first discipline is concerned, Connor (2002:496), for instance, asserts that despite a great emphasis on the textual analysis of coherence and cohesion patterns in most CR studies, some reservations have been raised about the adequacy of entirely text-based analysis as a basis for results that go beyond the scope of textual characteristics. Thus, instead of analyzing what a written text means, emphases need to be placed on how meaning is constructed. Bazerman and Prior (2004:6) also came out with three major questions that are involved in the analysis of writing: What does the text talk about?; How do texts influence audiences?; and how do texts come into being? Seemingly, it appears that much of the work on CR in its early stages was primarily based on integrating rhetorical analysis with linguistically oriented analysis.

With regard to the second discipline, i.e. writing as literacy, the findings support the fact that rhetorical styles of writing a text and ways of using them are culturally specific. That is, how each specific community shapes its own ways of interpreting the world, and then that would influence the manner in which that community performs its literacy based on culturally embedded trends of thinking (Connor et al., 2008:3). To add more in this respect, for example, different cultures would generate written texts in different ways. Even in the Sudanese context, it is evident that many writers seem to employ different Arabic rhetorical features such as puns, embellishment, exaggeration, simile, etc. in their English writing. This shows that each community is characterized by its own culturally embedded
writing preferences, which will prevent EFL writers from taking part fully in most L2 writing tasks.

2.4.1 Pedagogical Implications of CR

Since its primary goal is pedagogical, CR tends to cover a great number of writing techniques with a view to aid both EFL learners and teachers around the world to consider rhetorical differences in a FL writing field. Therefore, EFL writing instructors have come to notice that a broader perspective of EFL teaching framework should be taken into account, mainly inclusion of academic English compositions, English for specific purposes and EFL writing and meaning based on a variety of rhetorical dimensions. Grabe and Kaplan (1996:200), for example, suggest that CR focuses attention on seven forms of knowledge, which are assumed to be important in the teaching of writing. These are knowledge of:

1- Rhetorical patterns of arrangement and the relative frequency of various patterns (e.g. exposition, argument, classification, definition, etc.).

2- Composing techniques needed to generate text (e.g. pre-writing, data collection, revision, etc.).

3- The morphosyntax of the target language, particularly as it applies at the intersentential level.

4- The coherence-creating mechanisms of the target language.

5- The writing techniques of the target language in the sense of both frequency and distribution of types and text appearance (e.g. letter, essay, report).

6- The audience characteristics and expectations in the target culture.
The subject to be discussed, including both 'what everyone knows' in the target culture and specialist knowledge.

Looking at these viewpoints, it seems obvious that their awareness, no doubt, will strengthen EFL teachers' pedagogical practices aimed at bringing their students' attention that an effective written text always requires a good knowledge of a variety of rhetorical elements, especially the points 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7.

However, despite these pedagogical developments in CR and their significant role in teaching in ESL/EFL settings, some researchers once again raised some doubts about the effectiveness of the CR. It has been realized (Connor, 2002:503) that in 1997, three TESOL Quarterly researchers criticized CR for being insensitive to cultural variations. That is, Spack (1997) who teaches ESL learners in the USA was found to categorize his learners by their L1 background influence. At the same time, Zamel (1997) disfavors the tendency of CR and perceives cultures as "discrete, discontinuous, and predictable" (p. 343). Scollon (1997) also maintains that CR research places much focus on texts and ignores oral influences on literacy, as a result of which it seems to be unable to target effectively all communication settings as the case in Hong Kong. Another criticism in this regard was from Kubota (1999) who rejects the notion of a cultural dichotomy between East and West, arguing that such a dichotomy, as mentioned earlier, would tend to disregard some cultures and prioritize Western writing culture. Finally, Kubota and Lehner (2004) criticized CR for ignoring an active negotiation of multiple rhetorics in the writing classroom, and instead they proposed the notion of “critical contrastive rhetoric.”
Generally speaking, the above five viewpoints have been perceived as consequences of various disciplinary backgrounds of the researchers. That is to say, Zamel (1997), for instance, is believed to be closely linked to L1 writing features with a special attention to process writing and personal expression. By contrast, Scollon (1997) descends from anthropology, an area whose primary concern is not pedagogical matters; there is a wide difference of purposes between the two fields. As for Kubota, it has been said that she seems to deal with critical pedagogy as she questions the use of Western techniques of academic writing (Connor, 2002). Therefore, Connor et al. (2008:3) conclude that “it is unfortunate that these critics have begun referring to contrastive rhetoric as if had been frozen in space”. Evaluating most new criticisms, Connor et al. (ibid.) suggest that taking CR as being useful and explanatory is not enough. Yet, to remain “alive and continue developing, CR should move beyond its traditional binary differences such as linear versus nonlinear discourse, Japanese prose versus Finnish prose, inductive versus deductive logic, and collectivist versus individualist norms. Thus, they propose that CR needs to deal with the various complexities of cultural, social and educational components influencing a writing environment. It must tend to explain why and how individuals behave rather than just investigate cultural variables and products. It also needs to indicate how the writers and readers understand each other as well as processes of writing (ibid.).

Further, addressing the recent criticisms, Connor et al. (2008:4) suggest a new direction for more practicable CR: they draw attention to a wider perspective of CR and state that a new term would better replace the field of CR so as to differentiate between the often-quoted “static” model
and the recent developments that have been put forward. Then, they came up with the term “intercultural rhetoric” to address the current dynamic models of cross-cultural research. The new field is said to be dynamic as well as exploratory, examining new genres, broadening contextual research via historical and ethnographic investigations, refining methodology, using electronic corpora of texts, and extending beyond linguistic aspects to cover other specific differences in writing (ibid.).

Having discussed all these arguments, one can conclude that CR is one of the most effective mechanisms through which both teachers and EFL writers could examine textual differences stemming from different cultural and social settings. Most importantly, it becomes clear that CR theories tend to go beyond the traditional issues of ESL and EFL writing, to encompass areas such as business, scientific and technical writing. Nowadays, these fields are increasingly becoming important in our global community. Thus, CR will enable EFL writers to be familiar with different writing styles.

2.4.2 Arabic Rhetoric

During both the pre-Islamic and the early Islamic eras (period of the first Hijrah century), there were no signs of recognized written rhetorical standards that can be considered as a basis for an effective written Arabic discourse. Rhetorical views have been relatively based on individual linguistic evaluations of a particular statement or speech (Urbonaite, 2005). During these two periods, it has been argued that, there were only some perceptions that were common to the Arabs. Arab poets of the pre-Islamic period, for example, used to form opinions about each other’s speech on the basis of meaning, choice of words, rhyme and stylistic appropriateness. In this respect, al-Nabighatu al-Dhubjani (d .18 years before the Hijrah)
acted as an arbitrator for accurate poetic patterns and meaning. According to him, it is rhetorically more acceptable to describe, for instance, the swords by saying ﯽﺑِيِرَقُنِ ﰲ ﰲ ﰱدِدِ ﻦ (youbirigna beladuja) (they sparkle in darkness) than by (yalmana fee alduha) (they twinkle in the forenoon) as guests, according to the classical Arab culture, come more likely at night time than during the day (Abdul-Raof, 2006:32). Similarly, in the pre-Islamic period, Arab poets such as Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulama and Imru-‘al-Qays, used flowery rhetorical styles to entice the audience perceptions. During this period, Arabic rhetoric was mainly characterized by the notion that to what extent a rhetorician can be able to use eloquent language to express meaning, especially in terms of clourful word choice, rhythm, and presentation. In short, the first generation of Arab rhetoricians considered the concept of rhetoric as succinctness: to answer promptly and deliver speeches accurately (ibid.). In the light of this, rhetoric was interpreted as al-balaghah which means reaching a given end through using certain semantic patterns. This, then, is one side of viewing rhetoric from the Arab culture point of view which is likely different from today's Western perception of rhetoric, which pertains to written communication.

The Holy Qur’an is also considered one of the important sources of Arabic rhetoric. In most of the Holy Qur’an’s verses, there are several types of rhetorical styles, i.e. systematic stages of description and logical statements that refer to certain situations of people’s life (Zaharna, 2009:10). Indeed, the Qur’an chapters (Suwaar) adopted very unique and powerful rhetorical features so as to communicate the intended message explicitly and implicitly. However, what can be observed in the Holy Qur’an's rhetoric is that Arabic native speakers might come across different forms of
rhetorical techniques such as simile (tashbeeh), metaphorical expressions (maajaz), pun (Tawreya), and metonymy (kenaya). Therefore, it seems that the classical Arabic, in which the Holy Qur’an is written, has influenced Arab EFL writers in a way that they tend to transfer those rhetorical traditions into English writing, the reason why sometimes the intended goal cannot be easily understood by the native English speakers due to rhetorical differences between the two languages.

Linguistically, Abdul-Raof (ibid.) argues that Arabic rhetoric whether written or spoken is categorized into three main principles: meanings (maani), eloquent illustrations (Bajan) and embellishment (Albadi). Yet, he concludes that Arabic rhetoric is dependent on five major principles:

1- The selection of eloquent lexical items. This refers to compatibility between the word selected and its meaning. A particular word should be able to convey the signification that is chosen for. It also reveals the interrelation between the word’s form and meaning in any communicative environment.

2- The well-formedness of the proposition. This is about the grammaticality and morphological consistency of a syntactic structure. The intended goal of a word should be interpreted through a well-structured grammatical construction.

3- The selection of a style appropriate to the psychological and ideological states of the audience. The competent and skilled communicator has to be aware of his/her audience’s state: especially the social and educational status.
4- The inclusion of a good introduction and conclusion. An effective text must contain a very clear-cut introduction and conclusion.

5- The psychological impact on the text receiver. This is concerned with the rhetorical styles that influence the audience emotionally, or socially.

In Arabic, there are rhetorical features that Arab writers use to express their communicative point of view. Some of these features are the validity markers including hedges and emphatics. Examples of hedges in Arabic are *rubama* (perhaps) *amatan* (generally), *min al-mumkin* (it is possible), and *yabdu li* (it seems to me). Emphatics in Arabic, on the other hand, refer to the writer’s strong desire to the reality of the propositional content, e.g. *bi la shakkin* (undoubtedly), *bi al-tabi* (of course), and *min al-muakadi* (certainly) (Elseidi, 2000; cited in Ibrahim et al., 2000:112). However, an Arabic emphatic aspect that may not have an English equivalent is the article “*inna*” (ensuring or strengthening particle), which comes initially in nominal clauses. Hassan (1995) points out that the meaning of this emphatic “*inna*” (and some kinds of *anna*) lies in the fact that “it emphasizes the ascription, that is, the ascription of the *khabar* (predicate) to the *mubtada* (subject), and eliminates doubt of its denial.” As far as the effective use of these two particles is concerned, Hassan adds that it is rhetorically unacceptable to utilize them unless the predicate is subject to doubt or denial.

More importantly, Arabic rhetoric favors coordination as opposed to the English rhetoric (subordination); sentences may start with “*wa*” (and) or “*izan*” (so). Again, the basic word order in classical Arabic sentence also causes problems for Arab EFL writers as the verb precedes the subject (V-S-O) just as adjectives come after a noun. Apparently, differences in the word
order between English and Arabic may cause problems for many Arab EFL writers when they get involved in English writing.

Broadly speaking, given the relationship between Arabic sentences structure and word order, Chaffin (2006), provides the following points with regard to verbs and verbals:

1. No equivalent of do.
2. No verb ‘be’ in present tense.
3. No modal verbs.
4. No gerund or infinitive forms.
5. Perspective of tense and time is very different from English.
6. Past perfect is formed with be.
7. Reported speech retains tense of original.
8. Simple present tense covers meaning of simple and progressive in English.

Arabic writers also use repetition as a means for textual cohesion and rhetorical effectiveness (Chaffin, 2006:3). The reason behind this tendency is that as Santos and Suleiman (ibid.1993) suggest, written discourse of Arab ESL learners is heavily influenced by Arabic logic and cultural thought patterns. This point of view supports the various claims made about the relationship between the culture and the way writers think in shaping their meaning. For example, in Kaplan’s (1966) comparative study of Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education, he notices that Arabic paragraph development is based on a group of parallel constructions: either
positively or negatively. In contrast, al-Hassan (2004), in examining the rhetorical differences between the English and Arabic writing, maintains that Arabic speaking EFL learners seem to devote much emphasis on the sentence level, rather than discourse level and accordingly, in many instances, more than one idea can be stated in one sentence. In his view, such an Arabic rhetorical technique may mislead the anticipated English native speakers (NES) as that contradicts their way of writing. Moreover, al-Hassan argues that most Arab EFL writers find it difficult to draw a clear distinction between a declarative sentence and a question, or a command when writing in English.

Equally, Moujtahid (1996:2) in investigating the influence of cultural and linguistic backgrounds on the writing of Arabic and Japanese students of English, notices that Arab EFL writers incline towards exaggeration, emotionalism, overstatement and what is sometimes called “purple prose.” Indeed, the causes of these problems are differences in the way of writing. In other words, in Arabic culture there is a great emphasis on an effective expression based on impressiveness than on logic and reasoning. Hence, Arabic rhetoric (both speech and writing) is characterized by exaggeration and emphatic assertion as a result of culturally embedded factors of Arabic speech community. Kufaishi (2006:9), for example, sees that the Arabic statement ?akhbarakum ?athlajat Sudurana would mean nothing to an English speaker if it is translated literally into ‘the news we received iced/froze our chests’, because ice in Western sense is not related to “ease”, “relief” or "pleasure". Similar situations of exaggeration could be added. For example, in Sudan, during the early days (perhaps even now) of the National Salvation Revolution regime, some politicians used to
pronounce slogans such as نأكل من ما نزرع (nakul min ma nazara) (we feed ourselves from what we cultivate). This statement means that Sudanese are no longer in need of foreign assistance, especially from the West. In this sense, when Sudanese EFL writers, for instance, use such a phrase in their English writing, it sounds fair and acceptable as they are influenced by the Arabic rhetoric of exaggeration. That is to say, they used to hear similar frequent pronouncements from their politicians. Nevertheless, taking the political environment of the country into consideration, an English native speaker may consider such phrases as irrelevant and insincere.

On the other hand, it is worth noting that, even in the early years of the twenty-first century there has been vigorous antagonism against the Western-based modern approach to Arabic rhetoric. One of the chief opponents of this new direction is, for example, Abdl al-Aziz Hammudah (cited in Abdul-Raof, 2006:62) whose books are critical of the application of Western modern rhetorical norms to Arabic prose. He calls for the analysis of Arabic written texts within the framework of classical Arabic rhetoric. Nevertheless, Abul-Raof argues that classical Arabic rhetoricians, linguists and exegetes have been aware of the Western approaches to rhetoric. Abdul-Raof adds that, for instance, Ibn al-Mutazz (d.296H) has adopted the textual-level rhetorical analysis of the classical Arabic discourse and examined the relationship between the beginning, middle and the end of the prose. In addition, exegeses of Quranic text-level analysis and its rhetorical characteristics have been studied. Interestingly, Abdul-Raof concludes that modern Arab rhetoricians apply new rhetorical techniques that have already been used by classical mainstream of Arabic rhetoric with different names. For example, the new rhetorical concept (al-ramziyyah -
symbolism) is known in classical Arabic as *al-kinayah* (metonymy) or *al-isti arah* (metaphor).

Likewise, in the wake of these Western stylistic approaches to rhetoric, some Sudanese rhetoricians and linguists (cf. al-Hassan, 2004; Abdalla, 2005) call for the importance of applying Western rhetorical techniques in Sudanese EFL writing settings. Seemingly, such attempts can be meant to raise the awareness of Arabic-speaking rhetoricians that rhetorical studies in terms of discourse analysis should be expanded to cover both micro-level (i.e. the word and sentence levels) and macro-level (i.e. the discourse level) with more emphasis on the latter. In general, it is necessary to point out that Arabic-speaking EFL writers should develop stylistic patterns of their L1 along with a wide variety of L2 rhetorical techniques in order to improve their language proficiency in English writing. That is, studying similarities and differences between the Arabic and English written texts’ patterns would raise their understanding of both languages’ forms and techniques. However, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, although there is a huge body of research on CR of other languages, very little research on Arabic rhetoric has been conducted. Therefore, further studies are highly recommended in this area.

### 2.5 Cohesion in EFL Writing

Following the attempts made by Halliday and Hassan in 1976, much attention has been directed toward the study of both cohesion and coherence (see 2.6) in discourse studies. In more broad terms, since the emergence of their efforts, many researchers, including M.A. and Ph.D. candidates used these two concepts as the subjects of their research areas.
Being aware of how cohesion functions within a text to establish semantic ties could be beneficial to EFL writers in order to elaborate meaning. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), the concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it stands for relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that illustrate it as a text. They also add that cohesion can be achieved when the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is determined by that of another (p.4). Thus, it can be noticed that the central point of their concept lies in the fact that the unity of a text is achieved by the cohesive ties it contains.

Generally speaking, cohesion is partly created through the grammar (grammatical cohesion) and partly through the vocabulary (lexical cohesion). However, it has been argued that when cohesion is perceived as being grammatical or lexical, this does not mean that it is an entirely formal relation, and has nothing to do with meaning. This argument supports the above claim that cohesion is a semantic relation. To put it simply, Halliday and Hassan (p.6) stress that as the case in all elements of the semantic system, cohesion can be achieved through the lexicogrammatical system, i.e. it shows how meaning is being established based on the semantic relations that are shared between and among the lexical and grammatical aspects in the text. Therefore, these semantic relations would enable a writer to postulate his/her thought accurately so as to enable a reader to grasp a text’s main purpose more easily.

The above mentioned two types of cohesion will be discussed thoroughly under their respective headlines in the following sections.
2.5.1 Grammatical Cohesion

Grammatical cohesion can be attained through reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunctions. In general, the concept of reference is traditionally used in semantics to refer to the relationship between a word and what it means in the real world. In Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) view, it simply stands for the relationship between two linguistic expressions: “items in the text instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right... make reference to something else for their interpretation” (p.31). So, in writing context, reference means the way the writer interprets his/her ideas and tends to keep track of them till the end of the text.

There are three forms of referencing: personal (such as pronouns, and possessive determiners), demonstrative, which maintains flow of ideas through location using proximity references (such as this, these, that, etc.) and comparative, which maintains flow of information via indirect references employing adjectives (such as similar, otherwise). It has been argued that these types of referential cohesion can function either endophorically, which stands for information that can be obtained from within the text, exophorically, which stands for a meaning being obtained from context outside the text, and homophorically, which stands for shared information through the context of culture (Holland and Lewis, 2001:57-8). Moreover, it has been reported that the endophoric reference tends to show more explicit textual cohesion as compared to the exophoric one (Halliday and Hassan, 1976:181), and as such, it is endophoric reference which is the main concern of cohesion theory. In fact, endophoric reference is categorized into three levels: anaphoric (points backwards), cataphoric (points forward) and esphoric (within the same nominal group or phrase).
The second type of grammatical cohesion is substitution and ellipsis. As noted above, reference attempts to hang semantic relationships within the text. However, the picture seems to be different in the case of substitution and ellipsis. They are said to operate as linguistic links at the lexicogrammatical level. So, they might be used when a writer tends to avoid a repetition of a lexical item and focus on one of the grammatical elements of the language to replace the item. Relatively, each one (i.e. substitution and ellipsis) can replace the other, especially ellipsis is considered as zero substitution (Halliday and Hassan, 1976:317; Bloor & Bloor, 1995:96). Both substitution and ellipsis incorporate three subcategories: nominal, verbal and clausal. In nominal substitution, the most frequent substitution words are: “one and ones” and they stand for nouns, e.g.

Can you give me a pen? There is one under the table.

With regard to verbal substitution, the most used substitute is the word “do” and its different forms such as does, did, and done, e.g.

A : Who did break the window?

B : I think Ahmed did.

The word “did” is a substitute for the verbal phrase “break the window.” As for the clausal substitution, it takes place when a whole clause is substituted. Consider the following example:

Non-paid-fees students will not be allowed to sit for their exams. The University of Khartoum authorities disclosed so. The word “so” is assumed
to replace the whole sentence: non-paid-fees students will not be allowed to sit for their exams.

As far as ellipsis (zero substitution) is concerned, the following three examples show instances of nominal, verbal and clausal respectively:

1. A : Do you intend to stay another night?

        B : Yes, **three more**.

2. I **read** ‘Ajrass al-Huria’ newspaper and Ahmed ‘al-Sudani’.

3. A : Are you going to attend Mr. Ahmed’s wedding party on Friday?

        B : **Yes**.

Yet, in some cases, the whole clause may often be left out as in, e.g.

A : What sort of music do you want to hear?

        B : **Jazz**.

It is worth noting that clausal ellipsis often occurs in dialogue in terms of yes/no questions.

A third way of establishing grammatical cohesion is through conjunction. Unlike the other cohesive relations, conjunction is based on the concept that, first, there are in the linguistic system, types of systematic relationships between sentences. Second, there are certain ways in which the system permits the parts of a text to be related to one another in meaning (Halliday and Hassan, 1976:320). In general, in the history of human thought, there are some basic logical relations existent in ordinary
language, and these logical relations are embodied in linguistic structures in terms of coordination, opposition, modification, etc. (ibid.).

To be precise, conjunctive relations are more encoded in form of linkages between the elements of a text, rather than in the form of grammatical structure (e.g. as in 2.5.1). Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999:519; cited in Chen, 2006:114), divide Halliday and Hassan’s version (1976) of cohesive devices into four main categories:

1- Additive

**Emphatic:** in addition, additionally, moreover, further, furthermore, besides, and, also, in fact, at the same time, or.

**Appositional:** that is, that is to say, in other words, rather, yet, though, for instance/example.

**Comparative:** likewise, similarly.

2- Adversative

**Proper adversative:** however, nevertheless, nonetheless, despite this, in/by contrast.

**Contrastive:** conversely, in fact, on the other hand, at the same time, in the meantime, meanwhile, otherwise.

**Correction:** instead, rather, on the contrary, at least.

**Dismissal:** in any case/event, anyhow, at any rate.
3- Causal

**General causal**: therefore, consequently, for that reason, thus, as a result, so, for, because, in this respect, hence, thereby, accordingly, inconsequence.

**Causal conditional**: then, in that case, in turn.

4- Temporal

**Sequential**: then, in turn, next, first, second, third, fourth, (fifth...), after that, until then, first of all, firstly, (secondly...), last, finally, later, initially.

**Summarizing**: in short, in summary, in brief, in sum, in conclusion, to sum up, to conclude, to summarize, overall, all in all.

Generally, these cohesive devices are considered as logical connectors which serve to facilitate the existence of semantic relationships among sentences in written English discourse. Thus, any difficulty in using them would result in a loss of the overall coherence of the written text.

2.5.2 Lexical Cohesion

As cohesion is achieved by grammatical relationships between the various parts of a text, it is also achieved by showing lexical semantic relationships in the text. Thus, an adequate selection of words in one's writing is absolutely important, as it helps him/her keeps the sequential flow of the semantic ties. It has been argued that (Crane, 2006:136) lexical cohesion seems to differ from the above discussed cohesive devices of reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction in that it is a non-grammatical function. That is, it is not related to any specific syntactic group
of elements, the reason why it is considered as the most open-ended and least properly defined as opposed to the other types.

Halliday and Hassan (1976:318) propose two distinct, though related, elements through which lexical cohesion can be maintained: reiteration and collocation. The first element (reiteration) deals with the repetition of a lexical item, or application of a synonym. Additionally, reiteration can occur in the form of repetition of the same lexical item or through the use of a synonymy, meronym, or hyponym (ibid.). Castro (2004:218), for example, points out that two different words are cohesively tied through synonym if they have the same meaning or are considered semantic equivalents, e.g. technology and science. He also adds that two words are cohesively related through antonym if they are semantic opposites, e.g. advantage and disadvantage, whereas two words are regarded to be hyponymous in case the cohesive bond between them is based on a general semantic relationship, e.g. machine and computer. Furthermore, two lexical items are cohesively linked through meronymy if the semantic relationship between them tends to be based on a part-whole or whole-part connection, e.g. house/door, room, wall, bathroom.

As for the second category (collocation), it differs from the first one in that it does not pertain to a semantic relationship between words. Rather, it pertains to the tendency of words to “share the same lexical environment”, i.e. some lexical items seem to work in the lexical territory of others (Halliday and Hassan, 1976:286). To clarify this argument, consider Halliday and Hassan’s (p.319) example:

Soon her eye fell on a little glass box that was lying under the table: she opened it, and found in it a very small cake, on
which the words ‘EAT ME’ were beautifully marked in currants.’
Well, I’ll eat it,’ said Alice, ‘and if it makes me larger, I can reach
the key; and if it makes me smaller, I can creep under the door;
so either way I’ll get into the garden, and I don’t care which
happens.”

She ate a little bit, and anxiously to herself, ‘Which way?
Which way?’ holding her hand on the top of her head to feel
which way it was wrong, and she was quite surprised to find that
she remained the same size: to be sure, this generally happens
when one eats cake, but Alice had got so much into the way of
expecting nothing but out-of-the-way things to happen, that it
seemed quite dull and stupid for life to go on in the common
way. So she set to work, and very soon finished off the cake.

Having examined the above quotation, one can notice a great deal of
repeated words such as ‘eat’ in ‘eat me, and I’ll eat’, ‘ate’ in ‘she ate a little
bit’ and ‘eats’ in ‘one eats cake. There is also an occurrence of the word
‘cake’ in ‘when one eats cake’ (second paragraph), although without
reference item, the repetition will create tie. In fact, the main target behind
the occurrences of the words in this example is to maintain cohesive effect
by the continuity of lexical meaning (Halliday and Hassan, 1976 :320).

In 1984, Hassan augmented Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) lexical cohesion
and suggested three major changes:

1- Additions and deletions to the classification of relations in lexical
cohesion.

2- The separation of lexical chains into two forms: identity chains and
similarity chains.
3- The theory of cohesive harmony in which a “further source of cohesion is laid bare” (Hassan, 1984:212).

Conversely, Martin (1992) introduced some modifications to the analysis of lexical cohesion based on the former work of Halliday and Hassan (1976) and Hassan’s (1984) work on cohesive harmony. His attempts refer to the linkage between the grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion in the text, and the readers’ perception of coherence of the text. For the most part, Martin’s view of lexical cohesion is basically highlighted in line with the overall context of “discourse analysis in terms of systemic functional linguistics”, as well as the investigation of lexical semantic relations: discourse semantics of lexical relations (p. 277).

Despite the role of cohesion in the analysis of written discourse process, the concept has received some criticisms. Widdowson (1978:26), for example, argues that although in cohesion one comes across an instance of propositional development, sometimes, sentences that have been used communicatively in discourse, may not in themselves show independent propositions. In other words, they take on value in relation to other propositions shown in other sentences. Therefore, one may find it difficult to recognize such a relationship, as well as to relate a sentence, or part of it to an appropriate meaning. Widdowson sees that the problem might emerge due to the fact that the type of a sentence may entail an inadequate arrangement of ideas. That is, while making the appropriate arrangement, one might violate the propositional development and then, weaken effective communication. At the same time, redundant repetition of what is already known, or given, may tarnish the communicative purpose, because the new elements of the proposition tend to be undermined by
what is already known. To illustrate this viewpoint, consider the following example of Widdowson:

A: What happen to the crops?

B: The crops were destroyed by the rain.

A: When were the crops destroyed by the rain?

B: The crops were destroyed by the rain last week.

In these sentences, each one indicates an independent expression of the proposition. Cohesively speaking, they have to be readjusted by getting rid of the redundancies so as the propositional development can flow forward smoothly (p.26) as in the following sentences:

A: What happened to the crops?

B: They were destroyed by the rain.

A: When?

B: Last week.

Carrell (1982) also doubts if Halliday and Hassan’s views on cohesion as the foundation of coherence (see 2.6) in the view of schema-theoretical assumptions of text processing. In fact, schema theory illustrates the “interactive process between the text and the prior background knowledge or memory schemata of the listener or reader” (p. 482). The weak point of Halliday and Hassan’s idea of cohesion, according to Carrell (ibid.), stems from their failure to consider the contributions of the reader. In other words, owing to the process of comprehension, the reader does not focus only on the surface linguistic characteristics of the text. Rather, the
schemata, or the world knowledge, that the reader tends to provide to the text environment has to be considered. Carrell bases his view on the standpoint that cohesion of surface linguistic characteristics is not the cause, but the effect of coherence. That is, the lexical cohesion might be the effect rather than the cause of the text’s coherence. Brown and Yule (1983:195) too express doubts about Halliday and Hassan’s concept of cohesion and came up with two hypothetical questions:

1- Is Halliday and Hassan’s cohesion important to the identification of a text?

2- Is such cohesion sufficient to guarantee identification as a text?

It seems that Brown and Yule emphasize the link between cohesion and text, arguing that lexical cohesion is not always a precondition for text to yield semantic relations between the sentences as shown in the example below (Brown and Yule, 1983:136):

A :There is the doorbell.

B :I’m in the bath.

Obviously, in despite of the fact that these sentences lack lexical cohesion, their sequence could enable the reader to comprehend the text. This shows that text can take place regardless of lexical cohesion, whereas lexical cohesion cannot be realized without text. As a result, Brown and Yule (1983:197), demonstrate this point by stating:

*The reader may indeed use some of the formal expressions of cohesive relationships present in the sentences, but he is more likely to try to build a coherent*
Despite the above critical observations about the significance of cohesion in text, it is necessary for EFL writers to take into account the importance of cohesive ties in both creating and understanding the communicative message of the text. In this regard, Carter and McCarthy (1988:204) suggest that cohesive bonds should be perceived as a “manifestation of how one is making sense of the message in the text.” Of course, this means that whatever the arguments and justifications concerning anti-cohesive remarks are, cohesive devices continue to bring the text’s semantic function into play.

Having studied the above researchers’ (Widdowson, Carrell, Brown and Yule) views, it becomes evident that they all agree with the existence of semantic relations in a text. Their disagreement centers on “explicitness.” That is, it has been noticed that Halliday and Hassan tend to be in favor of the explicit expressions of semantic relations, while others (Carrell, Brown and Yule) encourage the theme of “the underlying relations” that can be understood by the reader with the knowledge of language and other sources (Yeh, 2004:246).

2.6 Coherence in EFL Writing

As pointed in 2.5 that writing is thought to be a thinking process, EFL writers also need to bring out their ideas in a more coherent and logical whole. This is because, any piece of writing which its producer fails to abide
by such a style, his/her written work will be perceived as illogical, unfocused, or even, in some cases, boring and so awful.

Research on Sudanese EFL writing coherence, especially at the university level, has lately become one of the central issues among a very few Sudanese educational researchers due to the fact that almost all Sudanese EFL writers face problems in producing a well-organized meaningful text in English (see, for example, al-Hassan, 2004).

Broadly speaking, concepts such as coherence and cohesion (see 2.5) are not widely used or easily understood by ordinary writers as opposed to the concepts of other more frequently used language aspects such as vocabulary, spelling, grammar and so on. In Grabe and Kaplan (1996:67) words, in recent years, researchers in psychology and linguistics have increasingly attempted to explain the concept of coherence in an effort to know how readers handle language structure to provide a sense of coherence. Similarly, other disciplines, such as philology, sociology, philosophy and computer sciences have dealt with discourse coherence. Sociologists, for instance, discuss the production and understanding of coherent discourse in naturalistic conversations that are concerned with various groups and cultures, whereas computer scientists formulate and examine computer models that tend to produce and test coherent texts (Louwerse and Graesser, 2005:1).

Coherence has been defined in several ways. Traditionally, the term is defined as the relationship that sticks the information in a text together in order to establish a sense of unity for the reader (Lee, 2002:32). In addition, Briguglio (2007:1) describes coherence as the ‘glue’ that binds a text so that the ideas seem to flow easily and logically from one stage to the next. In
other words, paragraphs should be linked well from one paragraph to the next, sentences within a paragraph should also be linked well, and there is a logical sequence of ideas (ibid.). Another definition comes from Halliday and Hassan (1989) who state that coherence emerges from the meaningful interaction between the text and reader. Nevertheless, Qijun and Ban (2006:43) contend that it is very difficult to have a well-defined idea of both cohesion and coherence, and in their view, coherence means hold together. That is to say, a paragraph is assumed to be coherent if its sentences are woven together, or flown into each other. They also add that in order to obtain an overall meaning of a text, writers must get different kinds of coherence such as syntactic coherence, stylistic coherence and pragmatic coherence.

From all these definitions and possibly others, one can say that coherence seems to have more than one interpretation. As a result, EFL writers might find it difficult to have a clear cut definition of the notion of coherence. Experience has shown (according to my own teaching experience) that some Sudanese EFL learners find it extremely unsound and tedious to produce a well-planned, logical and coherent text in English. In fact, some of their problems are due to the inadequate use of grammatical rules, but mostly are due to the inappropriate use of written discourse markers which, no doubt, would lead to the creation of coherence in their English writing. One of the advocates of difficulty of coherence is Chiu (2004:155) who asserts that coherence seems to be one of the most difficult elements in writing pedagogy, which is uneasy to understand and uncomfortable to teach either. Further, he concludes that although some
EFL writers may have an excellent command of grammatical knowledge, they may face some obstacles in producing a coherent text.

There are several viewpoints about how coherence can be achieved. According to Halliday and Hassan (1989:95), coherence can be achieved by cohesive markers that are adequately handled. In this regards, they think that the semantic relations between the major ideas (i.e. cohesion) should be clear: contrary to Carrell's (1982:480) views that a text can be coherent without being cohesive. Consider her example below:

The picnic was ruined. No one remembered to bring a corkscrew.

Carrell tends to demonstrate that in such situations, coherence can be established by the reader’s general knowledge about the picnic, rather than by the lexical links between picnic and corkscrew. That is, despite the fact that there is a relationship between picnic and corkscrew in the reader’s perspective, it is possible that these lexical ties are on the basis of coherence. However, according to Halliday and Hassan (1976) lexical ties are cohesive, and the relationship between cohesion and coherence, according to them, is perceived in the sense that the surface structure contributes to the perception of underlying coherence of the text.

Another way of obtaining a sense of coherence in a written text is readers' expectations about the general structure of the text based upon the frames or schemas provided by genre (Van Dijik, 1980; Bae, 2001:57). Brown and Yule (1983, cited in Grabe and Kaplan, 1996:68) suggest that coherence is the outcome of a general knowledge and stages at which a reader could be able to call upon to establish a coherent picture of the overall message. So, they argue that coherence is apparently the work of the reader more
than a product of the text. Based on a general assumption of resemblance, the reader searches for similarities between the message and the knowledge he already has and then, tends to make connections. In contrast, James (1998:162), points out that coherence is mainly associated with the content, to the conceptual relatedness of propositions. That is, readers do not necessarily focus on ‘markers’ on the surface, but rather on underlying conceptual relationships. In such a way, readers will be able to find out where the writer has failed to adhere to the required patterns of relationship. Thus, it seems that the reader will directly be involved in the process of relatedness evaluation of the written text. Therefore, reader-based coherence seems to be dependent on the reader’s ability to understand the content of the text which should be consistent with his/her background knowledge about the text, or his/her expectations with respect to his/her world knowledge. Accordingly, readers have the right, based on their sense, either to perceive a written text as coherent or incoherent. Such a position makes us add that although awareness of the linguistic forms is necessary, it is the reader’s expectations that are thought useful, because in many cases, readers look for consistency within the text structure as well as the content. Generally, it can be said that attainment of coherence is a responsibility of both the writer and reader, but much of the burden will be on the former.

However, research on coherence in texts shows that much of the coherence-building information is not brought off in the text by the reader, especially in the instances of routinely performed texts (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996:69). Certainly, cognitive psychology studies signal to strong evidence for the influence of text structuring itself as a principal contributor to
coherence in texts. In other words, certain features of coherence can be said are related to the text structure itself, whereas other features can be noticed in terms of an interaction effect of the reader and the text information as well. Generally speaking, text-based coherence is established by both unity of its ideas and structure. As for the former, it is apparent that the unity of information in the text that makes it looks coherent and meaningful. Eventually, a text must contain a controlling idea, which is normally stated in the introductory paragraph, or other paragraphs of the text. In the preceding paragraphs, each one is controlled by a main idea embedding a topic sentence which with other supporting sentences will serve the controlling idea. All main ideas of the different paragraphs contribute to the exposition of the controlling idea expressed in the introductory paragraph, or somewhere else in the text. In this regards, the writer must know how to unite his/her ideas aimed at obtaining a coherent meaningful whole. This means that the ties between the sentences must be straightforward, and each paragraph must look a whole, rather than a collection of separate sentences.

Simpson (2000:294) contends that one particular way of analyzing written discourse coherence is topical structure analysis (TSA). Theoretically, based on the theory of "theme" and "rhyme" of the Prague School of Linguistics, Lautamatti (1987) developed TSA to investigate coherence in texts. He concentrated on semantic ties that can be found between sentence topics and the overall discourse topics. Topical structure analysis shows how topics reoccur, shift and come to previous topics in discourse (ibid.). Thus, Lautamatti proposes three different types of progressions:

1- Parallel progression (topics of successive sentences are the same);
2- sequential progression (topics of successive sentences are always different and come out of the comment of the previous sentences);

3- Extended parallel progression (the first and the last topics of a piece of text are identical but are by a sequential progression).

Some researchers such as Connor and Farmer (1990) and Schneider and Connor (1991) also applied topical structure analysis theory to examine ESL/EFL writing performance and realized that topical structure analysis matches well with a reader’s expectations of writing quality. They also think that TSA is useful in investigating the physical characteristic features of a paragraph: it helps teachers develop and evaluate EFL learners' composition coherence. Nevertheless, prior to the emergence of TSA, Sperber and Wilson (1986) acknowledge that coherence can be established through relevance. Pragmatically, the concept ‘relevance’ refers to what extent is a message coherent in order to be accepted? The overall view of this idea addresses a general cognitive processing procedure that people are expected to seek relevance in texts in terms of comparing the text to other ideas resulting in the establishment of new ideas, the consistency of old ideas and the confirmation of one’s commitment to something (Smith, 1989). According to Smith, the notion does not guarantee that relevance nearly equals coherence, because a text may be coherent and lacks the above three criteria for relevance. Thus, a reader who lacks the general background knowledge of the world from which he can obtain inferences would find it difficult to grasp the meaning of the text.

Pedagogically speaking, the majority of the EFL teachers feel that coherence plays a central role in students’ writing proficiency: by employing some ways which could assist their students improve coherence. Lee
(2002:34), for example, introduces five strategies to assist his students understanding how factors of coherence work in various forms of texts. First, he begins with what is called ‘introductory tasks’ in the sense that a teacher has to introduce students to the topic and thereby arouse their interest in the role of coherence in writing. At one level, it has been noticed that introducing macrostructure, for example, students can get involved in writing an interesting topic which is familiar to them. At the other, students may describe a clumsy incident. On both occasions, major elements of the discourse structure (e.g. introduction, development, and conclusion) can be practiced. Second, he provides learners with explicit explanations, in particular using simple text-analysis tasks. In this connection, Lee states that in teaching macrostructure, learners can analyze texts that incorporate the problem-solution structure and reshape disordered sentences. The third strategy is concerned with a student-handout which means that following an explicit instruction, student handouts on certain topics are made available so as help strengthen students’ understanding of coherence. Principally, handouts strategy is meant to provide explicit explanations about various mechanisms for achieving coherence at the metadiscourse level. Lee’s fourth strategy of teaching coherence is an ‘awareness-raising task’ which is considered the most central strategy of teaching. In this strategy, students are motivated to take part in a variety of text analysis tasks in order to employ the strategies they have acquired. For example, in some situations of ‘awareness-raising tasks’, students are asked to read a text and analyze its macrostructure and then, revise it to modify and improve it since the elements of the text are not logically arranged. Finally, Lee suggests a strategy of writing practice which permits students to apply the ideas of coherence to their own writing. That is, they might be given a
topic, and then, are required to organize their writing process and outline on the basis of a macrostructure relevant to the text. Nevertheless, it has been argued that as coherence is specific to genres, the ways for achieving it do not necessarily apply to all forms of writing and may differ on the basis of different genres. Accordingly, it is suggested that it is important to let students be aware of how the purpose, audience and context of a text influence its coherence (Lee, p 35).

As the matter in cohesion, coherence, however, is not without criticism. Most of controversies that are related to the nature of coherence are based on the fact that a text surface does not give a consistent harmony with the organizational development of the text. Grabe and Kaplan (1996:70), for instance, say that there is no a set of linguistic signals that will provide all the information needed to compose a completely logical text. Also, writers will use the formal resources for pointing out text organization at different levels depending on their awareness of intended readers and their knowledge of the topic and genre. Therefore, they suggest that, while it seems reasonable to examine the surface elements of cohesion, the nature of coherence is much more difficult to be perceived (p. 70).

Finally, Sheng (2008:21) considers most of the 1970s and 1980s views on coherence as traditional due to the fact that coherence has been based on the usage of connective ties such as pronouns, repetitive structures, contrast, and transitional elements. Sheng argues that these factors seem to be limited to sentence level connections that similar to cohesion establishment markers. Thus, he demonstrates that although cohesive ties seem to be part of what makes a text sounds coherent, they are not by themselves capable of creating a coherent text in terms of discourse-level
coherence. Obviously, he attempts to distinguish between two major views on coherence. The first one deals with the formal structure of a text, while the other interprets coherence as processes of the text production and meaning comprehension (Sanders & Noordman, 2000).

2.7 Reading and EFL Writing

Reading-writing relationship has been an issue of a great concern for many researchers since the 1980s (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1984; Carson 2001; Grabe 2001). Nevertheless, in 1993 - with the publication of Joan Carson and Ilona Leki’s book of reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives, L2 reading-writing studies were made known in a wider perspective (Hirvela, 2004:20). Since then, some language teachers started teaching reading and writing as integrated aspects of language, and a great deal of ESL/EFL researchers (Tsai, 2006:1) confirm that these two skills are closely related and should be taught together. For example, Hyland (2003:17) points out that research proves that L2 writing skills cannot be learned successfully by involving in writing alone, but should be supported by extensive reading. This shows that reading, whether assigned or voluntary, seems to have a positive impact on a learner’s composing strategies at numerous levels. At the post-secondary level, Carson and Leki (1993), for example, notice that reading in academic settings can be a solid basis for writing: learners’ ability to get involved in writing tasks is seemingly dependent on their ability to read and use authors' techniques in their own writing.

Broadly speaking, before focusing on reading-writing relations in L2 contexts, it would be useful to cast some light on reading-writing interconnections in L1 contexts. Certainly, it has been noticed that in the
1980s, researchers studied correlations between the students' reading and writing abilities, the roles of writer and reader in reading and writing. Stotsky (1983) , for instance, examined L1 correlational studies and concluded that (1) there are correlations between reading ability and writing ability,(2) there are correlations between writing quality and reading experience: better writers read more than incompetent writers, and (3) there appear to be correlation between reading ability and measures of syntactic complexity in writing, i.e. better readers seem to produce more syntactically acceptable writing compared to incompetent readers. In the 1990s there was also a huge body of research on these disciplines (i.e. reading and writing) in L1 contexts that encouraged researchers to discuss a variety of ways in which reading and writing can be related in writing situations (Grabe, 2001).

In L2 contexts, it was found that the emphasis on reading-writing connections was slow. That is to say, in the 1980s, L2 researchers thought that most L1 research findings can be applied to L2 learning contexts including writing, but with some relevant modifications. Yet, some L2 scholars (Silva & Carson, 1997) add that cultural and language differences among L2 learners can lead to difficulties that cannot be addressed by L1 research, among which are the following:

1. Differing senses of audience and writer.

2. Differing preferences for organizing texts.

3. Differing ways to use texts as learning resources.

4. Differing cultural socialization and belief systems.
5. Differing uses for writing.

Obviously, there are several complex ways in which the two skills are interrelated. What writers try to convey usually comes from the knowledge that they have gained from reading. As such, Hirvela (2004), for example, comments that “good writers are good readers” and “good readers are good writers.” This proves that exposure to texts via reading will lead to improvement of one's writing quality in terms of using the rhetorical techniques, cohesive elements and other features that rhetoricians usually use when composing texts.

One of the significant instances of reading-writing connections is obtainability of information. Indeed, to reinforce their viewpoint of reading-writing relations in academic settings, Carson and Leki (1993) indicate that academic writing normally needs to include materials from the source texts: such as statistics, ideas, quotations, paraphrases and so on. Learners who are thought to be good at reading will know how to deal effectively with the relevant information in the source texts aimed at transforming to their writing. Moreover, some researchers among them Belcher and Hirvela (2001) see that emphasis on meaning is vital, whether as readers or writers as it helps learners relate their previous knowledge to the current information in the text and thus, can produce more meaningful written texts. Another pro-advocate of a reading-based meaning is Flower (1996) who stresses that reading and writing are social phenomena. That is, learners should be motivated to take part genuinely in a true understanding of a text if they are to benefit from it. They should be familiarized with how to make and arrange their techniques to present the text more meaningful. In addition, they should be acquainted with the necessity of absorbing the
information found in the text in order to be used in their own writing. Through such ways, they could integrate their building knowledge (reading) with communicating one (writing).

What can be understood from these arguments is that knowledge (sources of information) is highly crucial. Even in terms of the current study, in the beginning I was very hesitant about how to conceptualize the key ideas of my study. Perhaps that phobia might have derived from a lack of background reading about the scope of my study. However, acting on my supervisor’s advice, I was able to overcome this problem by reading a fair amount of books, journals, articles and papers that are related to the area of my study. So, it is important to bear in mind that reading-writing relationship is apparently based on the understanding of relevant information, including information about the culture of the L2. This, no doubt, will enlighten writers on the rhetorical techniques of a certain linguistic community (Tao, 2006:78). Simply, exposure to various culture-based genres, would aid EFL writers to engage in a variety of writing samples through which similarities and differences that exist between their culture and others could be examined. In other words, EFL writers can evaluate their culture’s richness in writing and compare it to that of L2 context knowledge. In this context, Leki (1992:62) points out that “such reflection becomes a great basis of resources for writing”. Therefore, as noted earlier in (2.4), cultural information can be used as a background source to broaden the writer’s knowledge in L2 writing, and having not considered that, writers may face serious problems in L2 composing. Xin (2007:21), for example, notices that due to the culture differences and restricted knowledge of L2 system, L1 writing features, such as some local sayings and proverbs cannot
be transferred directly into L2 writing. Overall, knowing some culturally-embedded information about the topic through a process of reading is very vital and beneficial. This indicates that as Chen et al. (2006:18) say, culture is something that can be learned rather than inherited. Thus, writers can learn or understand some common values, beliefs and attitudes and use them in their writing.

Reading and writing are said will go hand in hand in terms of familiarization with the major organizational methods and rhetoric devices. Hirvela (p. 2) also thinks that exposure to texts through reading will probably lead to the understanding of those characteristics which form writing. These characteristics may include rhetorical techniques, cohesive ties and other means of writing that writers employ to interpret their ideas. Carr (1967) calls for the significance of the organizational aspects of a text that can stem from intensive and analytical reading and states that:

\[...] the teaching of composition has an affinity with the teaching of reading comprehension. Reading, too, is concerned with ideas and their relationships as expressed by their authors in paragraphs and essays... for most non-native speakers, these (organizational) patterns are alien, and until they have been taught these patterns, they will have difficulty with both reading comprehension and composition (P.31). Thus, it is quite fair to believe that reading can provide EFL writers with necessary rhetorical and structural models that will assist them in their writing. Relatively, it can be argued that Arabic speaking EFL writes while reading L2 texts, they may come across a variety of Western rhetorical features. For example, they will discover that in developing paragraphs, the main
idea is often placed in a topic sentence and that this sentence could come at the initial position, middle or end of the paragraph.

On the whole, there are numerous situations in which EFL writers can benefit from their reading knowledge. For example, exploring how different uses of L2 input stemming from reading influence on writing development, researchers use various terms. These include reading for writing, reading to write, reading while writing and writerly reading. All these terms reveal that, in most cases, reading proceeds writing. However, to provide a broad framework of the notion reading for writing, some researchers suggest the following viewpoints, all of which are cited in Hirvela (p.111):

1. The concept of reading for writing can be seen as an instance in which readers will use textual information they have acquired in their writing. Also, reading for writing can be considered as an outcome of what has been understood from the reading process (Carson, 1993:85).

2. In general, most researchers acknowledge that reading plays an important role in learning majoring composing methods (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1984:163).

3. Reading helps writers write rather than the other way around (Leki, 1992:468).

4. Writing instruction should begin with teaching reading. This assists student writers to become strategic writers (Kroll, 1993:75).

5. Probably the notion of reading for writing provides a strong foundation for gathering and analyzing information from what readers read (Smith, 1983:560).
Of course, these arguments may lead us to the notion of competence performance theory. In this theory, competence is said to refer to the knowledge that can be drawn when L2 learners engaging in reading, whereas performance is referred to the ability to utilize the knowledge obtained in competence, i.e. reading.

Researchers also examine reading-writing connections from three interrelated hypothetical notions which have been described as models (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). The first hypothesis is based on the idea that the reading-writing relationship is directional. In this model, reading and writing share structural elements in the sense that the structure of whatever is learned in one model can be applied in the other. For instance, gaining major rhetorical patterns such as comparison and contrast, or cause and effect in a reading text, would possibly enable the reader to employ these patterns in writing (Eisterhold, 1990). The essence of this model is that the transfer of structural information can take place in only one direction. Thus, it has been claimed that reading influences writing, but writing knowledge is not so essential in reading (ibid.).

According to Hirvela (2004:115), the direct model of reading for writing means learners will actively seek to gain knowledge about writing through reading. That is, they will know some rhetorical or organizational patterns in L2 writing learn linguistic aspects of writing and study lexical and analytical features of writing. To illustrate a little more in this respect, Hirvela uses an analogy (an image of miners digging out coal or some other valuable resource) for interpreting the process of reading with the aim of learning about writing. In other words, when miners get involved in the process of digging, they operate with a clear and direct aim in mind.
Likewise, learners using reading to obtain knowledge about writing will behave in the same way using their source texts for the input being targeted (ibid.). These remarks support the directional model in the manner that reading and writing are thought to share structural elements that can be learned in one domain and later can be applied in the other.

The second model is called the nondirectional model of reading for writing. In this interactive model, learners are not looking for a direct input which relates to writing. That is, obtaining this input might not be their main objective behind reading, since understanding of the source text(s) is automatically a major concern (Hirvela, p.129). Moreover, in this model, reading and writing are assumed to come from a single proficiency. That is, they are both part of a cognitive process of constructing meaning in the sense that learners learn to read and write by reading and writing (Cooper, 2003:342). The overall scenario in this model is that reading and writing are both considered as constructive processes, and improvement in one field would lead to improvement in the other. Seemingly, the difference between this model and the previous one is that in this model the transfer occurs in only one path: reading to writing or vice versa. However, in a directional model, it becomes clear that what is transferred from reading to writing or from writing to reading is thought to be a separate system or knowledge base, which is learned in one field and then, transferred to the other. In a nondirectional model, on the other hand, what is transferred is seen as a single underlying system or shared knowledge base (Eisterhold p.92).

The third model is about the bidirectional model in which reading and writing are considered as interactive as well as interdependent. Therefore, it has been stated that, “what is learned at one stage of the development can
be qualitatively different from what is learned at another stage of development” (Shanahan, 1990). This can mean that the two skills as components of general language knowledge proficiency, whatever thing is occurred in one will influence the other. Studies of Shanahan (1990) and Shanahan and Lomax (1986) examine various ideas that appear to provide strong support for the bidirectional model. They, for example, maintain that reading-writing studies need to account for the relationships between the two skills as a “constellation of interrelated processes that utilize a number of knowledge bases” (p.116). Based on this notion, it can be understood that there are various relations that are connected with the development of reading-writing relationship. To add more in this regard, Shanahan (1990) noticed in his research on grade two and five learners that reading and writing are apparently related for both grades. He further found that as students become more proficient, the nature of the reading-writing relationship changes. It appears that at any given point of development, reading and writing consist of both dependent and independent abilities (p.475). Later, both Shanahan and Lomax (1986) reached to a conclusion that the reading-writing model is superior to the writing-reading model, arguing that, in most cases, more reading information is needed in writing than vice versa. Again, this point supports the previous standpoints that reading influences writing more the opposite and acquisition of reading ability normally precedes acquisition of writing ability (see Shanahan and Lomax, 1986).

Pedagogically speaking, Xiaojing and John (2002:5) acknowledge that there are advantages and disadvantages which are related to reading-writing integration in a process-oriented approach. As for the former, they
point out that through integration, instructors will teach more effectively by getting involved in reading and writing simultaneously. Likewise, learners will write more sufficiently in a genuine context. In other words, focusing on interesting topics in reading texts, they will be encouraged to write; that is, the writing task will appear to be conceptualized and suitable for real life circumstances based on its relationship with reliable sources. In this manner, instructors and learners alike will perceive writing not only as a mere way for examining English skills, but also as a tool by which to meet the need for genuine communication. Moreover, through reading comprehension teaching, learners are assumed to widen their capacity to use reading texts and consider them as background information for their writing. Moving from reading to writing, they put a great emphasis not only on meaning, but also on the relationship between form and content by investigating the discourse structure and organization that they may manipulate later in their writing. This indicates that the reading techniques they learned previously in reading will turn to be part of their writing techniques later on.

Luo (2005:67-8) suggests that teaching English writing through reading, there are four advantages. First, it encourages learning in a real-life communicative context. That is, during the reading process, learners are asked to get involved in techniques of drafting, and editing as a result of which they are motivated to reveal their ideas about the text they have read. Secondly, it provides learners with interesting and encouraging issues of the L2 as well as the cultural perspectives. Thirdly, it helps learners participate in active reading and writing. In other words, active reading is thought could lead to the discussion of the information given by the
author/writer. Finally, it improves the learners’ reading and writing abilities as both skills depend on textual communication in terms of conveying opinions.

As for the disadvantages of reading-writing integration in a process-oriented approach, Xiaojing and John (ibid.) think that one of the leading disadvantages lies in the fact that integrating reading and writing will make teachers devote the bulk of their time and attention to planning to a new method, dealing with reading-writing processes and discussing with learners. As such, the approach seems to be quite time-consuming and uninspired.

Whatever the pros or antis concerning reading-writing integration, it is fair to argue that each one provides a valuable view on how to deal with reading-writing relations. Therefore, TEFL teachers, especially at college level, should integrate reading and writing in order to help EFL writers improve their writing ability. This is because, lack of an explicit knowledge about a certain topic as well as processes of presenting information would likely hinder learners to produce a good written text in English. Thus, EFL writers need to be motivated that extensive EFL reading creates good writers in terms of understanding major composing techniques along with other aspects of the language. Overall, a great emphasis should be placed on dealing with reading and writing as interrelated skills, rather than isolated matters, because that, as noted earlier, would aid EFL writers to compose more accurately and fluently.
2.8 Summary

This chapter explains the theoretical framework of the study in terms of presenting the key concepts of the study. Primarily, the chapter reviews the nature of EFL writing as well as four major approaches to EFL writing teaching: the cognitive approach, the social approach, the genre approach and the communicative approach respectively. The second part of the chapter investigates the concept of contrastive rhetoric including Arabic rhetoric. The third part, examines both cohesion and coherence aspects in relation to EFL writing. The final part of the chapter explores the relationship between reading and EFL writing in terms of rhetorical techniques improvement.
Chapter Three

Review of Literature

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review and evaluate widely and critically the previous relevant literature on EFL/ESL writing studies. Thus, the chapter will discuss some researchers’ diligent efforts made from across the world to investigate L2 writing pivotal perceptions. In line with this, the chapter will be divided into six sections: non-culture-specific EFL/ESL writing studies, contrastive rhetoric studies, cohesion studies, coherence studies, reading–writing relationship studies, and EFL/ESL writing teaching studies.

3.2 Non-Culture-specific EFL/ESL Writing Studies

Over the last two decades, there has been considerable literature on non-culture-based studies that examines problems EFL/ESL writers encounter in English writing. In fact, it is believed that this type of literature seems to put a premium on basic language skills problems in addition to writing skills problems, which will be discussed broadly in 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 respectively.

To begin with the Sudanese context, Arabi (2004) examined the correlation between lexical competence of some EFL Sudanese university students and their writing quality in English. The research materials were gathered through two instruments: vocabulary test and EFL writing test. Both tests were carried out among the students (second & third year) of the English Department at the Faculty of Education, University of al-Fashir. The
results of the study showed that although the overall performance of the participants on both tests appeared to be poor, lexically competent students have produced quality texts. The results also indicated that learning only individual words would not lead to the improvement of the students’ EFL writing performance. Rather, other aspects of the language should be taken into account if the written work is to be more effective and meaningful.

Commenting on Arabi’s (2004) study, it can be argued that as vocabulary knowledge is one of the important factors of reading comprehension, it can also enhance one’s writing proficiency. Yet, knowing only a list of words does not always guarantee a production of an effective piece of writing. That is, EFL writers should be aware of the context in which these words can be used. Quality writing, in many cases, involves a set of parameters such as ability to use words adequately, logical flow of ideas, voice, style, among others. Moreover, one cannot think of vocabulary as a single entity, on the contrary, there are different genres of vocabularies. For example, history department students may find it difficult to use medical or engineering-based vocabulary in their written communications as they are likely familiar with words of their own field, and the same thing can be said of other disciplines. Shawna (2000), for instance, suggests that writers must be able to spontaneously recall words that are known not only by sight, but that are understood well enough in order to be used correctly in writing. Based on these observations, it would be interesting if Arabi’s (2004) research is limited to a specific type of vocabulary and its impact on EFL learners’ writing quality in a particular field, rather than discussing the matter (i.e. vocabulary) in a more general perspective.
Abdalla (2005) set out to evaluate the Sudanese post-graduate research on the EFL writing problems that carried out in the 1990s. The primary aim of his research is to see whether or not those studies have adequately handled the learners’ English writing difficulties. In order to elicit data, he selected post-graduate dissertations conducted at the University of Khartoum: five M.A. theses and one a Ph.D. dissertation. Abdalla’s paper showed that most of the Sudanese EFL writing studies conducted in the 1990s seemed to be much concerned with the examination of sentence level aspects, especially grammatical and mechanical ones. The paper also concluded that there were many weaknesses in those studies in the sense that their respective researchers claimed to address students’ writing problems in English, but they seemingly put their focus on grammatical and mechanical problems, which, as he thinks, have nothing to do with the students’ written discourse proficiency.

With regard to Abdalla’s (2005) viewpoints, it can be argued that in the 1980s and early 1990s, EFL/ESL academic writing research among most Sudanese L2 researchers (perhaps other researchers) was overshadowed by the language aspects, especially sentence level features. Apparently, before shifting to a more holistic perspective of L2 writing issues, these researchers would have thought to deal with grammatical and mechanical errors since they seemed to be the most prevailing stumbling block of the Sudanese EFL learners. Furthermore, it can also be added that there were and still are quite a number of Sudanese EFL learners who could not produce grammatically correct English sentences. It would, therefore, be fair to say that these researchers were not to blame for their overemphasis on a sentence’s elements, rather it would have been more acceptable if Abdalla’s
(2005) paper had attempted to investigate the effectiveness of those studies in terms of overcoming Sudanese EFL learners’ writing problems.

Likewise, Bataineh (2005) attempted to find out the Jordanian undergraduate EFL students’ errors in the use of the definite article in their written compositions. The subjects of his study were all students of English language at Yarmouk University (Irbid, Jordan) in the second semester of the academic year 2003/2004. In other words, a total of two hundred and nine male and female students, most of them were between eighteen and twenty three years of age, were targeted for the study. According to the findings of the study, nine categories of errors were found. The errors include: (1) deletion of the indefinite article, (2) writing “a” as part of the noun/adjective following it, (3) substitution of the indefinite for the definite article, (4) substitution of the definite for the indefinite article, (5) substitution of “a” for “an”, (6) use of the indefinite article with unmarked plurals, (7) use of the indefinite article with marked plurals, (8) use of the indefinite article with uncountable nouns, and (9) use of the indefinite article with adjectives. The results revealed that all these errors, except (1), were not influenced by the subjects’ native language, i.e. Arabic. In Bataineh’s view, developmental factors and common learning strategies such as simplification and overgeneralization were believed to be the major causes of the target learners’ writing errors.

Generally speaking, although Bataineh’s study suggests a considerable number of important results, the researcher disagrees with him in the exclusion of developmental factors and overgeneralization from being affected by Arabic interference. Thus, as the current research will explore such matters in detail in 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 respectively, to the best of the
researcher’s knowledge, such problems could be attributed to L2 learners’ mother tongue background influence.

Shokrpour and Fallahzadeh (2007) attempted to investigate the major defects in EFL writing skills of medical students at Shiraz University, Iran. The main objective of their study is to identify whether language aspects or writing aspects are the major difficulty areas that fifth year medical students and interns confront in their English writing. Based on systematic sampling method, the two researchers examined one hundred and one notes written by the students and interns in pediatric and internal wards of a teaching hospital of the University. The written notes were tested from the point of view of language aspects including spelling, grammar, syntax, and vocabulary; and writing aspects including punctuation, cohesive devices, coherence, and organization. However, because of the scope of this section, the writing aspects will be discussed in 3.4, 3.5, and 4.3 respectively. The results of their study indicated that Iranian medical students seemed to have problems both in language and writing skills. Yet, it was found that grammar and punctuation were assumed to be the most problematic areas, whereas the use of vocabulary was better as opposed to the use of the other elements. The researchers attribute this to the fact that the medical students possess a considerable knowledge of technical terms. Nevertheless, despite this privilege, the students’ written work showed that in the use of general vocabulary, they faced more difficulties. Of course, this will lend support to my aforementioned observations about Arabi’s (2004) assumption of relating vocabulary knowledge to EFL learners’ writing proficiency without distinguishing a particular category of learners and vocabulary. Moreover, their findings also showed that the mean differences
of the problems in each element were much close to each other, interpreting that the subjects of the study faced problems in all elements. With regard to the findings of the interview with the subjects, it was realized that they seemed to have very little time for writing courses, mainly writing in English. This is because, as the interviewees claim, it would be useful not to waste their precious time on English language and EFL writing lectures. In addition, their classes are not carried out in English besides their written tests and assignments are done in the native language. Finally, apart from their awareness of medical vocabulary, they lack sufficient background of general vocabulary which makes them not write adequately.

To overcome their subjects’ EFL writing problems, the two researchers came up with some suggestions. First, since the language teaching techniques have been shifted toward discoursal factors of the language, writing instructors need to alter their one-way focus. That is, discoursal aspects of writing should be emphasized in their writing lectures. Second, they contend that the bodies of curriculum designers have to plan the medical courses in the sense that the preliminary year university students should be exposed to English language, especially to EFL writing courses prior to the commencement of their specialized courses.

In generally, it can be argued that this research tends to tackle the major problems that Iranian University (medicine) students face when engaged in EFL writing. Nevertheless, their findings were only drawn from written notes, which might fail to cover the major problems that most medical students or practitioners encounter in EFL writing. Moreover, it can be noticed that the subjects of the study lack motivation to learn English or attend EFL writing classes, i.e. when they were asked about English courses,
they seemed to ignore them due to time constraints. Indeed, this is not an excuse to justify their deliberate negligence of the English classes as EFL writing will be linked to their future career as future doctors. In other words, dealing with patients verbally is not enough, because their medical knowledge needs to be explained in written English in most cases. Therefore, in such situations, before discussing the communicative skills (language & writing skills) their study’s subjects need some sort of encouragement to take part in English classes and, as a result, more time may be given to EFL writing issues.

Hsu (2007) studied the use of English lexical collocations and their relation to the online writing of sixty two Taiwanese college English majors and non-English majors at the University of Science and Technology in south Taiwan. Hsu’s materials for data collection were written tests. That is, the subjects were asked to write a 45-minute online English writing test examined by the web-based writing programme, Criterion Version 7.1 (Educational Test Service) to identify the subjects’ utilization of lexical collocation (i.e. frequency and variety). In addition, the test was also meant to show writing score of the two student groups. Then, findings were investigated to answer two principal questions for correlation: (a) between the subjects’ frequency of lexical collocations and their writing scores and (b) between the subjects’ variety of lexical and their writing scores. The findings of the study revealed that: (1) there seems to be a significant correlation between Taiwanese college EFL students’ frequency of lexical collocations and their online writing scores; and (2) there also seems to be a significant correlation between the subjects’ variety of lexical collocations and their online writing scores.
Seemingly, this research addresses a very important area in EFL/ESL discipline: computer-mediated communication, namely web-based writing programs. In short, besides its positive indicators such as rhetorical knowledge, critical thinking, vocabulary, among others, it has some negative aspects such as its overemphasis on product, its ineffectiveness in identifying hidden semantic relations at sentence level, and misleading techniques for fooling the scoring criterion (Warschaur & Ware, 2006).

Abdl-Latif (2008) examined the influence of linguistic knowledge, writing effect and writing quality on three text length-aspects: text quantity, number of sentences written, and words per sentence. The participants of the study were 57 fourth year English department students at the Faculty of Education, al-Azhar University in Egypt. The three text length-aspects found in the participants’ essays were compared to their grades on five scales evaluating their grammar and vocabulary awareness, writing apprehension and self-efficacy, and to their analytic writing quality scores. The findings of the correlational analysis revealed that linguistic knowledge and writing proficiency play an important role in text quantity. Further, the results showed that the subjects used various strategies to deal with the text quantity in their essays.

It is obvious that Abdel-Latif’s (2008) study attempts to explore the relationship between writing quality and the quantity of the written text. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, writing quality is a multidimensional phenomenon which goes beyond number of words or sentences used. Therefore, this would suggest that EFL learners may have length aspects, but still experience a considerable number of problems in the ways of using these aspects, especially the knowledge of correct grammatical rules, proper
punctuation, flow of thoughts, spelling and so on. These factors would lead us to say that not all quantitative essays look to be quality essays; on the contrary, some short essays (or even paragraphs) remain good and meaningful. Thus, it is misleading to believe that, for instance, wordy essays seem to be quality essays.

3.3 Contrastive Rhetoric and EFL/ESL Writing Studies

As noted earlier in Chapter two, section (2.4) that CR is generally based on Kaplan’s (1966) notion that culture-bound thought-patterns (including socio-cultural aspects) influence one’s writing behavior. This section will focus on some perceptions of EFL/ESL writing studies in view of rhetorical differences across two cultures and languages, all of which hinder effective written communication in L2.

In this regard, Petri (2007) reported the writing experiences of students studying at English-medium post-graduate university in a non-English country in Central Europe. The participants of his study were five Master’s students who differ in terms of cultural and language backgrounds: two from Poland, one each from Czech Republic, Serbia, and Kazakhstan. Data were drawn from a semi-structured interview with each participant. Interview items included participants’ histories in their L1 and other languages, writing instruction they received in any language, the role of writing in their previous and current studies, the problems they face, and their opinions of the differences between writing academically in English and their L1. The findings of the study indicated that the participants encountered three types of differences: language and rhetorical differences, differences between the educational systems, and disciplinary differences. As for the first one, the participants emphasized the influence of their L1
rhetorical patterns in the fluency and speed of their writing in English. Thus, it seems that their previous writing background does not only make their English writing insufficient, but also affect their ability to convey their writing objectives. As for the second, it was found that the participants relate their writing problems to the differences between the educational systems their previous and current universities used to adopt. Interestingly, although the participants come from different linguistic backgrounds, a common agreement is that at the universities in their countries of origin, less attention is devoted to written assignments, writing instruction, and feedback practices. Finally, the findings also revealed that disciplinary differences affect participants’ writing proficiency, especially when moving from a ‘hard’ science background to a different discipline or embarking on interdisciplinary studies (Perti, 2007).

Chien (2007) conducted research on the role of Taiwanese EFL learners’ rhetorical strategy use in relation to their achievement in English writing. The subjects of the study were chosen randomly from ten universities in Taiwan. They were second and third year students (n=116 in total) majoring in English composition. Therefore, the data collection was based on the analysis of English expository texts written by forty high-and low-achieving students. In this study, the term high-achieving students in EFL writing stands for the average two students based on multiple scores in English writing scored by university instructors who deal with the English composition courses. On the other hand, the term low-achieving students pertains to the average bottom two students. To analyze the English discourse organization, Chien applied Kaplan’s (1966) idea of location of the opinion-strategy sentence: whether the participants chose to write their
essays in a “direct” or in an “indirect” way. Furthermore, macro-level rhetorical techniques (deduction & induction) as well as the presence of a conclusion at the end of the essay were taken into account. The findings showed that of the forty written samples evaluated, irrespective of whether they were high-achieving or low-achieving students, most of them used the deductive rhetorical pattern. In other words, they stated the thesis statement at the beginning rather than the middle or final position, apart from two high-achieving students who placed it in the middle and final positions.

Upon examining the overall organizational patterns, it was seen that thirty three students (82.5% - 15 high-achievers and 18 low-achievers) adopted comparison-based deduction, explanation-based deduction and comparison-based induction. Generally, it was noticed that most participants (95%) of the study stated their positions in the beginning and used the deductive pattern in English writing. Thus, this study’s findings do not tend to be congruent with the perception that Chinese writers prefer the inductive pattern (Connor, 1966). Moreover, with regard to the distinction between the high-achievers and low-achievers, the findings also revealed that the inductive style may not necessarily fall to comply with the rhetorical patterns as contended by Kaplan (1988), that native English speakers (NES) tend to put their theme at the beginning of their writing. Chien attributes his participants’ initial location of central ideas to the fact that they were probably influenced by the Western writing strategy. In addition, their interviews indicated that they employed their learned knowledge appropriately by placing the main ideas initially. Therefore, it can be argued that Taiwanese EFL writers may not encounter serious problems
in using deductive pattern, especially when they are acquainted with English writing techniques as well as different L2 writing models.

Prescott (2007) carried out a small scale exploratory study aimed at finding out the organizational strategies in the writing of entry-level university students at Eotvos Lorand University in Budapest. The subjects of the study were nine females and three males, who had graduated from Hungarian secondary schools in 2004 and had secured admission to be enrolled in the English Department on the basis of a written entrance test. Accordingly, they were asked to write a set of twelve short essays which were done in the class in the third week of semester prior to any formal instruction had commenced. In Prescott’s view, such a step is necessary as it shows that the participants’ essays can be understood as an indication of their pre-university proficiency.

Applying a descriptive method of data analysis evaluation, the results indicated some interesting differences in the manner Hungarian preliminary year university students organize their writing in English. Most importantly, problems in the area of paragraphing were evident, particularly missing topic sentences as well as inappropriate logical sequence. In addition, they appeared to find it difficult to produce meaningful introductions and conclusions when they are asked to write more advanced academic papers. One of the results is that most of the participants seemed to be unfamiliar with the writing techniques of comparison, contrast and argumentative structures, as a result of which they could not organize their English writing in a more coherent way.

Prescott’s a small-scale study although looks to have yielded some interesting findings of EFL text organization problems, its scope is very
limited. That is to say, a 12-student case study as if represents first year Hungarian university learners. Relatively, such a study, regardless of its significance, the authenticity of its results will be questioned, mainly in terms of validity and reliability. Most importantly, Prescott’s study does not provide any examples of comparison or difference between the Hungarian writing and English writing to justify that in what way the former influences the latter.

By contrast, Yang (2008) reported on the rhetorical organization of Chinese and American students’ expository essays. That is, to what extent Chinese university students’ writing differs from that of their American counterparts. Data were gathered from a total of two hundred expository essays written by fifty American university students in English, fifty Chinese university students in Chinese and one hundred beginning and advanced English learners in English. Accordingly, all the participants (i.e. Americans & Chinese) were asked to write an essay on the same topic entitled “the impact of individualism on society”. Each essay was analyzed in terms of the placement of the thesis statement and the use of topic sentences. To maintain objectivity, two independent coders took part to establish inter-code reliability which was about (91%) in the topic sentences, and about (95%) in terms of the judgments. The results of the study concluded that Chinese students like their American counterparts, incline toward directness in text and paragraph organization, but they are significantly less direct as opposed to the American students.

In this study, it seems clear that the gap between the American students’ writing strategies and of their Chinese counterparts is not so wide, i.e. the latter group has benefited well from the importance of being aware
of differences between L1 and L2 writing systems. To add more, Yang (2008) contends that although Kaplan suggests that essays written in “Oriental Languages” (Chinese, Korean) are characterized by indirect organization, but deductive and linear rhetorical styles were found in the expository texts written by ancient Chinese rhetoricians. Thus, Yang’s study leads us to say that despite the fact that rhetorical techniques across cultures and languages tend to be different, sometimes the possibility of rhetorical similarities might be thought as shown in this study. Another interpretation that can be added in this respect is that contemporary Chinese rhetoricians might have realized the effectiveness of English rhetorical strategies, and then tend to encourage Westernization of their writing system (even in L1) for the sake of apparently a meaningful mode of English/American writing rather than their beating around the bush, i.e. Chinese circular pattern of writing.

In a similar attempt, Wang (2008) explored the thesis writing experiences of a small group of overseas post-graduate research students at the University of Canberra in Australia. The purpose of his study is to find out the problems these learners face in their theses writing styles, which can be attributed to variations in cultural backgrounds and academic values they bring. The subjects of study include eight Ph.D. students, two Professional Doctorate students and one Master by research student. They are also from six countries: Thailand, China, Malaysia, India, Maldives and Bahrain. Data for this study was collected from a 40-60 minute semi-structured face-to-face interview, which is mainly based on similarities and differences between L1 and L2 writing systems. The study revealed a number of findings. For example, despite all the subjects were eligible for English
language standards for entering the university, they exhibited a sense of inappropriateness in terms of writing a thesis in English as a foreign language. That is, they lack confidence in using English to convey their ideas clearly and accurately. However, the study indicated those students who use English as a second language in their home countries (Malaysia and India), or received their undergraduate degrees with English as a medium of instruction, showed more confidence in English writing than other subjects: EFL learners

Another important result is that all the subjects have complained about the impact of their cultural backgrounds on the thesis writing process. For instance, the Thai students argue that they were asked by their supervisors to “put the conclusion first and then give reasons after that”, which is absolutely against English writing style. As for the Bahraini student, for instance, he/she contends that a linear rhetorical structure in English writing in which one’s central idea being placed straightforwardly appears to be less necessary in the Arabic culture.

On the whole, Wang’s (2008) study highlights the importance of being familiar with writing strategies, especially when the matter has to do with a thesis writing in English. Despite its importance, it looks to be rather limited research including only eleven subjects at one university. Thus, since the subject matter is concerned with the challenges that international research students face in English writing due to L1 background influence, a larger scale analysis of written texts is needed, because it is difficult to draw a conclusion of EFL writing problems from such a small study.

In another study, Bennui (2008) analyzed and described elements of L1 on paragraph writing by twenty eight third-year English-minor students
who registered in the basic writing course in the 2006 semester 1 at Thaksin University, Thailand. The subjects aged twenty to twenty two, and all had learned English as a foreign language for more than ten years. To elicit information for his study, the researcher used two main instruments: the researcher’s profile of the basic writing course and samples of the twenty eight students’ paragraph writing. The samples were analyzed according to three factors: first, the impact of L1 syntactic interference on the basis of Thai grammatical aspects at word, phrase, clause and sentence levels affecting the learners’ English sentences. Second, the influence of L1 lexical interference, which undermines the learners’ English words choice. Last, the analysis of L1 discourse interference in the sense of Thai stylistic and rhetorical features of paragraph writing affecting the learners’ English paragraph.

More precisely, Bennui’s research data analysis is based on the L1 interference concept in relation to four major approaches: Contrastive Rhetoric (CR), Contrastive Analysis (CA), Error Analysis (EA), and Interlanguage Analysis (IA). The findings from the data analysis indicated that in terms of CR, the relevance on Thai writing behavior, namely incomplete rhetorical styles and redundancy cases, indicated the subjects’ tendency for using their L1 writing techniques to produce their English writing. As far as CA is concerned, there was a literal translation of vocabulary use in the Thai students’ written English because of their mishandling of semantic systems of Thai and English words. In fact, it was found that the students tend to directly translate Thai words into English without knowing the different systems of word component and usage. Moreover, the presence of word order of Thai structure in the students’
English sentences is due to a limited knowledge of similarities and differences between the two languages’ grammatical structure. As for EA, the findings showed that the subjects’ English sentences were characterized by overgeneralization errors. Moreover, simplification errors were found in the subjects’ sentences: because they had used, for instance, Thai prepositions such as in “I stay with home” and in “I smiled with my new friends”. In the case of IA, their written English witnessed some relevance to features of interlanguage patterns. That is to say, the subjects tried to borrow some Thai words (e.g. tuk-tuk) when writing in English, which can be seen as a violation of English writing conventions.

Suarez‐Tejerin and Moreno (2008) set out to research on an English‐Spanish cross‐linguistic study of the rhetorical structure of book reviews (BRs): twenty BRs of literature in each language. Simply, their research attempts to examine the nature of possible influence of writing culture on the rhetorical structure of literary academic book reviews. In order to identify the rhetorical styles of textual organization used by English and Spanish academic book review writers, all the book reviews in the two corpora were analyzed on the basis of moves, subfunction and options. In their research, the moves are attained by inferring the rhetorical function specified by the different parts in the whole text in relation to the overall purpose of the text. On the other hand, in terms of subfunctions and options, Moreno (2004) suggests that the former is regarded as non‐exclusive, whereas the latter is regarded as exclusive.

The results of their research revealed that, in despite of sharing overall patterns of organization, the Spanish book reviewers were more likely to follow the descriptive moves of the book review. Further, the
statistical analysis of the findings indicated that Spanish book review writers appeared to be more sympathetic in their assessment as opposed to English writers. According to the two researchers, these differences can be referred to the rhetorical preferences of the two communities’ cultures in terms of book review writing, which may indicate variation in cultural expectations of this register.

In their study, Zare-EE and Farvardin (2009) focused on the linguistic and rhetorical patterns of L1 and L2 writing samples of Iranian EFL students. A total of thirty students majoring in English Translation at the University of Kashan, Iran took part in this study. They were nine males and twenty one females, aged from nineteen to twenty two years old. In terms of data collection procedures, the subjects were asked to write a composition in two parts. In the first part, fifteen students were asked to write Persian compositions while the rest were asked to write English compositions. In the second part, those who had written in Persian in the first part wrote in English and those who had written in English in the first part wrote in Persian on the same topic. The researchers attribute the use of the same topic for L1 and L2 to the fact that different topics could affect writing quality. The ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs, et al. 1981) was used to evaluate students’ both L1 and L2 writing performance based on five parameters: content, organization, sentence construction, voice, and mechanics. The results concluded that (a) there was a minor positive correlation between Persian and English writing total scores, (b) compositions written in Persian seemed to be significantly longer than those written in English, (c) Persian writing compositions were more complex than English writing ones on the basis of T-units , (d) T-units in compositions
written in Persian exceeded those written in English, and (e) the number of spelling errors in English writing samples found to be higher than those of Persian writing samples.

In general, their study indicates that apart from rhetorical differences, there are some similarities between L1 and L2 writing processes. It seems that the two researchers share views with those (e.g. Hirose, 2003; Kamimura, 2001) who think there is a significant positive rhetorical relationship between L1 and L2 writing. Overall, in despite of the fact that L1/L2 writing issues look to be controversial due to numerous approaches to L1/L2 writing, one would tend to favor strongly a view that suggested by some researchers (e.g. Hinkel, 2004; McCarthy et al., 2005; Silva, 1993) that L1 writing techniques appear to be greatly different from those of L2 writing techniques. Therefore, in many cases, L2 writers may not be able to meet the required standards of proper English writing.

### 3.4 Cohesion and EFL/ESL Writing Studies

In chapter two, section 2.5 EFL writing concepts have been highlighted in relation to cohesion in English, in particular the role of different categories of cohesive devices in the development of writing. Thus, the following studies will review in what way some researchers did examine the relationship between cohesive ties and overall meaning of a written text.

Mojica (2006), using Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) notion of repetition and Liu’s(2000) idea of reiteration, examined the most preferred types of lexical cohesion used by thirty ESL graduate students of advanced academic writing courses in English. The subjects were from De La Salle University, Manila, divided into two groups: Group A (the multidisciplinary group) and
Group B (the English group). Liu’s (2000) list of cohesive lexical devices which have been investigated in this study include: repetition, synonyms, antonyms, superordinary/hyponyms, related words, and text structure. The results of their study showed that repetition is the most frequently used sort of lexical cohesion by both groups sampled. The subjects also continuously used related words such as situational synonyms, situational antonyms, lexical items with superordinary/hyponym connections, and text structure words. More specially, it was noticed that about 60% of repeated lexical items had a similar type of occurrence. Further, holistic evaluations indicated that more than 50% of the subjects’ papers received an average rating in overall lexical cohesion.

Broadly speaking, the results of Mojica’s (2006) study can be considered of a great value in improving both EFL/ESL learners’ writing and reading skills. Therefore, English departments should pay much attention to the ways of enabling EFL students to overcome lexical cohesion problems in their English writing.

By the same token, Olateju (2006) investigated the extent to which ESL (English as a second language) learners can be able to attain cohesion in their written texts through examining the cohesive devices used by the learners during continuous writing sessions. The data of the study was gathered from seventy final year students of Ooni Girls High School in Osun State, Nigeria. The researcher chose this sample of students because he thinks that as they are final year students, it is assumed that they have been exposed predominately to English syntax for a considerable number of years and thus, he decided to examine cohesion in their written assignments.
The results of the study proved that although the subjects’ written tasks indicated some evidence of a perfect application of some cohesive devices given by Halliday and Hassan (1989), some of them found it difficult to use cohesive devices appropriately. Accordingly, the raters spent a lot of time in understanding the subjects’ written texts. Olateju attributes the subjects’ difficulty in using cohesive devices to Nigerian pidgin influence: of all Nigerian English varieties, pidgin appears to be the one that negatively influences the acquisition of both perfect spoken and written English in Nigeria. As an addendum to Olateju’s argument, one (from my own experience in Nigeria) can add that the peculiarity of the Nigerian English is very obvious, especially in their spoken style, which is influenced by a series of indigenous languages such as Yoruba, Ibo, Hausa, Fulani, etc. Therefore, it is reasonable to say that Nigerian ESL learners may use rhetorical styles that tend to be more Nigerian rather than meeting the general rhetorical techniques of English writing.

Chen (2006) also explored the use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL students. The major hypothesis of his study is that the Taiwanese EFL learners tend to overuse conjunctive adverbials in their essay writing. Upon using quantitative and qualitative analyses, the findings of the study indicated that student writers were found to slightly overuse connectors when the analysis was conducted at the word-level. Additionally, the qualitative analysis also revealed many challenges, for instance, it was found that many students used “besides” as an additive conjunctive adverbial, which is more likely suitable for oral communications. Another important finding is that the students used connectives to link a number of sentences together without having any
logicality. Furthermore, some students expressed their conclusions without giving evidence or enough information for the reader to understand the intended goal.

Jalilifar (2008) carried out research on the investigation of discourse markers in descriptive essays of ninety Iranian EFL learners (30 junior, 30 senior, and 30 M.A. students) who were chosen from two Iranian universities. The reason behind selecting descriptive essays, according to the researcher, is that the subjects are more familiar with such a type of writing: as a common task in their writing classes. The results of the study indicated that the use of discourse markers (DMs) was clear in enhancing the subjects’ writing quality because the subjects in the graduate group outperformed successfully. That is, they were competent in generating various forms of discourse markers, developing the topic sentences, and supporting the central idea in terms of discourse markers.

Another important result of the study is the statistically significant relationship between the quality of the compositions and number of effectively used DMs in the compositions. Also, it was found that some DMs types seemed to have a profound impact on the quality of the written texts. In particular, it was noticed that there were statistically significant differences between the texts in the use of DMs types in the three groups. For example, elaborative markers were the most frequently used DMs by all the three groups, interpreting the importance of this type of DMs. Moreover, it was observed that there were a wide range of DMs within good texts and repetition of the same markers in the poor texts.

What can be said of this study is that texts that have a considerable number of DMs are labeled as more cohesive, despite the fact that DMs are
not the only aspects that make a text looks cohesive. What is necessary is how to use these DMs effectively in one’s written text, and this leads one to argue that awareness and L2 writing experience are important factors in reaping the proper use of DMs.

Another study in line with the above studies is that of Ouk (2009). He attempted to examine cohesive devices and topical structure analysis of editorializing paragraphs in Cambodian newspapers that are written by Cambodian and American writers. The results of topic structure analysis, i.e. coherence, will be discussed in 3.5 below. The materials used for data elicitation were forty paragraphs drawn from twenty newspaper editorials, ten newspapers from The Cambodia Daily and ten newspapers from Phnom Penh Post. Of these paragraphs, twenty were written by American writers and the rest were written by Cambodian writers. To analyze the data, the researcher read the forty paragraphs and then identified the cohesive devices based on the categorization of Connor (1966) and the cohesive devices suggested by Halliday and Hassan (1976), which include reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion, and conjunctions.

The results showed that there were not many cohesive devices found in newspaper editorials opposed to many cohesive devices found in academic writings such as textbooks, journals, research papers. This difference can be attributed to variations in registers of writing. The cohesive devices used by the writers are reference, substitution, conjunction and transition words. The ellipsis and lexical cohesion were not realized in the corpora. As for the reference, it has likely been used more than the other cohesive devices in the forty paragraphs. However, it was found that Cambodian writers used slightly less number and percentage (63.63%) of the
reference cohesive devices when compared to the American writers (72.72%). Thus, this suggests that there are no significant differences in terms of reference cohesive devices between the two group writers. Nevertheless, some differences were noticed between the texts or articles written by the American and the Cambodian writers, mainly with regard to conjunction, substitution and transition words.

3.5 Coherence and EFL/ESL Writing Studies

One of the important issues in the investigation of EFL/ESL writers’ problems is the matter of absence of explicit semantic relations in their written communication. Accordingly, there are various arguments and explanations for this problem, and this section will review some of these explanations.

Yashi and Rinnert (2001) investigated discourse level revising skills among three groups of Japanese EFL writers and the relationship between these skills and the two aspects of English competence and writing background. The two researchers are mainly concerned with EFL writers’ ability to deal with coherence problems at three discourse Levels: intersentential, paragraph, and essay. They define coherence in terms of logical consistency of ideas at any given discourse level, including cohesion characterized by grammatical/semantic relations (Halliday & Hassan, 1976). The participants (N=53) of their study were categorized according to their educational level and the amount of L2 writing experience. That is, undergraduates with no writing instruction, undergraduates with one year of English writing instruction and the graduate students. The essays revised by the participants, were modified by the raters to include a certain number of coherence problems. The reason for this, as the two researchers argue, is
to enable them to identify specific elements, including topic and types of revision difficulties, and compare the three groups on the basis of their revision equally.

The results of a three-way multifactorial of variance (MANOVA) of the participants’ final scores revealed significant effects of all three factors: group, level (intersentential, paragraph & essay) and component (detection vs. correction). In other words, the results showed that at the essay level, group two outperformed group one, whereas group three outperformed the other groups, especially at the sentential level. The results also indicated that despite writing instruction was not a major variable of their study, EFL writers could learn to improve essay level coherence through instruction followed by the experience of writing.

Wang and Sui (2006) conducted research on the investigation of the use of decomposition in Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) to examine textual coherence. The main objective of this research is to measure the textual coherence by using LSA in seventy Chinese English majors’ English writings at Dalian University of Technology in China. Sui attributes targeting of English majors to the fact that they may make fewer grammatical mistakes in their English writing indicating that their major problems in EFL writing may stem from lack of cohesion and coherence. To elicit information for the research, the subjects were asked to write an English composition of 300 words on a given topic from an IELTS written examination. The subjects’ written compositions were analyzed both at the micro-level coherence and the macro-level coherence. The results at the former level explained that the way in which the subjects used the words is quite different from the way native speakers normally use. This shows that different thinking patterns
and cultural backgrounds seem to be behind this variation. Most importantly, it was found that most of the subjects tend to transfer meaning of their native words to the English language words. For example, they translated their Chinese characteristic “verb + object” structure into English. In short, although many cohesive elements were usually used in the subjects’ compositions, discontinuity of coherence was realized.

On the other hand, at the macro-level coherence, the results revealed that the subjects had experienced difficulty in establishing clarity of thought, and that they were incompetent in organizing the meaning of the sentences logically. Other practical results of Sui’s research are that: first, EFL learners should be made aware of employing clear ways of thinking and perfect cohesive ties on which coherence is established. Second, EFL learners should be provided with model texts to analyze and focus on the writer’s choice of words, such as connectives, personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, adjectives, etc. In so doing, EFL learners can learn the various logical and linguistic ties between sentences as well as the writers’ organization of ideas. Last, different analytical thinking patterns between English and L1 can also have a great impact on EFL learners’ English writing. To achieve this, it is recommended to raise learners’ awareness of analytical thinking in relation to cultural differences.

Likewise, ALmaden (2006) conducted research on the topical progression in paragraphs written by Filipino ESL students in De La Salle University- Manila. The main objective of the research is to investigate the types of progression that the subjects use in producing a written text on the basis of the topical structure analysis suggested by Lautmatti (1987). The findings of the study indicated that parallel progression was the most
adopted one in the paragraphs, extended parallel was the second most used progression, sequential progression was the third most preferred. In addition, extended sequential progression was found to be the least in the paragraphs. According to the researcher, the subjects made more use of the parallel progression compared to the sequential and extended types of progression due to the fact that they prefer to hang ideas close together rather than linking them across paragraphs.

Sattayatham and Ratanapinyowong (2008) discussed the problems in ESL paragraph writing of first-year medical students in four medical schools at Mahidol University, Thailand. For data collection, the subjects were asked to read three medical ethic passages drawn from the Internet, and then choose one of these passages and give their viewpoints on medical ethics in one paragraph. Based on a Chi-square test, the findings revealed that most subjects failed to show a logical connection or relation between ideas in their paragraphs, i.e. they did not give much attention to transitional words to link the ideas together. Also, the subjects did not clearly relate to their main idea, as a result of which the paragraphs seemed to look short and unclear. Furthermore, it became clear that medical students (i.e. the subjects) lack organizational strategies and give little attention to topic sentences, introductions and conclusions. In fact, a conclusion was found to be absent in most subjects’ opinion paragraphing writing.

In a more similar study, Dumanig et al. (2009) studied the topical structure of the Philippine and American editorials appeared in The Philippine Daily Inquirer and The New York Times. The aim of their study is to investigate the differences between the American and Filipino editorials in English in terms of number of words, clauses and sentences in a
paragraph; number of words and clauses in a sentence; and number of words in a clause. Moreover, their study also examines the difference in the internal coherence between the American and Filipino editorials in English based on parallel progression, extended parallel progression, and sequential progression. Based on the corpus, the findings indicated that the American and Filipino writers have minor differences in writing. That is, they have nearly the same percentage in the repetition of phrases and clauses. Nevertheless, despite this similarity in writing behavior, it was noticed that the Filipino writers incline to be verbose, whereas their American counterparts are more coherent. The study also revealed that both the American and Filipino writers attain a considerable degree of internal coherence in writing as noticed in the number of the above mentioned progressions in their paragraphs. Thus, the researchers argue that the similarity of writing between the two groups can be referred to the uniqueness of English used by the Philippines which is apparently close to the American English.

In short, it can be argued that topical structure analysis constitutes that ESL writers might not face serious problems in achieving coherence as EFL writers might do. That is to say, L1 influence is more evident among EFL learners, e.g. Arabic, French, Swahili, Russian, etc.

Zergollern-Miletic and Horvth (2009) reported on the investigation of the nature of Zagreb and Pecs students’ writing in relation to coherence and originality. From each university (i.e. Zagreb & Pecs), ten scripts were taken. Upon completion of the scripts’ analyses, the results showed that an indication of well-produced paragraph-level dimension was found in most of the twenty scripts. This suggests that as the participants learned about topic
sentences and came across different examples of topic progression, they have been able to use effective coherence in their essays. In addition, voice element was seen in the scripts: the participants conveyed the author’s ideas and feelings adequately so that the raters got evoked and found the essays more interesting and inspiring.

Again, from these results it can also be argued that EFL/ESL problems in terms of coherence tend to vary from one language to another or even from one writer to another. Therefore, in Zergollern-Miletic and Horvth’s (2009) study it seems that the subjects have a good command of L2 writing skills, especially with regard to their ability to express their views in a more logical manner, and this makes us predict that the subjects of this study are likely to be English majors or English minors as their writing performance seems to be different from the other disciplines’ students whose English writing performance has been discussed above.

3.6 Reading-Writing Relationship and EFL/ESL Writing Studies

As noted in chapter two, section 2.7, reading-writing relationships can be observed in various ways. For example, some researchers (Abadiano & Turner, 2002; Falk-Ross, 2002; Lee & Karashen, 2002) contend that reading and writing should be considered as related skills rather than disconnecting skills. However, the focus of the current research is to consider this connection in terms of rhetorical strategies. This section will report on some studies related to the relationship between reading and L2 writing proficiency.

Accordingly, Vieira and Taglieber (2003) set out to conduct research on the influence of reading in EFL students’ summarizing process. The
participants of the study were nineteen students from the College of Letters of Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil. They were asked to read and summarize two texts on different topics, of different organization styles, and of different lengths. A questionnaire about the familiarity of the participants with the topic of the source texts and how this familiarization occurred was administered. The results of the study provided that the reading of the source texts has influenced participants’ writing of their summaries. Apparently, the influence was in terms of main ideas, organizational patterns, text complexity and emotional arousal of the topic of the source text. The results also concluded that in some cases, the emotional appeal of the topic tends to have some negative impact on participants’ summaries. In other words, it directs the path of the writing to a more limited extent.

ELdouma (2005) investigated the relationship between reading and writing based on the performance, perception and strategy use of university EFL learners. The subjects of his study include students of English language from the Faculty of Education at Sudan University of Science and Technology, Sudan. To gather data for the study, the subjects carried out two reading tests as well as two writing tests to identify the connection between the two skills. The results of the study showed that there was a seemingly significant degree of correlation between the subjects’ reading and writing performance (r = 0.741; p=.000). The results also indicated that the connection between reading performance and writing performance varied according to the subjects’ standard of language competence which lends support to the bidirectional assumption. Again, the subjects’ responses to the questionnaire revealed that they make connection
between what they have read and their writing performance benefiting from the main ideas of the reading text. Finally, results of the subjects’ interviews added that almost all the subjects applied some common techniques when connecting reading and writing: good/poor readers and good/poor writers follow similar strategies for reading.

Shen (2008) examined the influence of a reading-writing connection on the first-year EFL university students who study English as a required subject at the National Formosa University in Taiwan. The purpose of Shen’s study is to find out the students’ literacy development by investigating their written entries, including reading log entries and their creative writing, to see the effect of reading on writing. The data of the study was collected from follow-up interviews. Findings of the study indicated that the students’ literacy developed not only in linguistic perspective, but also in critical thinking as well as in personal perspective. Further, the results revealed that reading enhances the students’ development of their written communication in terms of stimulus, structure, vocabulary, and prior experience. Finally, the results showed that reading-writing connection had a positive impact on the university students’ reading metacognitive awareness, i.e. referring to what they have read, as well as their reflection of individual beliefs and experience transaction.

Magno (2008) also carried out a similar research on the investigation of whether reading strategy, amount of writing, metacognitive metamemory (cognitive factors), and apprehension (affective factors) clearly indicate writing proficiency in English. The sample was of one hundred and fifty nine college students enrolled in an English course. The subjects were asked to write an essay as an assessment of their writing competence: by using the
Test of Written English (TWE) scoring criterion. In addition, multiple regression analysis was also applied to see which predictor is significant. The study revealed that all the variables are significantly related to writing competence, especially the variable of reading strategy. This finding is consistent with some researchers’ (e.g. Lee & Krashen, 2002; Asencions, 2008) research findings in that the relationship between reading and writing seems to be significance in many cases. The uniqueness of Magno’s (2008) study lies in the fact that the previous studies used reading as a tool of achievement or performance employing ability test, whereas his study uses reading as a pattern. Accordingly, he provides that as writers use reading patterns such as knowing the aim of the reading material, understanding relevant background, focusing attention on main ideas, assessment, monitoring and making inferences, the more likely they can produce an effective written text. His findings also lend support to some remarks made by Esmaeili (2002) and Koda (2005) that reading improves processes and strategies of one’s writing, i.e. it enables him/her to gain the required framework in developing his/her words, spelling, semantic relations and grammar, all of which lead to a better understanding of written communication.

The final study of reading-writing relationship is of Plakan’s (2009). He focused on the role of reading strategies in integrated L2 writing tasks: through think-aloud verbal protocols, interviews, and the resulting written products. The subjects of the study include twelve students from two large U.S. universities, and their majors are varied as well as the diversity of background which indicates insights into a heterogeneous class of ESL writers. Data analysis concluded that checking on source integration and
checking on citation strategies appeared to have helped the writers by determining what to do with the source texts, and also confirming that they are doing the task adequately. Relatively, the subjects used comprehension strategies such as skimming to write the gist of the source texts. Another result was that writers mined the texts, a strategy which involves returning to the text to reread or scan some parts, then select information and formulate it into integrated paragraphs. Here, one can argue that that reading is an important process in writing process: writers return to source text when composing, because they may need rewriting information or a strategy in order to finish the job. In general, Plakan’s study discusses various empirical, theoretical and practical notions. Thus, it contributes more to the scope of the current research in that writers can benefit from the language techniques they learned in their reading, despite the fact that not all EFL writers can make use of what they have read, especially in terms of rhetorical techniques.

3.7 EFL/ESL Writing Instruction Studies

In essence, effective writing instruction can be considered useful in improving EFL/ESL learners’ writing quality in various ways and at different levels as well. Thus, teachers could help their students learn some characteristics and procedures of good writing. For example, a teacher who teaches a reading course at the college level is expected to encourage his/her learners to pay much attention to different rhetorical norms that authors follow in presenting their views, then asks them (i.e. the learners) to pursue similar ways when giving their own ideas in written communication.

To illustrate some studies related to conflicting techniques of EFL writing instruction, let us begin with Archibald’s (2001) study which
examines the effect of focus teaching on students’ writing. Fifty EFL students from twenty one countries and with twelve different first languages were asked to write a 250-word essay at the beginning and the end of their program at the University of Southampton, The U.K. The principal aim of the program is to provide the students with the linguistic demands as well as other discourse genres and the best ways in which thoughts can be structured academically. The subjects’ written texts were evaluated using a multiple-trait method (Hamp-Lyons, 1991) which includes communicative quality, interestingness, referencing, organization, argumentation, linguistic accuracy, and linguistic appropriateness. The findings of the study showed that discourse organization and argumentation, which were the main targets of the classroom study, improved more than other aspects. Accordingly, as the researcher contends, it is recommended that teachers should perceive writing proficiency as an overall balance of proficiencies and that addressing factors of student writing might influence this overall balance. This shows a mode of tendency for British academic writing values and presumably also a better understanding of the objectives of the program which is provided by the university.

ALbakri et al. (2003) studied the effectiveness of using e-mail dialogue journals in developing ESL writing skills. His study mainly focuses on four important writing qualities: overall effectiveness, content, language, and vocabulary. In addition, the length of the journal entries has also been examined. The subjects of the study were four Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia Matriculation students (two males two females), categorized as intermediate level English language learners. The study was conducted for seven weeks and about seventy two journals were collected at the end of
the seventh week. The results of his study indicated that e-mail dialogue journal writing has a positive impact on the writing performance of ESL students at the college level. The results also revealed that the students have improved qualitatively in their writing abilities, namely in terms of overall effectiveness, content, language, and vocabulary. The analysis of the journal entries also showed that the students tried to improve their ideas appropriately as they were writing on domains of their interest. Further, they realized that they were able to learn new words from their partners: they were able to improve their writing ability through interaction with their peers. Apart from these results, another important result of his study is that it dealt with the students’ improvement in writing quantity: they were able to write longer entries, which indicates that they have gained more confidence in English writing.

Kim (2003) examined how Korean EFL writing instructors give feedback to their students’ writing performance and that what influences their feedback. Participants of the study included twelve full-time and part-time Korean EFL writing instructors in four universities teaching freshman English and intermediate EFL writing courses. Various instruments for data gathering were used in the study. These include a formal semi-structured interview with each instructor, a questionnaire on the instructor’s writing self-efficacy, and students’ writing samples voluntary submitted. The first lesson from the results of the study is that grammar was still the most frequent matter in giving feedback on students’ writing. The second lesson appeared from the interview data is that some elements of teacher feedback seemed to be affected by the teachers’ beliefs on L2 writing and their experiences in L2 writing teaching. In this respect, most participants
mentioned that they repeated the class activities, teaching techniques, and feedback practices that they received as EFL/ESL students. The final important lesson is that teachers decided how comments can be given on students’ writing based on whether they have noticed their feedback success in students learning to write. Overall, the results of Kim’s (2003) study show that the instructors’ clear awareness of their role in students’ learning to write is essential in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of their students’ writing performance.

Tran (2007) investigated the issues of motivation and students’ identity in an EFL writing classroom in Vietnam from the perspective of the students. The subjects of her study were thirty English-major students in a four-year Bachelor’s program. A questionnaire was used as an instrument for data collection. The findings revealed that although the commonly held perception gives much attention to factors of learners’ extrinsic motivation, their linguistic need, and social needs in learning EFL writing, the subjects were not only concerned with these factors. Rather, they were found to be more likely concerned with their intrinsic motivation such as their interest, passion and inspiration, which are related to their personal and cultural needs in writing. Broadly speaking, all types of motivation would help EFL learners express their views in writing.

In a similar study, Fung and Hoon (2008) reported on teachers’ perception on a collaborative activity in ESL writing class. The objectives of the study are of two-fold: to ascertain teachers’ perceptions of utilization of collaborative writing tasks in the classroom, and to identify how such tasks are enacted by each individual instructor. Data was collected from a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview with sixteen instructors who
teach an academic writing course at Universiti Purta, Malaysia. The results indicated that collaborative tasks in the writing class are useful as they tend to enhance the development of cognitive and social skills and encourage learners’ confidence in writing. Also, results from the interviews provided that the disadvantages of collaborative activity are due to passive and uncooperative members in addition to time constraints. The results further revealed that collaborative writing can be performed in various ways. That is, instructors can follow the collaborative styles that suitable for their students’ needs, level of competency and writing abilities. Therefore, it can be argued that it is necessary to be aware of students’ preference and learning styles for the sake of the students’ writing creativity.

Yoon (2008) examined a qualitative research study that investigated the changes in students’ writing process linked to corpus use over an extended period of time. The major objective of this research is to examine to what extent corpus technology influences students’ development of competence as L2 writers. The data of the research was collected through six main instruments: (1) classroom observation, (2) interviewsb,(3) recall protocols,(4) corpus search logs, (5) class corpus search assignments and (6) written reflections on corpus. The results showed that corpus use did not only have a direct impact on assisting the subjects, but also develop their perceptions of lexico-grammatical features and overall language awareness. Upon linking the corpus method to the writing process, the subjects felt a sense of responsibility for their writing, became more self-reliant writers, and their confidence in writing increased. As a matter of fact, it was realized that individual differences and contextual factors seemed to play an evident role in identifying the frequency and extent of corpus use, specification of
linguistic elements for investigations, the degree of analysis and interpretation, and the proper employment of corpus resources. All in all, the results of this study highlight the importance of teaching L2 writing in an EAP environment, particularly corpus-based integrated teaching.

The final study related to EFL instruction is of al-Jarf’s (2009). This research is about enhancing freshman students’ writing skills with mind-mapping software. A mind map is a graphic organizer which can be used to generate ideas, take notes, develop concepts and ideas, and improve memory (Buzan, 2000; cited in al-Jarf, 2009). Two groups of freshman students at the College of Languages and Translation (COLT) at King Saud University, Saudi Arabia participated in the study. One group received traditional in-class teaching (control) and the other group received a combinational of in-class traditional and mind maps based on software (experimental group). The findings explained that significant differences in writing development were noticed between the two groups indicating that use of the mind mapping software seemed to be an effective instrument for developing students’ ability to generate, visualize and organize ideas in writing. In other words, those who relied on this instrument became faster and more competent in generating and organizing ideas for their paragraphs and were capable of having more detailed ideas compared to those who did not use the mind mapping software.

On the whole, most of the aforementioned EFL writing instruction studies explore how EFL/ESL instructors might go about L2 writing based on the best ways of L2 writing teaching using basic principles as well as concepts of numerous theories. What is evident in these studies is that the researchers strive to focus on the recent strategies of L2 writing teaching
such as motivation for L2 writing, computer assisted writing, peer feedback writing, and the like. Again, one of the lessons that can be learned from these EFL instruction studies is that the researchers are interested in deserting the classical aspects of EFL/ESL writing teaching (e.g. grammatical correction, vocabulary) and dealing with more effective aspects such as the role of cultural variation awareness in L2 writing, social factors, and technology enhancement in L2 writing, all of which are believed to empower EFL writers to be aware of different genres of writing as well as different writing strategies.

3.8 The Related Literature and its Relevance to the Current Research

Generally speaking, from the results of the above reviewed literature it can be argued that this literature can contribute much to the present study in many ways. For example, both the present study and the ones discussed above, tend to explore issues related to EFL/ESL writing proficiency from different angles. Furthermore, both the current study and the previous studies reviewed use similar instruments for collecting data such as tests, questionnaires, interviews, and observations. Of these instruments, the present research employs the test and the questionnaire (see 4.2.3.1 & 4.2.3.2). As for the data analysis, the present research uses similar methods used by some studies reviewed above, in particular analytical assessment (cf. chapter 4). Pedagogically, the current research also tends to go in line with the aforementioned ones in that writing proficiency does not occur in a vacuum, i.e. language instructors should find better ways of aiding EFL/ESL learners who lack ability and confidence in their English writing to get involved in various writing tasks.
On the whole, as stated in chapter one, section 1.4, the uniqueness of the present research as opposed to the above mentioned ones lies in the fact that it tends to investigate unexplored problems of Sudanese EFL graduate students in English writing relating to Arabic interference. In other words, when they write in English, they may find themselves encountering the techniques of two languages.

3.9 Summary

This chapter has reviewed and evaluated the relationship between the present research and the previous related literature on EFL/ESL studies. This review has paved the way for a better understanding of how the present research adds to the studies already conducted as well as awareness of some theories and methodologies relevant to the present research. The issues which have been discussed include non-culture-specific EFL/ESL writing studies, contrastive rhetoric studies, cohesion studies, coherence studies, reading–writing relationship studies, and EFL/ESL writing teaching studies.
CHAPTER FOUR
METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology of the research. It provides a detailed description of the participants as well as the materials used in obtaining the required data. Furthermore, it reports on the measuring tools and their validity and reliability for evaluating specific dimensions of the research.

4.2 Methods

4.2.1 Participants

The participants in this study were 220 drawn on random sampling basis. Of the two hundred and twenty participants, one hundred and ten (out of one hundred and ninety) were English language and linguistics teachers in thirteen Sudanese universities as shown in Table 4.1 below, and one hundred and ten (out of one hundred and sixty nine) were Sudanese graduate students studying for Master degrees in English and Translation, and a post-graduate diploma degree in English language in five Sudanese universities: Khartoum, Juba, Sudan, al-Fashir and Nile Valley as shown in Table 4.2 below.
Table (4.1): Characteristics of the Sample of the Study: Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Omdurman Islamic University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Omdurman al-Ahalia University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>al-Neelein</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>al-Ribat National University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>al-Zaeem al-Azhari</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>al-Ahafad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>International University of Africa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>al-Fashir</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Niyala</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>al-Emam al-Haddi College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (4.2): Characteristics of the Sample of the Study: Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>subjects</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>al-Fashir</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nile Valley</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason behind targeting these five universities is that because they are the only Sudanese higher institutions that are believed to offer postgraduate programs in English language, linguistics, and translation at the levels of post-graduate diploma, M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in the aforementioned domains. Therefore, it is expected that a considerable number of graduate students can be found in these universities. In general, the students were drawn from the faculties of Arts (41%), Education (37%), and Translation Centers (22%) of the respective universities as shown in Figure 4.1 below.
As far as the distribution of the students is concerned, at the university of Khartoum, they were drawn from the Faculty of Arts, i.e. English Department and Translation and Arabicization unit. At the university of Juba, they were drawn from the Faculty of Education and Translation and Arabicization center; and at the other three universities (i.e. Sudan, al-Fashir & Nile valley), the students were drawn from the Faculties of Education. The researcher chose these faculties and centers because English is taught as a major subject of study.

Furthermore, the students were divided into three groups: M.A. English majors as Group “A”, M.A. Translation majors as Group “B”, and Post-graduate diploma students majoring in English as Group “C”. For the most part, most of these students had been learning English as a foreign language for more than eleven years. Therefore, it is expected that their proficiency level in English language would enable them to use Western
rhetorical strategies more competently when writing an English expository text as opposed to undergraduate EFL learners. On the whole, the main reason for choosing graduate students is that in the last two decades most Sudanese ELT researchers concentrated mainly on the written texts produced by some Sudanese EFL undergraduate students. Nevertheless, observing contemporary Sudanese EFL undergraduates’ English writing, the researcher strongly believes that they lack the ability of good writing standards. They seem to be unable to express their ideas clearly in written English to the extent that they could not even write a very short paragraph directly in English. Therefore, the overall predicted outcome of what they may write tends to lack major English writing techniques such as logical organization, coherence, cohesion, appropriate punctuation, voice and so on. With regard to the present research, any piece of writing which does not conform to such criteria may fail to provide significant research results. Of course, this is not to say that Sudanese EFL graduate students do not experience difficulties in English writing, but these difficulties are less great on their part as compared to the undergraduate writers.

On the whole, Sudanese EFL undergraduate learners are not fully trained in English writing. That is, they appear to study very few writing courses with limited credit hours. To the best of the researchers’ knowledge, the majority of the Sudanese universities teach two or perhaps three EFL writing courses for a B.A. degree in English. For example, in the case of Khartoum University, the Department of English at the Faculty of Arts, there are only two writing courses: English (102) and English (202). In fact, a two-course writing program cannot, by all means, fully prepare EFL learners for their academic and professional needs. This indicates that writing
competence can be acquired through studying a considerable number of writing-related academic courses backed up by a long period of continuous practice, since writing is a result of activity rather than an activity in its own right.

As stated earlier, the participants of the study also consist of one hundred and ten English language and linguistics teachers at thirteen Sudanese universities who took part in answering the questionnaire of the research (for more details see 4.2.3.1). As illustrated in Figure 4.2 below, 6.4% of the teachers were B.A. holders, 4.5% were post-graduate diploma holders, 63.6% were M.A. holders, 21.8% were Ph.D. holders, and 3.6% were professors. It appears that the majority of the English language and linguistics teachers in most Sudanese universities are M.A. holders. Thus, it seems reasonable to argue that the majority of them may lack experience in English writing instruction: they may not be so competent to address most EFL writing difficulties that their students might confront. Simply, in stead of assisting the students to overcome their English writing problems, they may seem to be part of the problem.
4.2.2 Instruments

The data for this study was collected through two instruments: an English expository writing test and a questionnaire. The test was given to the students, while the questionnaire was administered to the teachers. Below is an explanation of procedures of data collection.

4.2.3 Procedures

The data for the current study was collected during May, June, and July in 2009. The procedures adopted in gathering the required data of the study will be discussed as follows:
4.2.3.1 The Teachers’ Questionnaire

The chief goal of the questionnaire was to find out Sudanese English language and linguistics university teachers’ evaluative perceptions about the problematic areas that Sudanese EFL graduate writers encounter in writing in terms of the contrastive rhetoric. The researcher designed a 54-item pre-questionnaire (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was divided into five sections. The first section, which comprises items 1-13, deals with the teachers’ opinions on Arabic interference problems in Sudanese EFL graduate students’ writing. The second section, which includes items 14 -22, is concerned with logical organizational problems that Sudanese EFL writers face in writing. The third section, which comprises items 23 - 30, focuses on the areas of coherence difficulties in Sudanese students’ EFL writing. The fourth section, which contains items 31- 40, intends to review on the problems of achieving cohesion in Sudanese EFL writing. The final section, which consists of items 41-54, explores the relationship between the EFL reading inability and Sudanese students’ EFL writing proficiency, mainly in respect of rhetorical strategies’ improvement. In other words, to what extent good writers are believed to be capable of using different writing strategies that they have obtained from EFL reading.

The questionnaire was based on a five-point Likert scale, but all the items included were prepared by the researcher, which took him almost two weeks to design, following a very comprehensive background reading as well as reviewing the theoretical framework and the relevant literature of the present study. Yet, the researcher chose Likert scale for the following reasons:
1- Explicitness of its guides, which could enable the respondents to answer the questions without a great difficulty.

2- Its flexibility and configuration of the items could enable the respondents to specify their position clearly: either agree or disagree, which means that the scale is expected to have a high degree of accuracy.

3- Its easiness and applicability to evaluation.

4.2.3.2 The Writing Test

To carry out this test, the researcher, first, got in touch with the teachers of English, linguistics and translation in the target universities (see Table 4.2) to secure their students’ consent to take part in the test. Indeed, all the teachers magnanimously agreed to offer one of their instructional lectures to the researcher to administer a 2-hour English expository writing test. Luckily, some of them even went too far in their cooperation by considering the test as an assignment to be evaluated as part of the class work. In fact this gesture has motivated the testees to take the test seriously.

Having succeeded in obtaining teachers’ cooperation, the researcher went to each of the target universities (i.e. Faculties of Arts, Education &Translation Centers) to conduct the test on a previously planned schedule. Interestingly, before the commencement of the test, each teacher introduced the researcher to his/her students urging them to participate in the test as honestly as possible as it touches an area that seems to be challenging for many Sudanese EFL learners at university level.
The testees were asked to write a 500-word English expository essay on one of the following topics:

1- University life.

2- The advantages and disadvantages of living in a big city.

3- The importance of intercultural communication.

4- The consequences of the recent global economic crisis on people’s life.

5- The impact of swine flu on individuals’ movement.

The rationale behind giving more topic options rather than a single topic is that familiarity with the essay topic will exert much influence on the testees’ writing performance. In other words, since they have an idea about the subject matter, they could feel more confident and then compose enthusiastically, because of their prior knowledge. Huang (2008) also maintains that factors determining the writability of an essay topic include knowledge, interest, experience, and data availability. Therefore, the researcher thought that the students were supposed to be familiar with some of these topics, namely global events occurred coincidently with the time of the present study, in particular (4) and (5). Moreover, the testees were allowed to use dictionaries for possible spelling problems since the major concern of the study was problems related to rhetorical strategies problems rather than spelling problems.
4.3 The Scoring Criterion for the Writing Test

To gain more reliable and valid information about the students’ written essays, an experienced ELT inter-rater was requested to take part in the scoring procedures of the essays. To safeguard the privacy of the testees, the researcher and the inter-rater have agreed to replace the testees’ names by code letters. That is, A1 for the University of Khartoum students, B1 for the University of Juba students, C1 for the students of Sudan University of Science and Technology, D1 for the University of al-Fashir students, and E1 for the University of Nile Valley students.

As far as the scoring method is concerned, each essay was divided into four components each with subcomponents. Also, a total of 100 scores were assigned for each student’s essay. As such, Arabic interference problems received 30 scores, logical organization problems received 20 scores, cohesion problems received 30 scores, and coherence problems received 20 scores. The scores of these four components were based on the following writing criteria:

A- Arabic interference problems: in evaluating this component, a set of writing features were considered:

1. Too long introduction.
2. Absence of capitalization.
3. Arabic prepositions’ usage.
4. Unnecessary repetition.
5. Figurative language usage, which includes: exaggeration, embellishment, simile, metonymy, proverbs, and emotional tone.
B- Logical organization problems: in this regard, the following writing elements were evaluated:

1. Introduction has a clear topic sentence.

2. Introduction contains a controlling idea of the whole topic.


4. Each paragraph has one controlling idea.

5. Inconsistent paragraphs.

6. Random shift of ideas.

7. Unclear conclusion.

C- Cohesion problems: in assessing this component, the following writing aspects were taken into account:

1- Grammatical cohesion, which incorporates:


   - Substitution: (nominal, verbal, clausal substitutions).

   - Ellipsis: (nominal, verbal, clausal ellipses).

   - Conjunctions: (additive, causal, temporal and adversative conjunctions).

2- Lexical Cohesion, which includes:

   - Repetition, synonymy, antonym and hyponymy.
D- Coherence Problems: in evaluating this component, the two raters examined the following writing aspects:

1. Verb – noun agreement.
2. Appropriate use of subordinates.
3. Appropriate use of commas and semicolons.
4. Use of transitional expressions.
5. Necessary repetition.
6. Consistent parallelism.
7. Literal translation.

Generally speaking, the essays were scored independently as well as analytically by the researcher and the inter-rater. Then, the two scores were averaged for a single score (see Appendix C). Theoretically, this type of scoring method (i.e. analytic scoring) seems to be more relevant to the current study as it evaluates a number of EFL writing features, such as organization, coherence, cohesion, punctuation and so on. More importantly, what differentiates this scoring method from the holistic one is that instead of examining the whole text with a single score, the raters can focus on different dimensions and assign each a different score. Zimmaro (2004:2), for example, contends that analytic scoring is preferred over holistic scales by many writing experts for a number of reasons. First, it gives more reliable diagnostic information about learners’ writing abilities. In other words, it tells clear information about the strengths and weaknesses of the learners, and then allows teachers and curriculum designers to address the genuine problems of their learners’ writing. Second, this type of
scoring is mainly useful for EFL/ESL learners who show unstable standard across different features of writing. That is, for instance, some L2 writers may have good writing techniques in terms of content and organization, but may fail to deal with grammatical control; others may be aware of sentence structure, but they may find it difficult to organize their writing in a coherent way. Third, it is argued that raters can easily be trained on using analytic scoring scales, than on using holistic methods (McNammara, 1996). Last, the clearness of analytic scoring steps gives instructors a highly valuable mechanism for providing writers with relevant and direct feedback.

All in all, despite the fact that each scoring scale has some advantages and disadvantages (especially when the matter is concerned with aspects such as coherence, cohesion and logical style), the researcher and the inter-rater were firmly convinced that analytic scoring appears to be the most suitable scoring scale for the current study.

4.4 The Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out to verify the workability of the instruments used for data collection. Based on this, the pilot study’s information was collected from a questionnaire administered to 50 English and linguistics teachers at five Sudanese universities, i.e. Khartoum, al-Neelein, Sudan, Omdurman Islamic, and Omdurman al-Ahala universities. In each university, 10 teachers were randomly chosen. The second instrument for data collection was students’ English expository writing test. The pilot study would solve unseen problems that might arise in the course of the main study. For example, through the pilot study, one could make sure that the guidelines, content and the layout of both the questionnaire and writing test are clear and measure the intended goals. Furthermore, as far as the
students’ writing test is concerned, the pilot study of the writing test will indicate whether the time allotted (i.e. 2 hours) to the test is quite enough or not, besides other factors such as venue and its equipment, all of which will largely affect the mode of the testees’ writing performance. Finally, the pilot study could enable the researcher to carry out necessary modifications in the instruments as well as the procedures.

As for the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted before the distribution of the final draft of the questionnaire to the target sample of the study: teachers. Then, the pilot questionnaire has been exposed to a specialized body of experts in ELT, linguistics and translation (i.e. a jury) to assess its format, clarity and relevancy. Having done that, the questionnaire was distributed to a small sample of teachers (see Table 4.3 below), which consists of two professors, five assistant professors, and three lecturers. An introductory letter was also attached to the questionnaire explaining the main purpose of the questionnaire.
Table (4.3): A Jury Committee for the Teachers’ Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Academic Status</th>
<th>Area of Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mahammed Albusairi</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>English, Linguistics&amp; Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Abderaheem Mugadam</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>EFL/sociolinguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mahamadein Yousif</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>Phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Suleiman Nourein</td>
<td>al-Fashier</td>
<td>//</td>
<td>EFL/Oral communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mahamad M. Alshengiti</td>
<td>al-Ribat</td>
<td>//</td>
<td>Applied linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Salahaldeen Adam Adouma</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>//</td>
<td>EFL reading &amp; writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Alsaid Fadalnabi</td>
<td>al-Fashir</td>
<td>lecturer</td>
<td>ELT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Taha .M. AbdIwahid</td>
<td>al-Neelein</td>
<td>//</td>
<td>English/Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Abass Elsidig</td>
<td>al-Neelein</td>
<td>//</td>
<td>English/Linguistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the writing test, prior to the administration of the test, a pilot study was administered to 45 students. That is, 5 B.A. (Honors.) and qualifying year students from the Faculty of Arts at the University of Khartoum, 20 postgraduate diploma students majoring in English from the Faculty of Education at al-Fashir university, and 20 M.A. English students from the Faculty of Education at Sudan University of Science and Technology. However, the B.A. students did not return their essays, and the researcher attributes that to the fact that they were allowed to write the essays at home contrary to the graduate students who wrote their essays in the classroom. So, to overcome similar instances of the B.A. students in the course of the study ahead as well as the reasons which have been stated in
4.2.1, the researcher categorically decided to neglect the undergraduates and carry on with the graduate students only. Therefore, only 40 students were chosen to become the actual sample of the pilot study in terms of the writing test.

4.5 Validity and Reliability of the Teachers’ Questionnaire

In general terms, validity is based on the assumption that an instrument is valid if it measures what it is intended to measure. That is to say, validity pertains to the accuracy and precision of a measure. However, a measure or test might look reliable yet might not look valid. It is sometimes assumed (Meadows & Billington, 2005:13) that validity is more essential than reliability, because there is no point in measuring something reliable unless one is aware of what he/she is measuring.

Given the importance of validation procedures in this study, three types of validity (i.e. face, content and construct) will be described. The face validity is concerned with how a measure looks. In other words, it relates to its design, reasonableness, and workability. Given these predictions, the pilot study’s referees confirmed the overall accuracy of the questionnaire.

In terms of the content validity, the jury members of the pilot study also maintained that the questionnaire has covered all the aspects of the research questions and hypotheses in a systematically relevant fashion. As for the construct validity, the jury members also reported that there is a consistency between the theoretical notions and the intended measuring device. In fact, their arguments seem to be congruent with Wainer and Braun’s (1998) view that the construct is the initial concept, notion, question
or hypothesis that indicates which data are to be collected and how they are to be collected.

Statistically speaking, it has been argued that according to classical test theory, the maximum validity for a test is the square root of the reliability (Clark-carter, 1997, cited in Meadows & Billington, 2005). Accordingly, the subjective validity value of the questionnaire is 0.881, which equals 0.938616, which is highly perceived as valid.

Having collected the pilot questionnaire from the jury, substantial modifications were made. For example, nine items were omitted due to their irrelevance, vagueness, or having similar meanings. Also, some redundant phrases were removed and unclear items have been restructured to become more consistent with the general motives of the study. Furthermore, some items or even parts of the questionnaire were transferred. For instance, in the configuration of the pilot questionnaire, coherence variable was placed before cohesion variable. However, in reshaping the questionnaire, cohesion was placed before coherence, since the majority of the jury members hold the view that although coherence and cohesion are interlinked notions, on most occasions, cohesion usually leads to coherence: based on Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) point of view.

Following these observations and modifications, forty five items of the pilot questionnaire were found to be relevant to the study. Consequently, a total of one hundred and fifty questionnaires (the final draft) were distributed to the target teachers (see Appendix B), and one hundred and ten questionnaires were returned. The respondents were allowed to fill in the questionnaire at their convenience, for instance, some of them took three weeks or even more to answer the questions. In general, despite their
precious time, the bulk of the teachers were extremely helpful and punctual apart from very few who appeared to be uncooperative, if not unpunctual too.

As for the reliability (for a detailed definition, see 4.6 below) of the questionnaire, Cronbach’s alpha for examining internal consistency of the items for each dimension was carried out as illustrated in the Table 4.3 below. In practice, cronbach’s alpha is one of the most widely used tools of internal consistency reliability coefficient. It demands that research data should meet some assumptions, which would interpret that the reliability estimates are supposed to be perfect and acceptable.

**Table (4.4): Reliability of the Teachers’ Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>N0.</th>
<th>Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic interference problems.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical organization problems.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion problems.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence problems.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading inability and EFL writing relationship problems in terms of rhetorical techniques improvement.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.881</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To measure the reliability of the questionnaire’s items, 50 questionnaires were distributed to a small group of teachers. An introductory letter has been attached to each questionnaire. In general, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. More
importantly, it is argued that there is no lower limit in terms of the coefficient, but the closer Cronbach’s alpha consistency to 1.0, is the greater internal consistency of the items in the scale (George & Mallery, 2003). Based on this, it can be noticed that the Alpha reliability values appear to be high: 0.601 for Arabic interference problems, 0.747 for logical organizational problems, 0.732 for cohesion problems, 0.610 for coherence problems, and 0.503 for EFL reading inability and its relationship with English writing problems. The above table also shows that reliability coefficient fluctuates between the values 0.503 and 0.747, which are statistically appreciable, whereas the total reliability coefficient for all the dimensions is 0.881, which indicates that there is a high level of consistency between the dimensions and hence, the questionnaire is found to be reliable.

4.6 Validity and Reliability of the Writing Test

To begin with the validity, the researcher discussed with the supervisor the content validity of the writing test. That is, whether the testees will write on one topic or a multiple choice of topics will be offered. Then, it was agreed that the latter move will be more favorable as justified in 4.2.3.2. Thus, it was regarded that the content of the test seemed to be valid as it will serve the intended motif. In addition, in order to calculate the statistical validity of the writing test, the square root of the reliability value of the same test was estimated: 8882, which equals 0.9391, which is highly perceived as a valid result.

As for the reliability of the writing test, as mentioned earlier in 4.5, let us begin with a brief explanation of the concept itself. Generally, reliability pertains to the extent to which a test scale indicates consistent results, if the measurements are repeated several times. Setzer and He (2009) add that if
a given test produces widely discrepant scores for the same testee on separate test administrations, and the testee does not change significantly on the measured attribute, therefore the scores on the test are not reliable. Nevertheless, the researcher seems to favor Meadows and Billington’s (2005) view that reliability can be perceived as an instance of the absence of error when the test is administered.

There are four different ways of evaluating reliability: test-retest, interconsistency, split half, and inter-rater reliabilities. Of these ways, the inter-rater reliability seems to be more relevant to the current study. In essence, inter-rater reliability is a statistical procedure which examines the level of agreement between two independent raters who are scoring the same test based on identical assessment criteria. The inter-rater reliability of the writing test as illustrated in the Table 4.4 below was achieved by using Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

Table (4.5): Inter-rater Reliability Coefficient for the Students' English Writing Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>M.A. English + PGD English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of cases</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average mark of the first rater</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average mark of the second rater</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
The above Table shows ways of calculating inter-rater reliability for the students’ writing test in terms of Pearson correlation. For instance, for the average mark difference between the researcher and the second rater appears to be not so great: 3.7. Most importantly, the overall correlation coefficient between the researchers’ rating and of inter-rater is 0.882, which indicates that the rating procedures of the writing test are positively and significantly correlated.

4.7 Summary

This chapter describes the methodology used in the present research. Thus, it focuses on the description of the participants, instruments, and procedures followed in data collection process. It also tests the validity and reliability of the instruments employed in gathering the information of the research.
CHAPTER FIVE
DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with data analysis, results, and interpretations of the results on the basis of the research questions and hypotheses. In discussing these results, statistical figures in terms of frequencies and percentages will be reported for each variable of the study. The chapter is divided into five sections: Arabic interference problems, logical organization problems, cohesion problems, coherence problems, and reading-writing relationship and rhetorical techniques improvement in EFL writing.

5.2 Arabic Interference Problems

Most of the previous EFL writing studies conducted in the Sudanese context in the 1980s and 1990s have focused on the prevalent linguistic and syntactic difficulties that Sudanese EFL learners encounter in English writing. At the same time, as less sufficient attention has been paid to the area of L1 interference on L2 writing performance among Sudanese EFL learners in higher education, this study attempts to investigate Sudanese EFL graduate students' English writing problems from both linguistic and cultural perspectives. To strengthen this attempt, a descriptive statistical analysis of the first hypothesis will be provided along with other relevant interpretational details, especially randomly chosen excerpts of the students' written test.
Hypothesis One

Transfer of Arabic rhetorical techniques into English writing has a negative impact on Sudanese EFL graduate students' English expository writing performance.

In discussing the results of this hypothesis, elements of the following Tables: 5.1 and 5.2 will be dealt with simultaneously as they revolve around the same issue: the former pertains to the results of the students' written test, while the latter is pertinent to the opinions of some Sudanese EFL university teachers (English and linguistics) on the impact of Arabic interference on the target students' English writing abilities.

Table (5.1): English writing test’s results based on Arabic interference problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Frequencies &amp; percentages of existing instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Too long introduction</td>
<td>61 55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Absence of capitalization</td>
<td>94 85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arabic prepositions usage</td>
<td>86 78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unnecessary repetition</td>
<td>106 95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exaggeration</td>
<td>65 59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Embellishment</td>
<td>74 67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Simile</td>
<td>50 45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td>34 30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>10 9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Emotional tone</td>
<td>78 70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>English and Arabic have different writing habits.</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Different writing habits of both English and Arabic affect Sudanese English writing performance.</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>There are similarities between English and Arabic in terms of writing process.</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Due to unawareness of linguistic and cultural differences between English and Arabic, most Sudanese EFL learners encounter writing problems in English.</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>In teaching, I tend to discuss the relationship between the related aspects of culture and language.</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A large number of Sudanese EFL learners transfer negatively Arabic rhetorical strategies into their English writing.</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL learners transfer positively Arabic rhetorical strategies into their English writing.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Arabic writing habits such as exaggeration, overstatement and generalization influence Sudanese English writing negatively.</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to validate the first hypothesis, especially with respect to Table 5.2, a non-parametric method of Chi-square test has been used to assess the opinions of some Sudanese university teachers of English and linguistics on the students' English writing difficulties due to L1 interference. As far as their responses were concerned, percentages of strongly agree and agree have been merged as a single positive response, whereas percentages of strongly disagree and disagree have also been merged as a single negative response.

Table 5.1 above shows that 95.4% of the students exhibited instances of unnecessary repetition in writing an English expository text. More importantly, it was found that most of them tended to repeat conjunctions such as 'and', 'also' and 'or' as the following excerpts selected randomly from the students' English writing test indicate.

1- In university life there are interact between the students because they come from different parts of the country and there will be different tribes and different customs and traditions and they learn from others (C18).
2- When we turn to the culture as a level of living, we find that most of people have well acquainted of other cultures and have an interaction, and that comes through media and Internet, so they opening to the world, and this lead to development by followed the others successful economic policy, which lead to high living (B8).

3- So in this context, I will shed light to different dimensions of university life. For example I will focus on the academic side of university life, cultural side of university life, and the social dimension of university life (A13).

From these excerpts, it becomes obvious that the bulk of the Sudanese EFL graduate students incline toward excessive repetition of words or even phrases to put emphasis on certain parts of the essay. The reason for such a repetitious tendency may stem from the fact that it is natural and common in Arabic writing techniques to repeat expressions, ideas and words in one sentence as a means of assertion. So, it is worth saying that such a problem of English writing behavior may be related to cultural peculiarity of Arabic writing system. So, as examples (1) and (2) show, the students unintentionally used the Arabic conjunction (و) (wa), which means 'and' in English several times in the same sentence, which sounds monotonous and unacceptable in English writing style, i.e. in English writing, one has to be specific, brief and meaningful. As for the teachers' responses to this problem, 72.7% of them argue that the Arabic writing habit of repetition appears to be one of the most evident problems that face most Sudanese EFL graduate students when writing an English expository text.

The findings of the study also show that absence of capitalization (85.5%) was found to be one of the major challenges that Sudanese EFL graduate students encountered in their English writing. More precisely, only
15% of the target students were able to overcome the problem of capitalization. Indeed, proper usage of capitalization plays a key role in written English discourse. Nevertheless, it can be argued that since Arabic writing lacks capitalization, it is possible that these students might have been influenced by this characteristic phenomenon and hence, they did not value the importance of using capital letters in their English writing. As the whole, it is worth noting that the target students did not only face difficulties in using capital letters, but also lack an adequate knowledge of employing other punctuation marks, especially commas, semicolons, periods, and colons.

One of the problems that noticed in the students' English writing test is that 78.2% of them were unaware of the difference between Arabic and English prepositions. The following extracts indicate to what extent the students' L1 background knowledge has affected negatively their English writing performance in terms of Arabic prepositions transfer:

4- In developed countries, this problem is solved by driving your car in your weekends (A2).

5- In the early ages of the human being life the earth he used to exist in a very little groups (A 27).

6- Seventh: when you went to visited your relative, they living in Far away, so that is difficult to reach with them. also some times people feel frighten from crime which they heard because there are some people came from another place nature or their sprit is criminal, so they cause in many crimes such as killing, robbery, stealing, and deceiving in different ways ( C 25 ).

Examining the above excerpts, it can be argued that these students experienced serious problems in using proper English prepositions in their
EFL written texts. Having argued that, most of them had transferred their knowledge of Arabic prepositions into English writing, which indicates that they were weak in using English prepositions. For example, the first student (A2) has transferred the Arabic preposition (في) (fee) (means 'in' in English), which sounds well in Arabic if it is read as في نهاية الأسبوع [fee nihayati ؟alusbi], which its equivalent in English is 'at the weekend'. As for the second student (A27), apart from some language errors, he/she has misused the preposition. That is, instead of using ‘on’ as a preposition in 'life on the earth', he/she used 'in', which also means 'fee' in Arabic. However, what is worrying here is that even in Arabic writing, using the preposition (في) (fee) in such situations seems to be inappropriate, because it is more acceptable to say 'على وجه الأرض' [Gala wajhi ؟الاردل] : on the earth or the surface of the earth, rather than في الأرض [fee ؟الارد], i.e. 'in the earth', which means just like to place a dead body in the earth. With regard to the last student (C 25), in addition to some rhetorical problems which will be discussed later, he/she incorrectly used the Arabic preposition ‘من’ (from) instead of using an English preposition 'by' in order to be read as ‘people feel frightened by the crime', which its equivalent in Arabic is الناس فزعوا من الجريمة ؟[؟النัส فژوا من الالص: ؟الدري:مدتی].

As far as the emotional tone is concerned, it was observed that 70.8% of the students had attempted to be more impressionistic in presenting their ideas thinking that would nudge their readers' appetite for accepting or appreciating what they have written. The following extract shows an instance of personal emotion in the students' English writing test:
7- And the disadvantage of living in big cities may be extended the advantages. The most important one is that I feel as if those who live in cities are not Muslim for if you greet any he/she looks for you with strange look.

As can be seen in the above example, this student tends to create a strong emotional sense while stating one of the characteristics of those who live in big cities. However, the reality is that to be effectively understood in written communication, one needs various techniques including emotional mode. Yet, imposing your own culture-based personal feelings on others would lead to misinterpretation of the intended meaning, because in most cases, emotional modes are derived from cultural norms and religious beliefs. Therefore, it is highly important that EFL writers should bear in mind the diverse cultural trends that are involved in expressing their personal viewpoints, otherwise what has been written might be perceived as not meeting the required standards of good English writing. Again, it can be added that emotionalism in Sudanese EFL graduate students' writing can be attributed to the nature of Arabic rhetoric, which is believed to have been influenced by Arab pre-Islamic poetry and since then it had been noticed that most Arab writers, including the contemporary ones, used to follow the same pattern of writing. Thus, due to this stylistic feature, it was found that the target students tended to use lyrical words in the sense of better persuasion, as a result of which the recipients (e.g. native English speakers) of their written product might become scapegoats of such stylistic idiosyncrasy.

The findings of the study also indicate that 59.1% of the students inclined toward exaggeration, while 67.4% of them inclined toward embellishment so as to beautify their written discourse. According to
Moujtabahid (1996:3), the cultural tendency toward "exaggerated" expression is reflected in the structure of the Arabic language, which includes several emphatic forms provided by the addition of suffixes showing special stress. To explore some areas of exaggeration and embellishment in the students' written work, let us consider the following excerpts:

8- The first day in university I had that feeling of entering a holy place but messy in the same time, because politician seniors shouting everywhere taking their flags and posters calling for thinking I have never heard. Rights, voting, union and constitutional amendments. All these things was very new for me and frightened, therefore I went home with a heavy load wondering what that life? The university is a place where you can taste different spices, views, and options (B27).

9- To sum up living in big cities is a two-edged weapon. If used well it give its fruits otherwise it will be harmful.

10- At day time the shining sun bits their skins with high temperature, at night no shelters they have to protect them from cold weather (B12).

The above examples indicate that the students pervasively used exaggerated and colorful statements (i.e. the underlined ones) to express themselves in written English. However, to someone who is unfamiliar with Arabic rhetoric, this glamorizing language seems to be hyperbolical. In the point of view of Arabic native speakers, such colorful expressions are perceived natural, because throughout history, Arab writers have been interested in using an eloquent language, particularly when describing their social aspects of life such as hospitality, bravery, honor, dignity and so on. Thus, as stated earlier, these exaggeration and embellishment-based cultural values which had been inherited since the era of the pre-Islamic are also still favored by most of today's Arab writers including Sudanese EFL
graduate students. On the basis of this claim, one can also add that Arab politicians are believed to have been influenced by the social and cultural aspects of exaggerated and decorated oral and written prose works, the reason why there is always some kind of paradox and an immense gap between what they say or write and the reality. Of course, the political perspective of exaggeration-oriented writing cannot be discussed here since the scope of the study is ultimately limited to Sudanese EFL graduate students' English expository writing problems.

As for the exaggeration and embellishment, the results of the questionnaire reveal that only 8.92% of the teachers disagree with the notion that an Arabic writing technique of exaggeration tends to influence Sudanese EFL graduate students' English writing. Moreover, nearly 62% of the respondents think that Arabic flowery style of writing would undermine the students' English writing performance. Accordingly, what can be said here is that the students' writing test results appear to be congruent with the teachers' opinions on the difficulties that encounter the target students when writing an English expository text.

In respect of the figurative language usage, the findings indicate that 45.4% of the students used the Arabic rhetorical technique of 'simile'. While 30.9% of them attempted to use Arabic metonymy in their English expository texts. Below are some instances of Arabic simile transfer into the students' English writing:

11-So communication its not an easy as we imagin its very broad bridge between the nations, so a man with different culture he is completely different from other because he know how to deal with other in civilize way without injuring his feeling (C16).
12-If citizen is from rural, he will wait the end week to go home, so as to get rid of living in this great prison (B16).

13-Life in a big city give you imagination you live in a paradise (A 52).

14-So within short time big city turn to a bee cell, that will raised crime level and occuraing, unsafty even when people are inside their houses, big number of homeless beggars of men , women other than the her borns (B4).

15-So I can say that life in big city is the sword with two faces. Either to enjoy it and take it is value or to be destroyed by the life in city (A36).

What can be noticed from these extracts is that despite of some spelling and grammar errors, Sudanese EFL graduate students tended to employ Arabic aspects of simile and metonymy in their English writing. The first student (C16), for instance, used the word 'bridge' to refer to the complex nature of communication between the different nations, which looks incorrect in English. At the same time, the student also exhibited an instance of Arabic simile: by using the phrase 'without injuring his feelings', which seems well in Arabic writing meaning that while dealing with different cultures, one has to consider other people's norms, beliefs and attitudes (i.e. feelings). However, in English, it is so strange to use such an expression, because feelings as an abstract entity cannot be injured. Similarly, the other four students (B16, A52, B4 and A36) used some cases of Arabic simile and antonym: a prison, a paradise, a bee cell, and a sword with two faces respectively. Yet, of these instances, simile instances seem to surpass metonymy ones. This can be referred to the fact that images of simile are often more present in Arabic contexts in the sense that many Arab poets and writers of the past were overwhelmingly impressed by the discoursal patterns of simile in shaping ideas implicitly in particular milieus
such as using *lion* to denote a conduct of bravery, *deer* to pertain to a sweetheart, an *ostrich* to relate to cowardice, etc.

Finally, the findings of this part of the study show that only 9.1% of the students were found to have used Arabic proverbs in their English writing. This may posit that Sudanese EFL graduate students are unfamiliar with Arabic proverbs in addition to the enigmatic nature of the Arabic proverbs' semantic interpretations, some of which are impregnated by Arab socio-cultural values and virtues. The following extracts indicate some instances of figurative style in the students' English writing test:

16- *As I know that the human being is the son of his nature* (B16).

17- *Also the life in a city is complex than village in the village the life is simple and the treatment is very simple when we have a dilemma in anyone the people stand with you as the English proverb two heads are better than one* (A49).

Commenting on the above examples, the first student (B16), has used an Arabic proverb which says "الإنسان ابن بيته" [ ?al insanu ?ibn bee atihi], which means in English 'man is a creature of nature'. So, instead of using 'a man' (generally perceived as a human), the student translated the word literally (for more information see 5.5), which might sound strange in English writing. As for the second student (A49), in spite of verb-subject agreement errors and a shaky way of presenting ideas in writing, the student was able to use an English proverb correctly. In general, it could be argued that proverbs are bound to cultural contexts of a particular language. Mollanazar (2001), for instance, provides that in many cases, proverbs cannot be transferred literally to L2 writing since they have no natural figurative equivalents in L2. With this in mind, it can be predicted that the target
students of the study who used Arabic proverbs in their EFL writing, experienced serious difficulties in conveying the intended meaning adequately, because similar lexical equivalents to such Arabic proverbs are unavailable in English. Therefore, knowledge of proverbs is not a matter of literal translation of a lexical meaning, rather than knowledge of culturally-embedded concepts rooted in the minds of speakers of a specific language. For example, the following Arabic proverbs have different connotations compared to English semantic equivalents:

**Table (5.3): Examples of Arabic proverbs and their English meanings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic proverb</th>
<th>Its meaning in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | كأن على رؤوسهم الطير  
Ka?ana Gala ru usihimu ?alteir | As if birds over their heads |
| 2   | رجع بخفي حنين  
RajaGa bikhufei hunein | Returned with Hunein's shoes (i.e. with nothing). |
| 3   | أجدود من حاتم  
?ajawad min hatim | More generous than Hatim |
| 4   | أبخل من مادر  
?abkhalu min Madir | Stingier than Madir |

In Arabic contexts, it is perceived that the above proverbs are related to instances of stupidity, disappointment, hospitality, and stinginess respectively. Therefore, if these proverbs are used by an EFL learner in written English discourse, a native English speaker might find it difficult to comprehend the intended meaning. That is to say, as far as English culture is
concerned, he/she might have not come across, for instance, a saying that pertains to birds over somebody's head, or even bafflingly, he/she might ask questions such as who and what are they?, i.e. in cases of Hatim and Madir, who were two men lived in the Jahiliya period; the first was famous for generosity, while the second for stinginess and greed. Here, like English, some proverbs and idioms have stories referring back to one's culture (i.e. religion, folklore, traditions, etc.), and thus, an Arab writer should either explain such proverbs and idioms or not use them at all.

What can be understood from these results is that Sudanese EFL graduate students' English writing is deeply influenced by Arabic writing techniques in the sense that most of the Arabs' past social and cultural patrimonies are still present in many of these students' way of English writing. Thus, it is worth arguing that their EFL writing problems are not only confined to linguistic elements, but also to cultural norms (such as pompousness, lament and hospitality) as well as religious beliefs. On the other hand, when the respondents of the questionnaire were asked about the problems of Sudanese EFL graduate students' English writing, almost 99% of them agree that these writing problems are due to differences in writing techniques between the two languages: English and Arabic. Furthermore, the respondents add that due to unawareness of linguistic and cultural differences by most Sudanese EFL students, they tend to discuss with them issues of cultural differences in L2 writing.

5.3 Logical Organization Problems

The results of this part of the study are extremely important as they are designed to examine the problems that Sudanese EFL graduate students face when organizing their ideas in English writing. In general, text
organization seems to differ from one language to another, based on logical rhetorical ways that writers follow. According to Kaplan (1996, cited in Lui & Qi, 2006), writers' ideas are expressed not only by development of words and sentences, but also by development of ideas through an appropriate arrangement of sentences and paragraphs.

**Hypothesis Two**

*Sudanese EFL graduate students face logical organization problems in writing an English expository text.*

To examine this hypothesis, statistical results of Tables 5.4 and 5.5 below will be taken into account.

**Table (5.4): English writing test’s result based on logical organization problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction has a clear topic sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction contains a controlling idea of the whole topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supporting evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each paragraph has one controlling idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inconsistent paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Random shift of ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unclear conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (5.5): Teachers' opinions on the students' logical organization problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Many Sudanese EFL learners encounter serious problems in producing a well-organized written text in English.</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL learners usually find it difficult to write a meaningful topic sentence.</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>When Sudanese EFL learners engage in English writing, their introductions seem to be too long.</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>36.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The opening paragraph of most Sudanese EFL learners fails to include the controlling idea of the whole topic.</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>69.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>When writing a paragraph in English, most Sudanese EFL learners’ topic sentences lack supporting evidence.</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>72.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL learners usually include more than one central idea in one English paragraph.</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>A great number of Sudanese EFL writers shift randomly from one idea to another, making the whole text sounds inconsistent.</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>118.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>When writing in English, most Sudanese EFL writers concentrate on mechanics and grammar rather than on writing as a process of different stages.</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>A lot of Sudanese EFL writers find it difficult to make a clear conclusion.</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>67.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates the results are significant at 5%
As shown in Table 5.4, the majority of the students (70.0%) were able to state clearly a topic sentence in their introductory paragraphs. In other words, only 30% of their essays were found to be without clear topic sentences. In fact, sometimes a topic sentence can be stated in the middle or end of a paragraph, but when it is placed in the beginning, it will aid the readers to follow both order and unity of the paragraph easily. However, what has been noticed in the students’ written work is that some of them did not tend to state their topic sentences in the introduction since they were already aware of the topic, i.e. according to instructions given, they have to choose one topic to write on it. Thus, their introductory paragraphs look well as all sentences pertain to the topic. In contrast, suppose that the reader has no idea about such instructions, then, he/she may not be able to identify the topic sentence.

As presented in Table 5.5, almost 83% of the respondents agree that Sudanese EFL graduate students usually find it difficult to write a meaningful topic sentence when composing an English expository text. Given this, it would be fair to say that this difficulty seems to have made the students to write too long introductory paragraphs when engaging in English writing. The following three extracts, which have been chosen from the students' English writing test, indicate the problem of a clear topic sentence in introductory paragraphs:

18-I'm very glad to address you this morning to tell you about the title above mentioned which is very important for the human being nowadays (C16).

19-I chose this topic because it's has a big influence in my life. I worked for Arab Authority for agriculture and development for five months and half,
and when this crisis happened, the organization was obliged to dismiss some of employees and I was one of them (B14).

20-I was so excited the moment that the invigistators announced that we should put the pens down at the last session of the Sudanese secondary certificate. I could say it was a moment of highly mixed feelings, delight, fear, hesitation, and hope (B27).

In the above examples, the students were asked to write about the importance of intercultural communication, the impact of the recent global economic crisis on people's life and the university life respectively (see 4.2.3.2). It is evident that these introductory paragraphs lack clear topic sentences, which means that the students are unaware of having a clear topic sentence in written English discourse. For instance, in the case of the first student (C16), there is no indication of what he/she is going to say, and therefore his/her paragraph turns to be a group of words conveying no meaning. Evidently, all the three examples began with a generalization and then rattled on. Such a way of starting a paragraph seems to be very odd, if not unacceptable, to native English speakers, because they are accustomed to be put in the picture explicitly from the very beginning.

Moving on to the problem of a controlling idea of the whole text in the students' written essays, the findings reveal that nearly half (49.1%) of the students could not be able to provide the controlling idea of the whole composition as can be seen in the above extracts (C16, B14, and B27) in which the students violated the concept of overall controlling idea by dumping a group of ideas in one paragraph. Indeed, without a clear controlling idea of the whole text, readers will become distracted for it would be hard to differentiate which of the provided ideas is the central
one. Therefore, it was realized that 79% of the students' essays examined, included more than one controlling idea. That is, only few of their essays were assumed to meet the requirements of a central idea in the development of an English paragraph. In this respect, al- Hassan (2004) maintains that the idea of the paragraph in Arabic seems to be problematic, as it revolves around a series of central ideas some of which might not be developed further. If this is the case, one could contend that possibly most of the students under the study might have been influenced by what al-Hassan suggests: they have been affected by characteristic features of Arabic writing. Moreover, the results of the teachers' questionnaire also show that approximately 76% of the target teachers believe that the opening paragraphs of most Sudanese EFL graduate students fail to include the central idea of the whole text. This opinion, of course, supports the students' writing test results, which have been discussed above that the students seem to lack a better understanding of the role of a controlling idea in English writing.

Generally speaking, what has been noticed in the students' English writing test is that it is very difficult to identify the main central idea in their paragraphs as they include a series of thoughts almost on equal basis, i.e. each paragraph tends to describe a certain point of view.

One of the apparent results of the study is that most of the students have produced inconsistent paragraphs. In other words, only 25% of them were found to have written meaningful paragraphs in English and accordingly, it can be argued that such inconsistent instances of paragraph organization may be attributed to their misunderstanding of the essence of a paragraph in English writing. Most of them did not care about the logical
sequence of the paragraphs: they only put emphasis on the quantity of the paragraphs. However, contrary to the researcher's prediction, the findings indicate that the students faced fewer problems in terms of providing evidence in a paragraph development. In this regard, 63% of them were able to develop the topic sentence of the paragraph by employing various rhetorical strategies of paragraph expansion such as exemplification, elaboration, inductive/deductive methods, analogies, and so forth. Nevertheless, although most of the students succeeded in providing supporting information when developing the paragraphs, many of them appeared to have problems of random shift of ideas. To illustrate this claim, consider the following extracts taken randomly from the students' English writing test:

21-WHO has distributed a regular circulars to announce about this disease. So that the government should take action, the Sudanese economy has influenced by this disease. Many cases have diagnosed in Khartoum and other States. To some extent they have fought some cases. Any way, it isn't the first time for RVF to appear in Sudan. It is appeared in early seventies. Swine Flu if we look at the dictionary, swine means disgust, it is something filthy and dirty. They have launched the name recently for the pig. The first case has announced in Mexico then Cuba then some of South American countries (A1).

22-But the disadvantages of the life in the cities it depend on few pointes as discipline of children out of schools and related with bad street boies, and corruption, watching bad cunal (shops) in TV and feed the society by bad habits and traditional of ather community and the educational, economic, cultural, religion crisis that effected the forgen world.

Therefore, air pollution of industrial areas in the cities is also disadvantages of living in big cities and interference religones, and
traditional and habits is effected each other from time to time. also it changing generation dynamically and also people of cities they cannot help each other because their life depend on individual life they do not look after their relatives as in rural area (C3).

In common sense, the rhetorical technique of ideas' consistency is considered to be fundamental in the organization of any written text. Yet, the above examples show that the students exhibited problems of random shift of ideas while writing their English expository texts. As for the first student (A1), she/he started the paragraph with the WHO's warning against the disease without specifying what type of disease is. Then, the writer abruptly slipped into the point of Sudanese economy's influence due to this disease, also without giving any details that in what way it has been affected. Moving into the phrase 'they have fought (fought) some cases', one may wonder what the pronoun ‘they’ refers to: to WHO authority, or the government officials, or Khartoum State authorities. Moreover, just before the end of the paragraph, the writer managed to define the disease. In fact, it would have been better if such a definition had been provided in the beginning of the paragraph, because it would make the reader to feel that the ideas are united and understandable.

Similarly, indicators of a random shift of ideas can be seen in the second student's (C3) extract. For example, apart from many unforgivable grammatical errors, the student started the paragraph by listing disadvantages of living in a big city, but his/her random arrangement of ideas made the whole paragraph looks vague, especially when the words education, religion, economy, and cultures have been considered as aspects of disadvantage. That is to say, no one would imagine that these aspects
turn to be disadvantages of living in a big city. Further, the student started the second paragraph by a rhetorical pattern of cause: an adverbial conjunctive 'therefore'. Apparently, it seems that this conjunctive has been misused as there is no an explicit relationship between this paragraph and its predecessor, i.e. the air pollution is a result of already mentioned factors in the previous paragraph. Nevertheless, those factors have nothing to do with the air pollution. Moreover, it is also very difficult to predict what the student means by "also it changing generation dynamically and also people of cities........)". So, the pronoun 'it' does not make any sense as it may refer to the air pollution, or a big city, or interaction of religions, or even the tradition. Broadly speaking, it can be argued that Sudanese EFL graduate students faced difficulties in presenting their ideas consistently, the reason why readers may get confused as the ideas seem to be fragmented in their sequential order.

The final problem of logical organization to be investigated is an 'unclear conclusion'. Just as the importance of a clear introduction, a clear conclusion also plays an essential role in one's written text's meaning. In other words, a clear conclusion will speak for itself, because it will encourage the reader to be satisfied with the overall meaning of the text. Relatively, the findings of the results indicate that 70% of the students encountered difficulties when concluding their essays. Also, as table 5.5 shows, 65% of the teachers think that a lot of Sudanese EFL graduate students find it difficult to make a clear conclusion. Here are some examples pertaining to instances of unclear conclusions in the students' written test.

23-The topic is very interesting but we lack time and it is my first day as a teacher in my school so I stop here (A12).
24- University life is different in tier attention and way of study (A20).

25- Big city's advantages reflects its disadvantages for example, technology waste time (B12).

26- In conclusion I can say, it is the responsibility of parents to take care of their children to live a better life, not only to imitate others but to teach them about the culture. An if you work hard, life is not difficult in the city, with your many (may be he/she mean money) you can overcome all types or kind of difficulties that would face you. If you are a hard worker or a prise person you can end up a thief or a street boy/girl. And there many of them in big cities (C1).

Based on the analysis of the above examples, the students' conclusions seem to be mysterious and incomplete, especially examples 23, 24 and 25. Similarly, in example 26, while the student was inclining to draw a conclusion, he/she jumped to talk about a new idea: a hard work and its related consequences. Quite simply, one could say that Sudanese EFL graduate students seemed to have very little knowledge about how to draw an apposite conclusion when writing an English expository text. That is, although it was observed that some of them have produced well written texts in terms of body, but they failed to give effective conclusions.

5.4 Cohesion Problems

As it has been noted earlier (see 2.4 and 3.3), cohesion is considered to be one of the key criteria in the examination of a written text. Therefore, this part attempts to examine the extent to which Sudanese EFL graduate students lack appropriate knowledge of English cohesive devices when writing an expository text. To achieve this purpose, percentages of correctly used cohesive ties will be reported: by putting the number of each cohesive
tie used by all the students over the total number of different cohesive ties used by all the students and then multiplying by one hundred as shown below:

Total number of each cohesive tie used by all the students \( \times 100 \)

Total number of different cohesive ties used by all the students

Moreover, besides discussion of rightly used cohesive ties, cases of misused cohesive ties will also be dealt with based on some of the students' writing samples. Basically, this part is categorized into two main sections: grammatical cohesion problems and lexical cohesion problems.

**Hypothesis Three**

*Lack of cohesion knowledge characterizes Sudanese EFL graduate students' English expository writing performance.*

To discuss this hypothesis, the following two Tables will be considered.

**Table (5.6): Frequencies and percentages of cohesive ties used by the students in English writing test.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Grammatical cohesive ties</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal reference</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>15.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrative reference</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comparative reference</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>15.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nominal substitution</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Grammatical cohesive ties</td>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Verbal substitution</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clausal substitution</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nominal ellipsis</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Verbal ellipsis</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clausal ellipsis</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Additive conjunctions</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Causal conjunctions</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Temporal conjunctions</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adversative conjunctions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Synonyms</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Antonyms</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hyponyms</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>3862</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (5.7): Teachers’ opinions on the students’ cohesion problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% Strongly agree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% No opinion</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Cohesion is a very difficult task for most Sudanese EFL writers.</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91.2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Many Sudanese EFL learners find it difficult in using referents when writing in English.</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I usually find it difficult to realize instances of substitution and ellipsis in Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The bulk of Sudanese EFL learners feel confused with the usage of English connectors.</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>127.7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Many Sudanese EFL learners overuse English connectors when writing in English.</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>55.0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>When writing in English, a considerable number of Sudanese EFL writers experience problems in using collocations.</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>78.7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners do not use Lexical cohesion aspects such as repetition, synonymy, antonym and hyponymy.</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>76.1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>General-specific and part-whole relations tend to be absent in most Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>45.0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates the results are significant at 5%
5.4.1 Grammatical Cohesion Problems

Grammatical cohesion problems which will be investigated in this study include reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. To begin with the problems of reference cohesive ties, the results indicate that of the three references examined, the students seemed to have more problems in using demonstrative references. That is, only 9.53% of them were able to use this type of cohesive tie appropriately. In terms of personal and comparative references, the findings reveal that there were no significant differences in the use of these two references, i.e. in both cases nearly 16% of the students were found to have employed proper personal and comparative references. In general, these percentages show that the students lack proficiency in the use of reference cohesive ties despite the fact that references are assumed to be the most common ones as compared to other types of cohesive devices.

It is worth noting that while rating the students' English writing test, many of them were found to be unaware of the function of exophoric reference, which needs one to refer to knowledge outside the text. Mohamed and Omer (2000), for instance, attribute Arab EFL learners' problems in using references to the fact that Arabic sometimes employs a pronoun as a cohesive device even if it has more than possible referent, and therefore, an Arabic reader tends to use contextual intermediaries to specify the intended referent of the pronoun. On the other hand, native English speakers, in most instances, use a pronoun as a reference aspect only if it has one possible referent. More importantly, in the case of two possible referents that can be referred to by the same pronominal type, an English writer repeats the noun to avoid ambiguity in indicating the intended
referent (ibid). Below is an example of one of the target students’ EFL writing technique indicating misuse of cohesive ties:

27-University life require specific requirements needs more responsibility, and more attention for their study, and I think firstly the student need to prepare himself before enter the university in their secondary school must try to culture himself must learn how to read before go to the university the student must discover himself his ability, their choices musn't be randomly, just according to their degree in secondary school, simple because it effect their study and emotion in the university (A20).

Apart from many grammatical errors, one can also add that the above example lacks a clear sequence of semantic relations due to misuse of some cohesive devices. As a result of this misuse, it is apparent that a reader may find it difficult to follow the flow of ideas with ease. For instance, the first pronoun 'their', it is not known if it has been used as a cataphoric reference to refer to the student. Thus, if it is so, the noun 'student' should have been used in plural (i.e. students), but what is bizarre here is that the noun 'student' has been used in singular. In general, the writer randomly used pronouns such as “their”, “himself” and “his” without paying consideration to identification of the antecedents.

As shown in Table 5.7, the teachers' questionnaire results show that almost 73% of the respondents agree that a lot of Sudanese EFL graduate students are unaware of most English cohesive ties. Interestingly enough, their standpoint appears to be consistent with the outcome of the results of the students' writing test analysis.

In regard to substitution cohesive ties, as demonstrated in Table 5.6, there are no significant differences in the use of correct substitutions.
Typically, the three types (nominal, verbal & clausal) look to be similar in percentages: nearly 6% of the students were found to be able to use these substitutions adequately in their written English texts. Yet, compared to reference cohesive ties, the findings signal that the students seemed to have a low level of proficiency in the use of substitutions.

Table 5.6 also shows that there are very few occurrences of elliptic instances in the students' English writing test. That is, only 2% of the students were able to use nominal and clausal ellipses, whereas nearly 3% of them used verbal ellipsis. To discuss this problem in a more detailed way, consider the following samples extracted randomly from one of the target students' English writing test:

28-Therefore, such people prefer living in big cities whereas recreation facilities are available. Putting in mind, the Western country or specially the londonian ones, services are expensive to a variety of reasons (B6).

29-Whatever it is, view differ. Some are fond of urban areas while other see the opposite aspect (B6).

It can be noticed that there is evidence of ellipsis in the above samples: "ones" in the first sample and "other" in the second one. Nevertheless, guessing the student's apparent purpose in the first sample, one cannot be able to interpret promptly these elliptical instances. In other words, one may anticipate that the student attempts to compare the kinds of facilities that can be found in some of the Western countries' cities including London, i.e. London city services. Also, another possible assumption is that the student may tend to compare the preferences of the Western countries' inhabitants including Londoners. Thus, although the student has practiced an instance of ellipsis, but due to its vagueness, one
cannot be able to give a clear cut answer about the main target of the writer. Coming to the second example, one can argue that it would be more meaningful and consistent if the student could have used the nominal ellipsis' element "other" in plural, i.e. "others", because that would lead the reader to obtain the message effortlessly. Generally, the students' low usage of ellipses may either be attributed to the fact that they find it difficult to practice this stylistic characteristic in their English writing; or they may see it unnecessary to show instances of ellipsis and even substitution, but the latter prognosis is more probable. This in mind, some researchers (e.g. McCarthy, 1991) suggest that, to some extent, ellipsis is a writer's choice and not a compelling feature. However, despite such an argument, the researcher thinks that ellipsis and substitution are necessary rhetorical techniques of English writing as they help writers avoid redundancy and produce quality writing. Even in terms of teachers' responses, it was realized that more than half of the respondents demonstrate that they find it hard to trace instances of ellipsis in Sudanese EFL students' English written texts. Further, their responses support my assumption that the target students lack sufficient knowledge of English ellipsis cohesive ties.

As for the conjunctions, the results indicate that there are significant differences between the four categories examined. More than 9% of the students' essays rated, included correct additive conjunctions, while only 4.17% of causal conjunctions were accurately employed by the students. Evidently, the logical connector ‘and’ was found to be the most used cohesive conjunction to the extent that sometimes a sense of redundancy or confusion is created. As mentioned earlier, this might confirm that these students seemed to have been influenced by Arabic rhetorical pattern (٥)
"wa", which is similar to 'and' in English. Moreover, Table 5.6 shows that the students appeared to have very little knowledge about the use of both temporal and adversative conjunctions. In other words, their EFL writing test's results provide that approximately 3% of them prudently employed temporal conjunctions, while only 0.73% of them used adversative ones. To have a clear idea about this type of writing problem, let us examine the following two extracts taken from the students' English writing test:

30-So, during the time of university many things is going to face you as a students. **However**, you are actually going to meet new faces from different places, and **otherwise** you are also going to meet new cultures and traditions that you ever seen in your hall life (C 10).

31-The term 'city' refers to a big town which has qualifications **rather** than others, such as Khartoum city (A25).

The first extract shows that although the student attempts to use a proper adversative (i.e. however), but there is no any relationship between the sentence that begins with this adversative (however) and the first sentence which begins with 'so, during the time of ......'). That is, one may fall into a trap that the student is going to offer a contrastive idea, but the reality is that the two sentences seem to incorporate the same idea: things a university student may face them. Furthermore, the same student tends to use the contrastive adversative 'otherwise', but still there is no tendency for a contrast between the two ideas or things. With regard to the second example, despite the fact that the student managed to use a correction adversative 'rather,' but he/she failed to provide the other side of the picture: the reader may not, but actually, cannot be able to guess what the phrase "than others" stands for. So, it is clear that adversatives are assumed
to be the most problematic area which has been noticed in the students' English writing performance test. That is, almost two in five students' essays rated, lacked most types of adversative conjunctions such as contrastive, correction and dismissal.

To sum up, of the four grammatical cohesive ties investigated, the results show that adversative conjunctions are the most daunting problems that faced the target students followed by ellipsis, substitutions and reference respectively.

5.4.2 Lexical Cohesion Problems

Broadly speaking, lexical cohesion is thought to be necessary in written English discourse since it provides how lexical cohesive relations operate in the text structure. Thus, this section intends to shed light on the Sudanese EFL graduate students' ability in using lexical cohesion elements when composing an English expository text. Table 5.6 indicates that the target students experienced problems in the use of repetition and antonym cohesive ties: there are no significant differences in the use of these two categories. Comparatively, synonyms and hyponyms were less used, that is, nearly 3% of the students were able to use these two cohesive ties. Of course, one can say that the students lack rich vocabulary, which enables them to use lexical items interchangeably in terms of semantic equivalents and opposites.

Moreover, the reason why most of the target students faced problems in the use of hyponyms is that, as noticed in their essays, most of them confused between inductive and deductive relations. In other words, many of them tended to start a paragraph with a part-whole sense and
suddenly jump to a whole-part relation, which, no doubt, will affect readers' progression of ideas. Relatively, responses to the teachers' questionnaire show that many Sudanese EFL graduate students rarely use lexical cohesion items of repetition, synonymy, antonym and hyponymy. In addition, more than half of the teachers also claim that hyponymy-hypernymy relations appear to be absent in most Sudanese EFL writing contexts. So, once again it could be said that there is a consistency between the students' EFL writing results and the questionnaire's results. In conclusion, the ratio of correctly used cohesive ties is very small compared to the number of words used by each student in the writing test, which indicates that the majority of the students lack a better understanding of cohesive elements.

5.5 Coherence Problems

As achieving coherence in English writing is one of the most tedious problems that face most EFL/ESL learners, this part tends to investigate Sudanese EFL graduate students' English writing difficulties in terms of text's overall unity of ideas. It is worth noting that similar procedural steps which have been taken in 5.3 will also be adopted here in order to calculate the frequency of occurrences and percentages of coherence elements which are supposed to be examined. That is, the calculation of coherence elements will be as follows:

\[
\text{Total number of each coherence aspects used by all the students} \times 100
\]

Total number of different coherence aspects used by all the students
Hypothesis Five

Lack of coherence knowledge characterizes Sudanese EFL graduate students' English expository writing performance.

To thoroughly highlight the results of this hypothesis, interpretations of the following two Tables 5.8 and 5.9 will be taken into consideration.

Table (5.8): Coherence aspects examined in the students' English writing test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Coherence aspect</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Verb-noun agreement</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appropriate use of subordinates</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appropriate use of commas and semicolons</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of transitional expressions</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>15.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Necessary repetition</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consistent parallelism</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Literal translation</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>24.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (5.9): Teachers’ opinions on the students’ coherence problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Sudanese English writing usually lacks verb and pronoun agreement.</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>118.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL graduate students find it difficult to use subordinate clauses in English writing.</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners are unaware of transitional words and phrases in English writing.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>English expository texts written by Sudanese EFL graduate students often lack necessary repetition of key words and phrases.</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>124.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL graduate students often miss or misuse commas and semicolons when writing in English.</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>41.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL graduate students tend to translate when writing in English.</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL written work usually lacks parallel constructions within sentences.</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners have not been taught functions of coherence in English writing.</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates the results are significant at 5%
The above Table (5.8) shows that significant differences in terms of coherence aspects can be identified in the target students' English writing test. Apparently, of the seven coherence aspects examined, the results indicate that the students experienced great difficulties in dealing with both necessary repetition and consistent parallelism. Indeed, repeating the key words or phrases is recommended in EFL expository writing, but when this repetition exceeds its usual limits, it becomes indifferent and boring. So, what has been observed in the writing test is that although most of them inclined toward too much repetition, only less than 5% of them were found to be able to repeat the key words or phrases. By the same token, the findings of the questionnaire also reveal that quite a significant number of the respondents (88.2%) agree that English expository essays written by Sudanese EFL students often lack necessary repetition of principal words and phrases.

As noted earlier (cf. 5.3.2), the students' unintentional instances of repetition can be referred to Arabic rhetorical techniques' influence. For example, Connor (1996) asserts that an Arabic written text includes ideas that can be developed through patterns of repetition in the sense of coreference of the theme repeated in sentence after sentence, in addition to repetition of words. Given the target students' L1 writing techniques impact, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to differentiate between cases of necessary and redundant repetitions, as a result of which the whole written prose may turn to be a heap of unrelated sentences and paragraphs and thus, creating a situation of tautology.

Evidence of poor parallelism was also seen in most of the students' written essays. That is, nearly 5% of them have succeeded in formulating
consistent parallel structures within and between the sentences to give a rhythmic movement between ideas. In general, parallelism can be perceived as not so essential as other grammatical factors such as subject–verb agreement in English writing, but it helps writers handle their sentences in the process of composing. However, what has been noticed in the target students' written essays is that they lack elements with which writers normally introduce parallel clauses, i.e. such as 'not only.....but also, neither...nor, either...or, not....but', etc. To illustrate some cases of nonparallelism in the students' writing test, consider the following examples:

32-I found myself in the last year very busy with researches and projects, we become small group at the last year seeing students struggling in their academic work and leaving university because they failed in exam and subexam (B27).

33-Any way I enjoy myself in that time in my university and we worked a lot to succeed (A30).

34-Above of that there are a lot of factories which it leads to pollution which it made a lot of people search fresh air (A52).

In the above examples, the students violated one of the basic notions of parallelism that the same word forms (e.g. verbs, adjectives, nouns) should be repeated in the same manner to give the same meaning. Nevertheless, what is evident in the three examples is that the students failed to follow the same tense pattern and consequently, a reader may feel a sense of disunity between the clauses. For instance, in the case of the first student (B27), he/she mentioned that last year he/she was busy with research and project, but the parallel clause is in the present simple tense,
so there is a kind of illogical shift of tense, which causes incoherence. Similar poor parallel constructions can be noticed in the other two examples: 28 and 29. As for the findings of the questionnaire in this regard, it was found that more than 74% of the respondents believe that Sudanese EFL written discourse often lacks consistent parallel constructions within the sentences. Thus, there is also a strong correlation between the teachers' viewpoints and the findings of the students' English writing test.

The third most frequent coherence problem appeared in the students' writing analysis was tense and noun agreement. If one must say the obvious, only 18% of the target students were found to be able to show verb-noun agreement symmetry in the English writing test. As such, it can be argued that although noun-verb agreement is one of the simplest phenomena of discourse, whether written or spoken, many Sudanese EFL graduate students failed to cope with this phenomenon. In fact, despite the fact that some researchers (e.g. Salebi, 2004 & Espada-Gustilo, 2009) contend that noun-verb agreement is a grammatical factor, I see it also as a signal of overall coherence in written discourse. Hall (1985), for instance, thinks that "if verbs supply the energy that makes prose go, nouns are the body of prose. Without nouns, as he argues, nothing would be doing the going". Adding to what Hall argues, one could argue that what can be said about nouns also can be said about verbs. In a way, a bond of consistency must be made available between these two important categories so as a meaningful message can be understood. In terms of the questionnaire's results, almost 81% of the teachers attribute Sudanese EFL graduate students' coherence problems in English writing to lack of tense and noun agreement. However,
to prove these claims, let us consider some extracts from the students' English expository writing test:

35- A big city have negative side and positive side concern with advantages of a big city clearly. There are many positive side. So a big city like central of Khartoum we can see different universities which have library, second there are many different types of colleges different students from various states so you can benefited from each other (A22).

36- These town has advantage and disadvantage, from its advantage its very easy for the people to fulfill any kind of social scheme in limit period by assisting themselves, also the ideas of people who are living in the town is very good and that assist in progressing and to be advanced in each field (C17)

37- People always lives in cities, towns, villages or even they are nomads moving from place to place.

38- Although a big cities have several advantages it has many disadvantages, as a matter of fact cities inhabitants are suffering from accidents which kill tens of people on bus as a daily programme.

Considering these samples, it appears that the students' biggest difficulty, the elephant in the dining room, of noun-verb agreement is mainly centered on the third person situations. However, besides that, it has been found that the students encountered some difficulties in the relationship between verbs, pronouns and adjectives. Of course, in discussing some of the previous parts of the study, we have attributed the contributing reasons for the target students' English writing problems to the styles governing Arabic writing. Yet, what can be seen here is that apart from some instances of adjective-noun order of Arabic found in some of the students' essays, there is no much Arabic interference. In the light of this, one could conclude
that the students' inability of noun-verb agreement might be due to a lack of understanding the basic grammatical rules of English language. Another possible reason is that the students might consider such errors as trivial reflections of any written discourse, and therefore do not assign much attention to them, but in reality they are at the center of the text meaning – they might stray a reader from understanding the major theme of the written text. Finally, it seems that the students are unaware of English collocational relations, especially those (seven patterns) suggested by Lewis (2000): adjective + noun, verb + noun, noun + noun, verb + adverb, adverb + adjective, adjective + preposition, and phrasal verb. Naturally, adequate knowledge of these relations would help writers overcome most problems of faulty predication and verb-noun agreement in general.

As for the appropriate usage of subordination, the findings of the study indicate that most of the students did find it difficult to balance between the ideas of the main and subordinate clauses, which in turn led to incoherent set of sentences muddling up readers' minds. Generally speaking, the main focus here is to scrutinize the extent to which the target students have been able to maintain logical relationships that exist between the dependent clause and independent, because using incorrect subordinating conjunctions could detract from the sentence unity. Thus, the writing test results show that 11.12% of the students used subordination to specify the relative significance of parts of sentences. In other words, they chose the subordinating conjunctions that are relevant to the relationship (paratactic & hypotactic) between the two clauses. In terms of the questionnaire, the results indicate that 81% of the respondents agree that many Sudanese EFL learners exhibit problems when using subordinate
clauses in English writing. To testify some areas of the target students' shortcomings in using logical subordination, consider the following excerpts:

39- (Illogical) Although people are different, they are in need of communication (A 14).

(Logical) Because people are different, they are in need of communication (shows reason or cause).

40- (Illogical) Living in city opens the way for many people to see different cultural and traditional of other nations, because many people from other countries come to cities as tourism or other purpose (A 21).

(Logical) Living in a city opens the way for many people to see different cultural and traditional activities of other nations whereas many people from other countries come to cities for tourism and other purposes (shows contrast).

41- (Illogical) Though several services are accessible, but problems are existing (B6).

(Logical) Though several services are accessible, problems are still existing (shows contrast).

42- (Illogical) Because university life include all kind of the societies and collected in one place and you can introduce yourself with them (C15).

(Logical) Because university life includes all kinds of societies collected in one place, you can introduce yourself to them (shows reason or cause).

Generally speaking, apart from subordinating conjunctions that signal contrast and cause relations, other subordinators were found to be very rare in the students' English writing test. In fact, most of the students have used coordinating conjunctions such ('and', 'but' and 'yet') instead of using
subordinating conjunctions. This is, as stated earlier, because Arab EFL learners are influenced by an excessive use of coordinating conjunctions.

Another coherence problem that has been noticed in the students' English writing test is that most of them were not able to use transitional expressions to create coherence and consistency in their English writing. Therefore, the results indicate that only 15.65% of the students were able to employ correct transitional words in order to show relationships among ideas and sentences. At the same time, respondents (82.8%) of the questionnaire observe that most Sudanese EFL students are unaware of the role of transitional words and phrases in English writing. Again, there is congruence between the two results (questionnaire and writing test) that the students exhibited poor command of transitional expressions in written English communication. To illustrate an example of absence of transitions in the students' English writing test, consider the following extract:

43-The university is a place where you can taste different spice, views and options. And the only one thing that made me unhappy the first year that seniors used Barloum which means new student, and it has another meaning "silly", however the first year passed quickly and we moved to the second year with a lot of discontinued students the thing that made me confident to score high marks. I became popular and well known and knew more friends and we established small society involved in many occasions like welcoming new students or a cultural programme then life become sweet. Exams was a nightmare for the other but for me it was an entertainment.

Generally I knew how thing was going on in the university and what did I want to be in future. So I sticked to the library reading references in social science and politics beside my specialized study. Time was running quickly and suddenly I
found myself in the last year very busy with researches and projects, we become small group at the last year seeing students struggling in their academic work and leaving university because they failed in exam and subexam, when I finished my studies successfully and the time of graduation come and I was hoppy and proud.

I experienced a vivid and active life at the university, and if I could turn the hand of time I would return it, but no chance we have to go on in our life and I missed that life (B27).

Obviously, there is a lack of transitions between the sentences of the above extract. For example, after the first sentence in the first paragraph, the writer could have used a clarification transition (e.g. that is, in other words, that is to say, etc.) to explain in what way the university life is different. Having done that, the writer could have also employed an emphasis transition (e.g. in fact, indeed, etc.) to link the second sentence's (in the first paragraph) idea to the previous one. Also, prior to the sentence ‘I became popular', a result transition can be used to tell that due unpleasant incidents which took place in the first year, the writer turned to become unhappy. Moreover, the end of the first paragraph can be developed as a separate paragraph, and therefore to be preceded by a contrast transition. For the most part, in the remaining two paragraphs, there are only three transitions (and, so, and because) between the sentences. In reality, this number seems to be small compared to the total number of words used in these two paragraphs. Based on these results, it can be said that Sudanese EFL graduate students face problems when using transitional expressions in English writing.

The appropriate use of commas and semicolons was also found to be one of the serious problems that Sudanese EFL graduate students
encountered in their English writing. Only 21.16% of them used commas and semicolons properly. Again, this percentage indicates that the majority of the target students lack a better understanding of punctuation aspects in English writing, namely commas and semicolons, which would enhance their overall writing coherence, and therefore enable the readers to pursue the flow of ideas.

Broadly speaking, punctuation can be considered as an element of textual cohesion that plays an important role in determining the meaning of a text. Minelli (2005), for example, suggests that punctuation acts at the syntactical, semantic and pragmatic levels, all of which are believed to attain both the cohesion and coherence (to some extent) of the text.

As reflected in Table 5.9, more than half of the respondents confirm that Sudanese EFL graduate students often miss or misuse commas and semicolons when writing in English. Considering this, one can also add that while rating the students' English writing test, it became evident that the students are unaware of most English punctuation marks. That is to say, in some occasions one cannot identify the controlling idea of a paragraph due to the random use of several sentences without using punctuation marks. For more details in this regard, consider the following examples taken from the students' writing test:

44-On the other hand living in big cities has its advantages. As a matter of fact always big shopping centers are found in big cities (A2).

45-Secondly big cities associated with different crims. In other words you can't live or even move savelly (A47)).
46- In conclusion I can say, it's the responsibility of parents, to take care of children to live a better life, not only to imitate others but to teach them about the culture (C1).

47- The most important reason for this is to avoid pollution. First environmental pollution; where they can have fresh healthy air (A2).

48- In spite of this easy, and excellent standard of living, and high quality of life there are disadvantages: cities are crowded because of traffic number of cars and people(B13).

As can be seen in the above examples, the students failed to use commas. Most importantly, after each of the underlined words, a comma should have been used to show parts of the sentences. Surprisingly, some commas were used redundantly by these students, especially in sample 42. In general, what has been noticed in the students' written test is that semicolons were almost rare in addition to the fact that most of them confused between the usage of commas and semicolons as shown in example 43.

Finally, literal translation was also observed to be one of the students' areas of difficulty in terms of coherence attainment in English writing. Thus, the written test results reveal that nearly 25% of the students inclined toward literal translation when writing in English. It has been noticed that many of them although seemed to have reasonable English rhetorical techniques, but their ideas sound Arabic-oriented thinking. That is, most of them first form their ideas in Arabic and then translate them literally rather than semantically into English, which may fail to give a clear picture of the intended meaning. The following examples below show to what extent the
target students have practiced literal translation techniques in their English writing.

49- University life is a great life and all the students wish to enjoy it because no ignorance there and all the students wants to be friends and works hardly so as to gain high marks and graduate (C18).

50- And it is bad if you are dismissed in the University for the Academic Problems. You will get yourself in between people who are educated and those are not educated this type can cause the problem for social life of society in general (A16).

51- In the university you can deal the political issues and you can explain your idea about these issues you must be a responsible about what you said and what you did. No one will help you if you send to prison if you arrested and no one will lost his academic future other than you (B29).

Looking at the above examples, one could not believe his/her eyes that EFL learners at M.A. and postgraduate diploma levels majoring in English or translation would write such rambling pieces of English writing. So, this provides that because of an insufficient command of English language, they are unable to demonstrate their thoughts in English. To compensate this gap, they tend to think first in Arabic and then translate what has been thought into English writing, which will negatively affect the overall coherence of the written text.

All in all, the bulk of the target students seemed to have exhibited serious difficulties in achieving coherence when writing in English. Accordingly, more than half of the respondents of the questionnaire attribute Sudanese EFL students' failure to achieve coherence in English
writing to the fact that most of them have not been taught functions of coherence in written discourse.

5.6 Overall English Writing Performance of the Target Students

The main target of this part is to see if there are substantial differences in terms of English writing problems between the students who involved in the study, i.e. M.A English, M.A. translation and postgraduate diploma students majoring in English.

Hypothesis Five

There are significant differences between the M.A and postgraduate diploma students in terms of English writing problems.

To verify this hypothesis, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been used to compare the average performance of the three levels. In addition, a post-hoc analysis has been carried out to determine the differences between the three levels in terms of each writing problem's aspect. To begin with the overall writing performance differences, let us consider Table 5.10 and Figure 5.1 below.

Table (5.10): Average performance of the students in English writing test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A. English</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>56.85</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>23.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Translation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>55.10</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>26.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma in English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>47.21</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>25.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>53.94</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>25.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.10 and Figure 5.1 above show that there are no significant differences between M.A. English students and M.A. translation students in terms of overall English writing performance. For example, it can be noticed that the highest mark in the former group is (86), while in the latter is (82). Even in terms of difference in mean, it seems no major differences can be noticed, i.e. 56.85 for the M.A. English students and 55.10 for the M.A. translation students. Absence of differences in performance between these two groups can be accounted for the fact that the two levels appear to be a homogeneous group of Sudanese EFL graduate students majoring in English and translation who are believed to face similar second language problems, in particular writing ones. Yet, significant differences were found between all M.A. students (English + translation) as one group and postgraduate diploma students whose average mean is 47.21. Further, Table 5.10 reveals that the coefficient of variation (CV) indicator proves that M.A. translation students have maintained the highest relative variation: 26.42 compared to other groups.
To test differences between the three groups in terms of each writing problem's aspect, consider Tables 5.11, 5.12, 5.13, 5.14, 5.15 and 5.16 below.

Table (5.11): ANOVA test indicating differences between the students based on Arabic interference problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between the Groups</td>
<td>500.986</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250.493</td>
<td>9.228</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Groups</td>
<td>2904.432</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3405.418</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (5.12) Tukey test indicating differences between the students based on Arabic interference problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha= .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. English students</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Translation students</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate diploma students majoring in English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td></td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (5.13): ANOVA test indicating differences between the students based on logical organization problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between the Groups</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Groups</td>
<td>114.795</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115.355</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (5.14): ANOVA test indicating differences between the students based on cohesion problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between the Groups</td>
<td>17.259</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.630</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Groups</td>
<td>15273.431</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>142.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15290.691</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11 shows that there are significant differences between the three groups in terms of Arabic interference problems. In other words, the F-value, which is 9.228 along with the P-value, which is 0.009 indicate that significant differences can be found between the three levels. Equally, in Table 5.12, Tukey analysis results show that differences can be noticed
among the three levels. That is, these differences can be proved by the fact that the harmonic mean for the M.A. English students is 8.51, for the M.A. translation students is 11.21 and for the postgraduate diploma students majoring in English is 13.64. Furthermore, Tables 5.13 and 5.14 indicate that there are no significant differences between the three levels both in terms of logical organization problems and cohesion problems. This is because in both cases the significance values are greater than 0.05. :941 and.771 respectively. That is, if P-value is greater than significance level (0.05), the null hypothesis is accepted and vice versa.

**Table (5.15): ANOVA test indicating Differences between the students based on coherence problems in English writing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between the Groups</td>
<td>518.259</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>259.130</td>
<td>6.656</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the Groups</td>
<td>4165.959</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38.934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4684.218</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (5.16) Tukey test indicating differences between the students based on coherence problems in English writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha= .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A. English students</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Translation students</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate diploma students majoring in English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.39 16.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig,</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 shows that significant differences can be found between the three groups in terms of coherence problems. That is, F-value (6.656) and significance value (.002) are evident indicators of differences between the groups: since the P-value is less than (0.05), thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Moreover, in Table 5.16 Tukey analysis results provide that there are significant differences between the three groups in terms of coherence problems, especially the difference is more apparent between M.A. English students and M.A. translation students: the average difference between them is 5.24.

5.7 Reading-Writing Relationship and Rhetorical Techniques Improvement

The major concern of this part is to see whether a relationship that exists between a wider reading and writing can improve EFL students’ rhetorical strategies when writing an English expository text. Results of this part were entirely drawn from the teachers’ questionnaire responses: to
examine their perceptions of possible connections between EFL reading and Sudanese EFL graduate students' writing performance in terms of rhetorical techniques improvement. Indeed, the researcher tends to verify how far the teachers’ responses are compatible with the students’ writing test results.

**Hypothesis Six**

*Extensive reading improves Sudanese EFL graduate students’ English writing abilities in terms of rhetorical techniques.*

Table (5.17): Teachers' opinions on reading-writing relationships and rhetorical techniques improvement in EFL writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Chi-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>EFL reading familiarizes EFL learners with a better understanding of different genres of writing.</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>86.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Because of EFL reading inability, most Sudanese EFL students face problems in understanding and using English writing strategies.</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners cannot evaluate and analyze English writers’ arguments logically in their English writing.</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>79.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Due to EFL reading inability, most Sudanese EFL writers are unable to understand the ways in which meaning is associated with patterns of text organization.</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>89.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 5.17 above, it seems clear that most Sudanese university EFL teachers (almost 82%) think that EFL reading could enable EFL students to become aware of various genres of writing. That is, when they start reading several types of texts, they come to know the techniques most authors utilized to structure their texts in a variety of disciplines, including literary and non-literary ones. For example, the students might notice that religious texts differ in content and techniques from legal texts; sports articles require a special language than advertisement; military written discourse seems to have a different vocabulary than a medical one; and so
forth. Actually, because of this variation, sometimes students may find it difficult to understand well all types of texts. Yet, what is necessary here is that at least they have to know that different genres have different rhetorical techniques and hence, they have to be fluent in the one (i.e. genre) they intend to engage in, as readers would expect a well-defined lucid message from the writer. In this way, it is true to argue that students can gradually build a background knowledge of different domains (each has unique characteristic features), all of which will be orchestrated to achieve specific goals and meanings. So, exposure to different genres would enable EFL readers to be familiar with a variety of rhetorical strategies, and also to bear in mind that a genre-based writing goes beyond knowledge of vocabulary and grammatical aspects. This means that one has to concentrate more on how often authors compose to convey their message, rather than what they have produced.

According to Swales (2004), postgraduate students’ writing inability might be attributed to a limited knowledge of a genre-based reading. Interestingly, this argument appears to be in line with Bitchener and Basturkmen’s (2006) viewpoint that postgraduate L2 writers face a wide range of problems not only at the sentence and paragraph levels, but also in understanding and meeting the requirements of the discourse genre. Equally, these researchers attempt to provide that there is a positive link between reading ability and writing improvement and therefore, one would say that there is a similarity between their arguments and of the respondents of the current study, i.e. because of reading inability, most Sudanese L2 learners experience difficulties in understanding and applying English writing techniques correctly in their EFL writing.
In the past, the Ministry of Education in Sudan devoted a lot of scholarly attention to EFL reading tasks, particularly in intermediate and secondary schools. Students were induced to read many English literature books and Michel West “readers”: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 at the former level, whereas 6 and 7 at the latter level. So, by the time the students enter university, they are believed to have reasonable background information about ways of writing an English text, i.e. the 'readers', besides other EFL reading materials such as textbooks, novels, journals and newspapers, could have helped them acquired major strategies of expressing themselves in written English communication. That is to say, they find it easy to deal with language features as readers and writers. At present, this is no longer the case, as there is an enormous gap between today’s Sudanese EFL students and their predecessors in the 1950s up to early 1980s when university libraries were crowded with all types of readers: reading for learning, or for interest, or for pleasure. What becomes apparent nowadays is that larger numbers of Sudanese university students tend to desert traditional libraries and rely heavily on lecture notes, or what is commonly known as “sheets". To put it boldly, lecture notes alone cannot and will not enable EFL learners to develop appropriate techniques of L2 writing. Specially, most of these sheets are written in Arabic, and here one can add that each language has its own distinctive cultural features which may influence its speakers when writing in L2. Thus, if Sudanese EFL learners only read Arabic-based materials, no doubt, they will transfer their L1 rhetorical techniques into English writing, which can be perceived as worthless and misleading in terms of meaning and purpose.
Apparently, using literature as an effective tool for teaching various communicative techniques of the target language had become one of the dominant features of English language teaching in Sudan in those days - from the 1950s until early 1980s. Interestingly, even in secondary school certificate exams, English literature had been considered one of the core subjects that qualifies literary-background students for college admission, the reason why many students used English literature to master the target language skills. Therefore, reading English literature books could make them to distinguish a written prose as a whole, rather than a list of individual words or fragmented sentences.

In fact, for many decades prior to the early 1990s, there was general consensus among Arab experts and writers that Cairo writes, Beirut publishes, and Khartoum reads. In other words, Egyptians write, Lebanese publish, and Sudanese read. Nevertheless, given the miserable deterioration of most Arab EFL learners’ language standards, especially in Sudan, over the last twenty-plus years, one would say that today’s generation of EFL learners (majority of them) in most Arab countries are unable neither to read nor to write well. Thus, since they appear to be incompetent readers, it is largely impossible that they can employ the techniques that have been garnered from reading in English writing. Eventually, someone who owns nothing has nothing to offer in the sense that one cannot expect from him/her a rhetorically-based EFL written text. In reality, such an argument leads us to the viewpoint of the majority of the respondents of the questionnaire (99.1%) that due to EFL reading inability, most Sudanese EFL students encounter difficulties in understanding and using English writing techniques.
On the other hand, many respondents (89.1%), believe that good readers can evaluate and analyze Western writers' opinions in a more accepted manner benefiting from cohesive devices acquired in the source texts. Actually, understanding the relevancies among the author’s ideas is extremely important because that would assist EFL students to be acquainted with the techniques of smooth flow of thoughts between sentences and within paragraphs, and hence, that can be applied in their future EFL writing. Of course, this type of application is supposed to be in terms of learning proper techniques of English writing, rather than imitating or paraphrasing other's work.

As noted in 3.5, here also most of the respondents (80.9%) argue that reading is very beneficial to attain cohesion in one’s writing. Accordingly, they predict that because of serious difficulties with reading comprehension, most Sudanese EFL graduate students find it difficult to see how Western writers keep track of cohesiveness. Most probably, their perception in this regard supports what has been discussed in 3.5. Magno (2008), for example, points out that reading strategies enable an individual to learn the necessary framework in enhancing one’s vocabulary, comprehension, spelling, and syntax. Nevertheless, although his suggestions seem to aid readers to become good writers, the current research tends to add a new skill: rhetorical techniques, because Magno’s ideas without awareness of rhetorical techniques may not function attractively in terms of writing mode. So, utilization of rhetorical strategies can provide a strong basis for EFL learners to produce quality writing.

The results of the questionnaire also show that a majority of teachers (78.2%) maintain that due to EFL reading inability, most Sudanese EFL
graduate students appear to be unable to understand the ways in which semantic interpretations are closely associated with strategies of text organization. In essence, clarity of one’s text is normally dependent on the techniques he/she uses to generate and explain the ideas. Thus, taking part in intensive EFL reading tasks, Sudanese EFL graduate students can become aware of how the authors organize their ideas through using correct logical ties. For example, one of the important strategies they may learn is that Western writers tend to employ a linear technique in which the thesis' theme is clearly stated in the beginning, and then backed up with detailed information in the body. Therefore, readers can learn the ways in which other writers attempted to construct and deliver their viewpoints coherently. Thus, as stated above, these readers can adopt the same strategies to formulate and explain their ideas in written communication. Given such benefits of reading, the majority of the respondents (88.2%) agree that EFL reading helps Sudanese EFL graduate students develop their main ideas when writing an English expository text.

Most importantly, the respondents’ views seem to be in line with some experts’ (Lee, 2000 & Esmaeili, 2002) beliefs that reading and writing seem to have similar ways of creating meanings. They suggest that proficiency in one skill, in particular reading, could support perfect performance in the other. Therefore, what the current research’s respondents put can be understood in the sense that readers can make use of most organizational skills gained from reading in their EFL writing tasks.

In general, 77.3% of the respondents claim that due to the importance of reading in EFL writing, they used to discuss several aspects of cohesion and coherence while teaching EFL reading. Similarly, as reading plays a far
important role in EFL students' rhetorical improvement, some of the respondents (70.9%) state that separate teaching of reading and writing will distance Sudanese EFL students from learning social and rhetorical dimensions of English writing. Seemingly, their argument is consistent with Hinkel's (1994, cited in Simpson, 2000:294) idea that "written texts represent a convergence of different stylistic, cultural, religious, ethical, and social notions, all of which comprise written notions and frameworks".

It is true to say that in addition to language strategies, reading embodies social perspectives of particular communities. That is, through reading, EFL learners will know that each society is likely to be distinguished by its values, and beliefs, all of which are reflected in the way they perceive the world – as argued by Whorfian hypothesis. Knowing these perspectives, they (i.e. students) come to understand that written discourse is a more complex phenomenon which is associated with socio-cultural factors. For example, if an Arab EFL employee writes a letter of request to his/her boss who is a native English speaker, he/she has to be conscious that writing is likely related to social perceptions of the recipient. In other words, the employee should not forget that Westerners always would prefer one to be direct, honest and open in what he/she intends to convey, whereas Arab EFL writers incline to use figurative language as a result of socio-cultural influences embedded in Arab societies. That is, from childhood they have been grown to delineate from facing the realities and consequences of their mistakes due to this characteristic social feature. For instance, in terms of political failure in Sudan, Politicians continuously used to put the blame on the colonies for the country's impasse and forgot to recognize that they were and are part of the problem.
Moreover, the responses to the questionnaire indicate that nearly 80% of the teachers disagree with the idea of separating reading and writing skills. Only 3.60% of them stress the necessity of separating the two skills, whereas the rest did not specify their viewpoint. Therefore, it is obvious that most of them favor the notion of handling the two skills simultaneously as that would enable EFL learners to develop communicative competence, especially gaining knowledge about different language functions in various genres.

In truth, in despite the fact that the respondents of the study disclosed that they prefer to integrate the two skills in their EFL classes, but the researcher firmly believes that English Departments in most Sudanese universities rarely relate EFL reading to EFL writing: reading is often taught as a means of knowing new words and expressions. Therefore, as I can see, there is some sort of antithesis between the teachers' perception and the reality of reading-writing relations in most Sudanese higher education institutions. Perhaps there are several reasons that hinder an effective integration of reading-writing relationship. One of these hindrances is that such integration requires a small number of students, whereas present Sudanese EFL classes include large number of students, which prevents teachers from identifying areas of students' weaknesses in both skills. Second, there are great differences in students' language proficiency: quick/slow in their uptake. Having said that, some students may seem to have obtained a great deal of ideas from reading materials, but they lack appropriate ways of arranging them, and vice versa. Third, it seems clear that many Sudanese EFL learners appear to have very less time for reading, that is, in most cases their reading does not go beyond the title of the book.
So, in such situations, students may fail to gain a better understanding of English writing strategies. Finally, most Sudanese EFL students enter the university with a little or even no knowledge about reading-writing relationship. That is, language syllabi in Sudanese basic and secondary schools failed to provide the students with enough input, which might enable them to attain a high level of proficiency both in reading and writing. In addition, the reading materials in the curriculum of these two levels do not effectively prepare the students for tertiary level writing, which involves familiarity with various language aspects.

As a matter of fact, one can say that EFL teachers should integrate the four skills when dealing with EFL issues, because that would enable their EFL learners to grasp language aspects more effectively. Also, teachers should encourage reading-based writing activities in which EFL learners can learn rhetorical techniques so as to use them in their own EFL writing. Best of all, reading-writing relations, namely at college level, should not be perceived as a matter of knowing vocabulary and grammar, rather emphasis has to be put on ways of creating meaning. That is to say, when using reading for teaching EFL writing, teachers should think of rhetorical analysis: how authors employ rhetorical techniques throughout the texts.

5.8 Summary

This chapter attempts to provide interpretations of the research findings. In highlighting these results it became clear that the characteristic features of the target students' L1 aspects such as unnecessary repetition, exaggeration, embellishment among others seemed to have affected negatively the way in which Sudanese EFL graduate students write in English. Furthermore, in discussing the results of this chapter, it was found
that the target students lack appropriate ways of achieving both cohesion and coherence in their English writing. Finally, the chapter deals with the idea that EFL reading helps EFL learners develop their English writing techniques.
CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS
AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the results of the study and provides the pedagogical implications that have been drawn from these results. It also displays some recommendations and suggestions for further research.

6.2 Summary of the Results

The results of this study were drawn from two sources: the students' English expository writing and teachers' responses, which were based on the research hypotheses which include:

1- Transfer of Arabic rhetorical techniques into English writing has a negative impact on Sudanese EFL graduate students’ English expository writing.
2- Sudanese EFL graduate students face logical organization problems in writing an English expository text.
3- Lack of cohesion characterizes Sudanese EFL graduate students’ English expository writing performance.
4- Lack of coherence characterizes Sudanese EFL graduate students’ English expository writing performance.
5- Extensive EFL reading improves Sudanese EFL graduate students’ English writing abilities in terms of rhetorical techniques.
6- There are significant differences between the M.A. and postgraduate diploma students in terms of English writing problems.

The analysis of these hypotheses has led to the following results:

1- In terms of Arabic interference problems, the results of the study indicate that the majority of the target students exhibited unnecessary repetition while writing an English expository text. Also, teachers' questionnaire responses show that almost 73% of the respondents agree that Arabic writing characteristic feature of repetition seems to be one of the major difficulties that encounter many Sudanese EFL graduate students' performance in English writing. Other problems of Arabic interference that have been emerged from the data analysis include absence of capitalization (85%), unawareness of the difference between Arabic and English prepositions (78.2%), impressionistic tone (71%), exaggeration (59%), embellishment (57.4%), simile (45.4%), metonymy (31%), and Arabic proverbs usage (9.1%).

2- The findings of the study also reveal that a lot of the target students failed to state clearly the topic sentence in their English introductory paragraphs. In this regard, 83% of the respondents of the questionnaire contend that Sudanese EFL graduate students often find it difficult to produce a meaningful topic sentence in English writing.

3- The findings further confirm that half of the Sudanese EFL graduate students (under the study) could not be able to provide the
controlling idea of the whole essay. Instead, they tend to put a series of ideas in one paragraph. Likewise, the results of the teachers' questionnaire also show that approximately 76% of the respondents believe that the introductory paragraphs of most Sudanese EFL graduate students lack the controlling idea of the whole essay.

4- One of the evident results of the study is that despite the fact that the target students succeeded in giving supporting evidence, their written English paragraphs seemed to be inconsistent due to the random shifts of thoughts.

5- The results of the study indicate that almost 99% of the respondents of the questionnaire agree that Sudanese EFL graduate students' English writing difficulties are resulted from the differences in writing techniques between the English and Arabic, in particular the students appear to be unaware of the linguistic and cultural variations between the two languages.

6- The results also indicate that 70% of the students failed to draw a clear conclusion of their written English essays. At the same time, 65% of the respondents assume that many Sudanese EFL graduate students' conclusions of their written English essays seem to be unclear and vague.

7- The findings of the study assert that the target students encountered serious problems in using grammatical cohesion aspects such as references, substitutions, ellipses and conjunctions. Of these grammatical cohesive ties, it was found that there were very few occurrences of elliptic instances in the students' English writing test,
whereas the adversative conjunctions were noticed to be one of the wearisome problems that encountered the students.

8- With regard to the lexical cohesion problems, the results show that the students exhibited many problems in the use of lexical cohesion items of repetition, synonymy, antonym and hyponymy. Moreover, results of the teachers' questionnaire reveal that hyponymy-hypernymy relations seemed to be absent in most Sudanese EFL graduate students' English written work.

9- The results indicate that of the seven coherence aspects (see table 5:8) analyzed, the students experienced great difficulties in providing necessary instances of repetition and consistent parallelism. In terms of teachers' questionnaire, 81% of the respondents claim that many Sudanese EFL graduate students face difficulties in using subordinate clauses in their English writing production. Furthermore, 83% of the respondents argue that most Sudanese EFL graduate students appear to be unaware of how to use transitional words, or phrases in their English writing.

10- The results of the study show that nearly 25% of the students were inclined toward literal translation while composing an English expository text.

11- The results further reveal that more than half of the Sudanese EFL university teachers attribute Sudanese EFL graduate students' failure to attain coherence in English writing to the fact that most of them have not been taught the ways of achieving coherence in English writing.
12- The findings of the study further indicate that there are no significant differences between the MA English students and their counterparts of translation in terms of overall English writing ability. Nevertheless, significant differences are noticed between the MA English students and MA translation students as a single group, and postgraduate diploma students majoring in English in terms of Arabic interference and coherence problems.

13- The results show that most Sudanese EFL university teachers (82%) agree that EFL reading can make EFL learners become aware of different genres of writing. At the same time, 99% of the respondents view that EFL reading inability has made most Sudanese EFL learners not to be able to understand and use Western writers' writing techniques appropriately in their English writing.

14- The findings also confirm that 78.2% of the respondents maintain that due to the EFL reading inability, most Sudanese EFL graduate students cannot understand the ways in which semantic relations are related to techniques of text organization. Based on this, 88.2% of the teachers think that EFL reading proficiency helps Sudanese EFL graduate students develop their main ideas while composing an English expository essay.

15- Finally, the results of the study indicate that nearly 80% of the respondents disagree with the idea of separating EFL reading and EFL writing skills in their EFL classrooms. On the other hand, only 3.60% of the respondents suggest the necessity of separating the two skills in EFL teaching contexts.
6.3 Pedagogical Implications

The results of the study have some useful implications for the EFL learners, teachers and syllabi designers, especially in overcoming English writing problems. These implications can be summarized as follows:

First, from the results of the study it becomes clear that the students seemed to have encountered serious problems in English writing. Thus, EFL learners need to be aware that English writing is not only confined to grammatical aspects, but also to culturally embedded factors. That is, EFL learners are supposed not just to exert their emphasis on the sentence level's elements, but also to see writing from a more broad perspective.

Second, the results of the study can be of great importance for the EFL teachers, in particular tertiary level EFL teachers, that is, in order to prepare Sudanese EFL learners for the recent global developments, teachers should pay great attention to L2 writing approaches that consider rhetorical techniques and cultural perspectives. Taking this into consideration, it will enable EFL learners to take part in various instances of English writing. Thus, EFL teachers should be sensitive to these variations when dealing with their students' English writing problems.

Third, the findings of the study also make us to argue that EFL teachers should understand that a greater emphasis should be placed on the relationship between the EFL reading and EFL writing, as that will encourage EFL learners to be familiar with the different types of texts, rhetorical organizations and grammatical patterns. As such, teachers would make the students to perceive that reading and writing are inseparable skills, in particular the former's competency will enhance the latter's proficiency.
Fourth, the findings of the study can be of an enormous benefit for the syllabi-designers. That is, the importance of good English writing can be raised by making writing courses necessary to college students, because that will compel them to become more conscious of the role that English writing can play in their academic life and even after their graduation. Moreover, as the results of the study reveal that Sudanese EFL graduate students seemed to have been unable to use good organizational techniques in English writing, syllabi-designers and the Departments of English in all Sudanese universities should focus on the problems of text organization, preferably of both English and Arabic aimed at raising the importance of logical arrangement in a text's overall meaning. Furthermore, EFL writing courses can be reviewed regularly in order to verifying their pedagogical appropriateness for the students. Also, in planning the EFL writing courses, the disparity between the secondary school level English writing and university level English writing should be taken into account, because each level requires specific genres of writing as well as different writing techniques. However, the onus should not only be laid on the syllabi designers, it is also high time that the Ministry of Higher of Education in Sudan to rethink its admission policies, especially following its politically motivated expansion, which is against the grain of quality education, many EFL writing teachers find it difficult, if not impossible, to deal effectively with the problematic areas of their students' English writing, viz. one -to- one tutorials in writing: due to large numbers of the students.
6.4 Recommendations

Having provided some pedagogical implications that resulted from the findings of the study, the researcher tends to offer the following recommendations hoping that EFL teachers, EFL learners and EFL syllabi designers will find them useful when dealing with EFL writing issues:

1- A closer look at the extracts of the target students' English expository writing test in chapter five, it becomes clear that the majority of the Sudanese EFL graduate students seemed to have serious English writing problems at the basic level, i.e. poor vocabulary, incorrect punctuation, bad syntax, fragmented sentences, among others. Therefore, besides focusing on the rhetorical techniques problems, Sudanese higher education institutions need to place much attention on the major principles of English writing, because in the throes of the absence of these basics, students may not be able to produce rhetorically meaningful written work in English.

2- Based on the findings of the study, one can recommend that English writing courses should be taught in all academic disciplines of the Sudanese higher education institutions. In other words, irrespective of the students' areas of specialization, the essence of English writing should be at the heart of the universities' curricula. That is, Sudanese universities can revive English writing importance, for instance, by establishing English writing development centers, which could provide specialized (or additional) English writing courses in terms of assistance to the university students, teachers and the public at large, in particular the business community in terms of information provision and techniques. At the same time, these centers can
integrate English writing with the other skills, namely reading and speaking ones. Also, the centers can benefit from the experiences of some writing professionals and scholars in different disciplines such as journalism, law, politics, medicine, physics and so on, because as stated earlier, English writing should be perceived in a more broad sense by targeting different realms and genres.

3- As the results of the study reveal that the bulk of the Sudanese EFL graduate students faced difficulties in achieving cohesion and coherence in English writing, it is advisable that prior to the commencement of the scheduled programs (whether MA English or MA translation, or postgraduate diploma in English), remedial classes on these two aspects' functions can be conducted. This is because, most of the target students seemed to be unaware of how to attain these two aspects appropriately while writing an English text. Another suggestion is that if there is no tendency for such classes, the concerned bodies should set standard criteria for admitting the candidates, because in so doing, the English Departments and translations centres can live up to the recognized standards of graduate studies, and accordingly, could produce competent and genuine graduates not just in name.
6.5 Suggestions for Further Research

Pursuing the different stages of the study, the researcher came up with the following ideas, which could be taken as suggestions for further research:

1- Since the research findings show that Arabic interference problems have affected the overall performance of Sudanese EFL graduate students in English writing, further studies that investigate the influence of Arabization on the Sudanese EFL graduate students' English proficiency are needed to see whether the policy of Arabization at the Sudanese tertiary level has affected negatively the overall performance of the students in English language skills, particularly English writing ability.

2- Additional studies that explore the absence of English literature in the secondary schools' curriculum and its impact on the university students' English writing are needed to show the importance of continuous EFL reading in EFL learners' English writing ability.

3- As in recent years many employers seem to be unsatisfied with the Sudanese university graduates' English writing performance, research studies investigating employers' attitudes toward the graduates' performance in English are needed so as to prepare competent EFL writers for the workplace.

4- For future studies, it is recommended that considerable attention should be paid to the issue of English writing anxiety (a psycholinguistic study) and its negative effects on the Sudanese EFL learners' English writing performance. That is to say, future EFL
researchers can examine the reasons behind the Sudanese EFL students' fear from involving in English writing tasks. They can explore that whether their fear seems to stem from the students' inability to write well in English, or from the teachers' way of carrying out the English writing courses, or from lack of linguistic competence.
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Appendix (A)

Teachers' Questionnaire (Pre-Questionnaire)

University of Khartoum

Graduate College

Dear Professor/Doctor/Teacher

Name--------------------------

Latest Academic Status-------

Area of specialization---------

Address (University)----------

This questionnaire is part of my Ph.D. research thesis in English language: Expository writing problems encountered by Sudanese EFL Graduate students: A contrastive rhetoric approach. Before I start distributing this pre-questionnaire to the participants of the study on Likert’s five-point scale: (I strongly agree, I agree, no opinion, I disagree and I strongly disagree), you are kindly requested as a panelist to offer your opinion on the design of the questionnaire as well as the relevancy of its items to the subject matter of the study. So, please put a tick (√) in the column that suits your opinion: relevant, irrelevant, or vague. A blank paper has been attached for possible additional comments or suggestions which are highly appreciated. Your views will be dealt with confidentially for the research purposes only.

Thank you for your cooperation

Yours Sincerely,

Abdalla Mahmoud Arabi

Graduate College

University of Khartoum
### (1) Arabic Interference Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>relevant</th>
<th>irrelevant</th>
<th>vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English and Arabic seem to have different writing techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Different writing techniques of both English and Arabic affect Sudanese English writing behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unawareness of English language culture hinders Sudanese EFL writers to apply various rhetorical genres when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers’ difficulties could be attributed to the fact that most Sudanese ELT instructors do not discuss matters of cultural differences in their EFL writing classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In teaching, I tend to discuss the relationship between aspects of culture and language, for it influences my EFL learners’ writing proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>During composing process, most Sudanese EFL writers usually transfer Arabic writing techniques to their English expository writing process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In most cases, Sudanese English writing suffers from being impressionistic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When Sudanese EFL writers write in English, they tend to incline towards repetition which leads to redundancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arabic writing patterns such as exaggeration and overstatement influence Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arabic culture’s features such as embellishments, similes, and metonyms affect the way Sudanese EFL writers write an English expository text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The bulk of the Sudanese EFL writers use excessive parallel structures when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>While writing an English expository text, most Sudanese EFL writers focus on individual words rather than ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers encounter serious problems in English writing, because they have not practiced any sort of writing techniques in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Logical Organization Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>relevant</th>
<th>irrelevant</th>
<th>vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Starting an English expository text is one of the serious difficulties that Sudanese EFL writers counter in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>When Sudanese EFL writers engage in English writing, their introductions seem to be too long and not expressing the particulars of the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The opening paragraph of most Sudanese EFL writers fails to include the controlling idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Writing English paragraphs, most Sudanese EFL writers’ topic sentences often lack supporting evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers usually incorporate more than one idea in one English paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>In developing the main idea, most Sudanese EFL writers shift randomly from one idea to another, making the whole text sounds inconsistent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers’ sentences within each paragraph appear to be irrelevant to the main idea of that paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>When writing in English, Sudanese EFL writers usually concentrate on mechanics and grammar rather than on writing as a process that requires several techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers often experience overgeneralization in ending their English expository texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coherence problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>relevant</th>
<th>irrelevant</th>
<th>vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>In English writing, most Sudanese EFL writers come across lack of tense and pronoun agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sudanese English writing sometimes becomes boring because they are unable to use synonyms and antonyms appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sudanese English sentences within paragraphs lack a coherent link due to absence of subordination and coordination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers are unaware of transitional words and phrases in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>In most cases, Sudanese EFL written work as a whole fails to convey sense of completeness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Many Sudanese EFL writers find it difficult to draw a clear distinction between conceptive coherence and semantic coherence in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The greater number of Sudanese EFL writers have not been taught functions of coherence in English expository writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers fail to make the reader feel the way they writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## (4) Cohesion problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>relevant</th>
<th>irrelevant</th>
<th>vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Maintaining cohesion in English writing is a very difficult task for most Sudanese EFL writers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers demonstrate difficulties in using referents (pronominal, proper nouns, demonstratives, comparatives) in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers find it difficult to deal with substitution (noun &amp; verb substitutions) when composing an English text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The trouble with the Sudanese EFL writers is that they cannot employ additive, adversative, causal and temporal conjunctions between independent English sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The reader finds it difficult to understand areas of ellipsis in Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Writing in English, Sudanese EFL writers experience some errors in using collocations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>General-specific and part-whole relations tend to be absent in Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Due to cohesive devices’ difficulties, Sudanese EFL writers cannot provide a clear argumentation in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sudanese English writing lacks continuity of tense, consistency of mode and punctuation devices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Overuse of conjunctions makes Sudanese EFL writers’ written texts sound like spoken English rather than written.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>relevant</td>
<td>irrelevant</td>
<td>vague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>EFL reading plays an important role in Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Due to EFL reading inability, Sudanese EFL writers face problems in understanding and using different structural and rhetorical techniques in their English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Their EFL reading inability hinders them to be familiar with genres of various cultures, audiences and purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Because of absence of pre-reading, they lack background knowledge about the topic to be produced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>They are unable to employ their rhetorical knowledge of reading in their English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>They cannot evaluate and analyze English writers’ arguments logically in their English writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Their EFL reading incompetence prevents them from understanding the ways in which meaning is associated with patterns of text organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>As they seem to be incompetent EFL readers, they cannot understand the patterns through which English writers achieve coherence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Since they appear to be unable EFL readers, they find it difficult to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>understand how English writers maintain cohesion in their writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>In teaching EFL reading, I usually concentrate on the aspects of coherence and cohesion, for a better understanding of them could lead to my EFL learners’ writing proficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Separate teaching of EFL reading and EFL writing will delineate Sudanese EFL writers from social and rhetorical dimensions of English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I am reluctant to integrate EFL reading and English writing because they are separate disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>EFL reading does not necessarily prepare Sudanese EFL writers to perform well in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>In the Sudanese context, it is difficult to manage EFL reading-based English writing activities due to the large number of EFL learners in one classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix (B)

Teachers’ Questionnaire (Post-questionnaire)

University of Khartoum
Graduate College

Dear Professor/ Doctor/ Teacher

Latest academic status---------

Faculty--------------------------

Address (University) ----------

This questionnaire is part of my Ph.D. research thesis in English language, which I am currently pursuing at the University of Khartoum. So, please, answer each item of the questionnaire as accurately and honestly as possible by putting a tick (✔) in the column that suits your opinion, based on the scale given below: Likert’s five-point scale. Your opinions will be dealt with confidentially for the research purposes only. The terms such as Sudanese EFL learners/writers used in this questionnaire stand for MA English, MA translation students and post-graduate diploma students majoring in English.

Thank you for your cooperation

Yours Sincerely,

Abdalla Mahmoud Arabi

Graduate College

University of Khartoum
1- Arabic Interference problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English and Arabic have different writing habits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Different writing habits of both English and Arabic affect Sudanese English writing performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There are similarities between English and Arabic in terms of writing process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Due to unawareness of linguistic and cultural differences between English and Arabic, most Sudanese EFL learners encounter writing problems in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In teaching, I tend to discuss the relationship between the related aspects of culture and language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A large number of Sudanese EFL learners transfer negatively Arabic rhetorical strategies into their English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL learners transfer positively Arabic rhetorical strategies into their English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arabic writing habits such as exaggeration, overstatement and generalization influence Sudanese English writing negatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arabic writing features such as embellishment, simile and metonymy affect the way Sudanese EFL learners write in English negatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A lot of Sudanese EFL learners tend to use flowery expressions in their English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The majority of the Sudanese EFL students use unrelated parallel structures excessively when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2- Logical organization Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Many Sudanese EFL learners encounter serious problems in producing a well-organized written text in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL learners usually find it difficult to write a meaningful topic sentence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When Sudanese EFL learners engage in English writing, their introductions seem to be too long.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The opening paragraph of most Sudanese EFL learners fails to include the controlling idea of the whole topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>When writing a paragraph in English, most Sudanese EFL learners' topic sentences lack supporting evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL learners usually incorporate more than one central idea in one English paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A great number of Sudanese EFL writers shift randomly from one idea to another, making the whole text sounds inconsistent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>When writing in English, most Sudanese EFL writers concentrate on mechanics and grammar rather than on writing as a process of different stages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A lot of Sudanese EFL writers find it difficult to make a clear conclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3- Cohesion Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cohesion is a very difficult task for most Sudanese EFL writers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Many Sudanese EFL learners find it difficult in using referents when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I usually find it difficult to realize instances of substitution and ellipsis in Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The bulk of Sudanese EFL learners feel confused with the usage of English connectors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Many Sudanese EFL learners overuse English connectors when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>When writing in English, a considerable number of Sudanese EFL writers experience problems in using collocations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners do not use Lexical cohesion aspects such as repetition, synonymy, antonym and hyponymy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>General-specific and part-whole relations tend to be absent in most Sudanese English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1- Coherence problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Sudanese English writing usually lacks tense and pronoun agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Sudanese English sentences often lack a coherent link due to absence of subordination and coordination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners are unaware of transitional words and phrases in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>English paragraphs written by Sudanese EFL students usually lack arrangement of details in order (time, space, importance, comparison and contrast, reasoning, examples, cause and effect).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers usually find it difficult to draw a clear distinction between conceptive coherence and semantic coherence in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL writers tend to translate when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL written work as a whole often fails to make a sense of completeness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners have not been taught functions of coherence in English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5- EFL reading inability and EFL writing connection problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>EFL reading familiarizes EFL learners with a better understanding of different genres of writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Because of EFL reading inability, most Sudanese EFL students face problems in understanding and using English writing strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Most Sudanese EFL learners cannot evaluate and analyze English writers’ arguments logically in their English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Due to EFL reading inability, most Sudanese EFL writers are unable to understand the ways in which meaning is associated with patterns of text organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sudanese EFL writers usually find it difficult to realize how English writers keep track of cohesion in their writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>EFL reading helps EFL learner to express and develop their main ideas when writing in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>In teaching EFL reading, I often concentrate on the aspects of coherence and cohesion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Separate teaching of EFL reading and writing will delineate Sudanese EFL learners from social and rhetorical dimensions of English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I do not integrate EFL reading and EFL writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix (C)

### Students' English Writing Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A students' No.</th>
<th>Researcher's rating scores</th>
<th>Inter-rater's rating scores</th>
<th>Average scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A students’ No.</td>
<td>Researcher’s rating scores</td>
<td>Inter-rater’s rating scores</td>
<td>Average scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A38</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ No.</td>
<td>Researcher’s rating scores</td>
<td>Inter-rater’s rating scores</td>
<td>Average scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A students' No.</td>
<td>Researcher's rating scores</td>
<td>Inter-rater's rating scores</td>
<td>Average scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A students’ No.</td>
<td>Researcher’s rating scores</td>
<td>Inter-rater’s rating scores</td>
<td>Average scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>