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ABSTRACT

This is a primary study investigating the pedagogical approach of employing cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric (CCCR) comparisons in graduate-level ESL Writing Service Courses at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Two 501-level classes were recruited to participate in this study: one class received CCCR instruction and participated in CCCR discussions, and the other class did not receive CCCR instruction and discussions. The study entailed both quantitative and qualitative investigations: the quantitative investigation involved the grading of the results, the counting of use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices in students’ writing samples; pre- and post-study surveys, questionnaires and interviews. The findings show that students who received CCCR instructions and participated in CCCR discussions demonstrated more active use of connectives and showed increased metacognition about the similarities and differences between English academic writing academic writing in their L1s.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The theoretical basis for the thesis is contrastive rhetoric—the study of how one’s first language influences his/her writing in a second language (English in this study) and the dynamic model of academic writing that calls for students’ metacognition instead of prescriptive pedagogies. The focus of the thesis is not on looking for the differences between students’ L1s and English in the areas of academic writing, but the pedagogical applications based on the existing studies of contrastive rhetoric studies. The subjects of the study are students in the Writing Service Courses in the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, which according to the university official website, has the largest international student population of any public institution in the U.S. with almost 10,000 students from abroad on campus. According to International Student Scholar Services of University of Illinois, the total number of international students in Fall 2014 is 9824. The research used one existing ESL writing service course as the experimental group, and another class of the same level that followed the same curriculum as the control group. All students in the control group received cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric (CCCR) lessons as part of their instruction. Pre-instruction surveys, unit feedback, and post-instruction interviews supplemented the instruction over the course of the semester. The question of the research is whether the instruction in CCCR improves students’ writing in comparison to the control group. The actual intended study was to determine whether students’ awareness of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric of Chinese Writing and English Writing has a positive correlation with the performance of English writing.

Despite the recognition of the cultural differences in terms of writing, ESL writing pedagogies have not integrated CCCR into the curriculum extensively. This
research analyzes the extent of the influence of explicit instruction of CCCR in class on students’ writing performance. The design of the instruction of CCCR is based on the previous studies of CCCR and the new dynamic model of writing proposed by Matsuda (1997). The results suggest possible changes of ESL writing to include the CCCR instruction and discussions throughout the curriculum so as to increase students’ metacognition about writing both in terms of rhetorical style, organization and language use including dependent clauses and cohesive devices.

Research Design

The research design involved two facets: the execution of the cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric instruction and discussions and students’ feedback. Instructors conducted CCCR instruction and discussions using three delivery modes: in-class discussion, videos, and readings. After students received CCCR instruction and finished discussions, they submitted their findings of similarities and differences between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s through online forms. Furthermore, a series of CCCR activities and discussions were integrated into the existing curriculum of ESL Writing Service Courses.

Students’ writing performances were assessed by four ESL raters, and they were all current ESL Writing TAs who received the same standard training from the Program of the ESL Writing Service Courses. After the CCCR study was finished, students’ pre- and post-writing samples were randomized and provided to the four ESL Writing Raters, who were not aware of the objectives, design and background of the study. The
researcher did not participate in the rating process and was only in charge of the tabulating the final grades given by the four raters.

CCCR instruction and discussions focused on two major aspects: global aspects of academic writing such as rhetorical style and organization and local language aspects including use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices. Students' final performance in these areas will serve as the criteria of the evaluation to draw the connection between the awareness of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric and students’ writing performance.

In terms of the nature of the study, the research is the combination of both quantitative and qualitative investigation. The whole process of the implementation of instructions is qualitative, and the evaluation of the writing products is quantitative based on the selected criteria (variables—the use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices) and the numerical grades provided by four ESL raters. At the same time, the research included students’ subjective opinions regarding the cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric, and whether the inclusion of their subjective opinions has any impact on the final analysis of the data and conclusion of the research.

The process of the research employs both traditional classroom setting discussions and technology-assisted videos and online forms. The instructions of the cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric were integrated into the writing service courses, separate exercise sessions addressing the instructions were created online and students were asked to complete the exercises to demonstrate their understanding of the instructions of CCCR and share their findings of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric analysis between English academic writing and academic writing in students’ L1s.
Questions to be answered by the Research

Research Question 1

a. Do students who receive dynamic CCCR instruction and participate in the CCCR discussions perform better overall in their writing assignments based on grade received than their counterparts who do not receive dynamic CCCR instruction? In other words, do students from the experimental group perform better than those from the control group?

b. Do students who receive dynamic CCCR instruction and participate in the CCCR discussions perform better on the specific elements discussed: dependent clauses and the use of cohesive devices?

Research Question 2

Do students actively see the connection between the instruction of CCCR and their writing performance? Does employing CCCR instruction and discussions raise students’ awareness/metacognition of rhetorical style, organization and language use in English academic writing?

Research Question 3

What are the areas of CCCR instruction that play a more important role in students’ writing assignments?

Research Question 4
What are the delivery modes of CCCR instruction and discussions that students respond well to?

Significance

Despite the recognition of the cultural differences in terms of writing, ESL writing pedagogies have not yet integrated CCCR into the curriculum to make use of international students’ background culture and their native language. This research analyzes the extent of the influence of explicit instruction and discussions of CCCR in class on students’ writing performance. The design of the instruction of CCCR is based on the previous study of CCCR originated by Kaplan (1966) and the new dynamic model proposed by Matsuda (1997). The results suggest that ESL writing courses include the CCCR instruction and discussions throughout the curriculum so as to improve their metacognition of English academic writing and hence, actively make relevant changes to their academic English writing. This pedagogical practice would function as a means for ESL writing instructors to raise students’ awareness of different strategies that they could make use when approaching English academic papers.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Potential Pedagogical Application of Contrastive Rhetoric

A number of researchers and linguists have already come to the general understanding that cultural contrastive rhetoric should be addressed in the pedagogies of English writing. The prospect of contrastive rhetoric has shown an increasing significance in L2 writing classes. Leki (1991) contended that contrastive rhetoric has the greatest potential of practical application in L2 writing classes. Silva (1993) claimed that although L1 and L2 writings are similar in their broad outlines, they are different in numerous and important ways (p.671). Kachru (1997) opined that for the purpose of finding a typology and a set of universals of rhetorical patterns, contrasting rhetorical patterns is meaningful. Petrić (2005) pointed out that the findings from contrastive rhetoric studies could serve as indicators for general tendencies and should be tested out in the real teaching context. Walker (2011) concluded that regardless of criticism of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric, a recent resurgence in the number of high quality pedagogical studies concerning the teaching of intercultural rhetoric in university writing classes for East-Asian (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) writers has been observed. Furthermore, despite the increasing globalization, it has been noticed that EFL writing in Japan still demonstrates some cultural features drawn from contrastive rhetoric studies (Mcinley, 2013). Matsuda called for the contribution of contrastive rhetoric in teaching of ESL writing and cited Leki (1992) confirming, “contrastive rhetoric suggests the need for the teachers to be aware of the differing cultural, linguistic, and rhetorical traditions that students bring with them” (p.47) and “pedagogical implications of contrastive rhetoric studies should not be dismissed because of the problems with the early attempts
to apply the findings of contrastive rhetoric research” (p. 58). Leki (1991) claimed that ideally contrastive rhetoric could provide writing teachers more understanding of the cultural differences in writing.

So far, it has been discovered that the strong link between contrastive rhetoric and culture is the key feature of contrastive rhetoric. Carrell (1984) found that strict expository organization facilitates ESL readers in recalling information of the paper and different discourse types seemed to have different effects on ESL readers’ quantity of ideas reproduced in their free written recall based on their different native languages. Matalene (1985) argued that a culture's rhetoric constitutes an interface where the prescriptions of the language meet the practices of the culture. Liebman (1998) also remarked that students could be ethnographers of contrastive rhetoric and this helps them become more conscious of their academic discourse. Atkinson (2004) concluded that using the notion of culture to explain differences in written texts and writing practices is one of the distinctive characteristics of contrastive rhetoric, and he suggested a more flexible and inclusive interpretation and application of using culture as an analysis tool.

However, whether there is a correlation between the pedagogies of contrastive rhetoric in L2 writing and improvement of writing performance has not been conclusively proven. The understanding at the moment is that the static teaching (Matsuda, 1997) is not the ideal means of teaching L2 writing using contrastive rhetoric. The pedagogical application of insights generated from contrastive rhetoric studies have been limited by the static theory of L2 writing, which has been widely employed in teaching organizational structures. Because of this, Matsuda (1997) suggested that textual
organization “needs to be taught in ESL writing classrooms, but it needed to be taught in ways that are informed by an appropriate theory of L2 writing” (p.58). Based on this observation, pedagogical approach improving students’ metacognition is proposed in this study.

The concept of metacognition was originally coined by Flavell (1979) and it refers to learners’ own knowledge of their own thinking, and Anderson (2002) defined metacognition as “thinking about thinking” (p. 23). Metacognition leads to specific changes in how learning is conducted and strategies that generate different or better learning outcomes (Anderson, 2008). Veenman et al., (2006) explicated terms pertaining to metacognition, including metacognitive awareness, metacognitive beliefs, metacognitive knowledge, executive skills, higher order skills and self-regulation.

Various studies have confirmed the existence of differences in English writing due to varied cultural backgrounds. Kaplan (1966) described thought patterns as linear for native English speakers, parallel for native speakers of Semitic languages, indirect for native speakers of Oriental languages and digressive for native speakers of Romance languages and Russian. While this very early work in the field by Kaplan is now seen as oversimplification of these differences, this paper is critical in that it founded this field. In terms of argument structure, Mahmoud (1983) reported that L2 subjects (Arabic) did less reporting of conditions, less defining, and less exemplifying, but used more warning and phatic communion than their NES (native English speaker) peers, and L2 writers were inclined to develop their arguments by restating their position (p.664). Connor (1984) reported that her ESL subjects’ texts had less adequate justifying support for claim
statements and less linking of concluding inductive statements to the preceding subtopics of the problem (p.664). Mauranen (1993) found that Anglo-American writers tended to reveal more writer presence in their academic writing than Finnish writers, as they appeared to use more metatext that helps to guide their readers through the structure of the paper. It was reported that L2 writers used shorter (Reid, 1988) and vaguer (Carlson, 1988) words and that their texts exhibited less lexical variety and sophistication (Hu et.al., 1982; Linnarud, 1986). In terms of lower level linguistic concerns, L2 writers’ texts were simpler in structure. Their sentences included more but shorter T units, fewer but longer clauses, more coordination, less subordination, less noun modification, and less passivization. They evidenced distinct patterns in the use of cohesive devices, especially conjunctive (more) and lexical (fewer) ties, and exhibited less lexical control, variety, and sophistication (Silva, 1993, p.668). Fagan & Cheong (1987) found that Chinese students used the same traditional transitional connectives (e.g., but, and) as English writers. Tucker (1995) stated that Asian writing was intentionally non-directional (p.127). Yang & Cahill (2008) held that Chinese expository rhetorical pattern does not differ greatly from that of English (p.128).

Despite consistent findings about contrastive rhetoric between English and other languages, researchers maintained that writing should not be taught as prescription of rules and patterns generated by contrastive rhetoric research as it involves a myriad of factors. Land (1998) propagated the idea of a pluralistic US rhetoric that equipped students with necessary skills to use Standard English Writing to succeed in a variety of disciplines. Mohan and Lo (1985) found that greater awareness of students’ native literacy and their educational factors affect students L2 academic writing. Matusda
(1997) agreed with Mohan and Lo (1985) by looking into the underlying assumptions of the static theory of L2 writing, which is that writers present ideas based on their community norms acceptable in his or her language, cultural or educational system that are not in alignment with the readers’ context. This explains how miscommunication between intended audience and the writer lead to unsuccessful writing.

Criticisms of Contrastive Rhetoric

Previous research agrees on the limitation of prescriptive teaching of contrastive rhetoric in ESL writing as the prescriptive teaching is originated from a static theory of L2 writing, which is built solely around the writer. Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy (1987) suggested that in writing, students and teachers should go beyond prescription and work as investigators of writing. Leki (1991) criticized that teaching of contrastive rhetoric has been overly prescriptive. Kubota (1998) believed that contrastive rhetoric alone cannot explain the writing differences and found that ESL writing is related to L1 writing ability, English proficiency and English composition writing experience. Kubota & Lehner (2004) also critiqued traditional contrastive rhetoric as constructing a static, homogeneous, binary picture of English versus other language and also projecting English writing as a superior to other writing styles. Most importantly, traditional contrastive rhetoric assumed the automatic L1 transfer in ESL learners writing and hence, Kubota& Lehner (2004) emphasized the importance of self-reflexivity in critical contrastive rhetoric. Matsuda (1997) argues that the assumptions of static theory are limiting the potential application of contrastive rhetoric research to the teaching of L2 writing. The first assumption about the writer ignores “writer’s agency” (p.50). He also pointed out that the prescriptive nature of teaching is one of the main problems as
prescriptive pedagogical approach to writing takes away students’ autonomy in writing. Applying the same logic here, if the organization of the text should follow reader’s expectations of the L1 context, then the teaching of organizational patterns “becomes the prescription of the value system of the NES (native English speakers) writers” (p.51). The negative characterizations of the form of contrastive rhetoric-based pedagogy that have been criticized as “composition and colonization” have led to many L2 teachers and researchers of L2 writing to dismiss contrastive rhetoric-based approaches. Matsuda (1997) carries on by conceding that the teaching of organizational structure is “problematic if one accepts the proposition that the organizational structure of written discourse is determined wholly by the writer’s background” (p.51). However, the main proposition made by Matsuda is that the teaching of the organizational structure does not have always to be prescriptive, as the organizational structure of written discourse is not based on the linguistic, cultural and educational background. These three factors, according to Matsuda (1997) are not the determining factors, and he proposed an alternative model of L2 writing—the dynamic model of L2 writing. The dynamic model of L2 writing, instead of looking at the L2 writer from his background, regards him or her as a member of the discourse community. Kubota and Lehner (2004) categorized the static writing as the traditional approach to contrastive rhetoric and contended that the traditional approach to contrastive rhetoric has focused on the cultural difference in rhetorical patterns among different languages.

The dynamic model of L2 writing means that teaching ESL organizational structure does not translate into prescribing patterns, but to involve “a way of raising ESL students’ awareness of various factors that are involved in structuring the text” (Matsuda,
Similarly, Atkinson (2003) argued for a new view of L2 writing that takes into consideration of a large scale of social and cultural contexts that influencing L2 writing. Connor (2002) also stated that as cultures and genres are dynamic, contrastive rhetoric should reflect the change of patterns and norms over time.

Based on the limitations of traditional contrastive rhetoric, a new model and approach towards contrastive rhetoric was proposed. Kubota and Lehner (2004) suggested *critical contrastive rhetoric*, which recognizes students’ identities, the rhetorical forms and multiplicity of languages, which is in line with the dynamic model of L2 writing employing contrastive rhetoric.

The observed gap from the literature review is that there is a call for new perspective of the contrastive rhetoric emphasizing the cultural aspect. This research is defining the dynamic cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric (CCCR) by instructing students on the similarities differences between their L1 writing and L2 writing and involving them in the finding of similarities and differences between academic writing in students’ L1s and English academic writing. The instruction of dynamic CCCR works to not teach the cross-cultural differences in rhetoric as a fact but as a starting point for students to reflect on their past experience of writing in both their L1s and L2. Furthermore, the instruction of dynamic CCCR does not only address the differences, it also serves to find the similarities between two languages. The instruction covers both the similarities and differences to craft a general picture of CCCR of both languages to students so that they could understand that academic writing is not only about following templates or rules. The areas for investigation include both the organization and language because Quinn
(2012) concluded that direct learning of rhetorical patterns can benefit students’ L2 writing in English and allow them to function better in the new discourse community and Land Jr. (1998) stated that ESL writing should make sure students are equipped with the necessary grammar and language skills. This study investigated into whether cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric activities would facilitate ESL students in understanding the possible gap between their understanding of English academic writing and the expectations of English academic writing, and whether a pedagogical approach employing CCCR activities would improve students’ metacognition and prompt them to change their previous ways of writing.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

The research spanned over the period of one semester, and the subjects of the research are students from two existing sections of ESL501 course. The ESL Writing Service Courses are specifically intended for international students with a TOEFL score lower than 103/120. These students are placed into different levels of ESL Writing Service Courses based on the English Placement Test before the beginning of the semester. The ESL Writing Service Courses are divided into two main categories: undergraduate courses and graduate courses. The Graduate ESL Writing Courses consist of two course sequences: 500 followed by 501 or a direct to 501 placement. Students could be placed into either 500-level or 501-level based on their performance in the English Placement Test. If students were placed into 500-level, after they complete the course requirements for 500-level, they will be moved on to 501-level. Once they pass 501-level ESL Writing Course, they fulfill the writing requirement for their respective degree.

The following is the official description of the course introduction of ESL 501 from the official ESL Writing Service Courses:

This is the second course in a two-course sequence for international graduate students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. It is designed to introduce students to the practices of research-based writing for American academic audiences, such as developing a research question, writing a literature review and annotated bibliography, synthesizing sources, drafting and revising research papers. Strategies for avoiding plagiarism will also be introduced and practiced in this process. General principles of academic writing, such as awareness of audience and purpose, coherence and unity, clear thesis statements, PIE structure, and formal academic style, will be also discussed as students analyze their own writing in light of these principles. Organizational patterns and features of a typical scientific research paper (so called IMRD paper) will also be introduced. Readings are used as a stimulus for discussion of a topic and/or as a
source of support in writing assignments. Although oral skills are not the main component of this course, students can expect to practice oral English through group discussions and peer review.

The 501 syllabus is designed to introduce students to the practices of research-based writing for American academic audiences, such as developing a research question, writing a literature review and annotated bibliography, synthesizing sources, drafting and revising research papers. Strategies for avoiding plagiarism are also introduced and practiced in this process. General principles of academic writing, such as awareness of audience and purpose, coherence and unity, clear thesis statements, PIE structure, and formal academic style, are also discussed as students analyze their own writing in light of these principles. Organizational patterns and features of a typical scientific research paper (so-called IMRD paper) are also introduced. Readings are used as a stimulus for discussion of a topic and/or as a source of support in writing assignments. Although oral skills are not the main component of this course, students can expect to practice oral English through group discussions and peer review. For this research, the subjects within the experimental group received extra instruction about cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric (CCCR), which was integrated into the existing curriculum, and participate in a pre-instruction survey, unit feedback and end-of-semester interviews. The subjects within the control group will not receive any instruction about CCCR or participate in any of the unit feedback, but they will still participate in the pre-instruction survey and end-of-semester interviews. The subjects from both groups follow the exact same curriculum, syllabus and instruction on all the other topics, and daily lessons (with the exception of the CCCR elements) are also identical. Subjects from both groups will write a diagnostic essay revision assignment, an ILMRD portfolio, an annotated bibliography, one problem-
solution or argumentative research paper, and one reflective assignment throughout the semester (see Appendix B). Their writings will be analyzed and compared so as to find the relation between the instruction of CCCR and students’ writing performance in English. The pre-instruction survey will include questions to test subjects’ prior knowledge and understanding about CCCR. Unit feedback tests students’ understanding of the instruction on CCCR. The end-of-semester interviews collect students’ opinions regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of the instruction of CCCR.

Data Collection

The data collected for the research consisted of three parts: students’ writing samples throughout the semesters, online surveys (pre-instruction survey, unit feedback) and the interviews with the students regarding their understanding of CCCR and their opinions about L2 writing.

For subjects from both groups, the writing samples of their assignments including the diagnostic essay revision assignment, ILMRD (introduction, literature review, methods, review and discussion) portfolio, annotated bibliography, one problem-solution or argumentative research paper, and one reflective assignment; the pre-instruction survey; and the audio recordings of the end-of-semester interviews were collected. For subjects from the experimental group, the unit feedbacks were also collected.

The writing samples, which were collected from Compass2g™ (the online Course Management System utilized in both courses), were only accessible by the students and the instructor. The interviews with students were transcribed and documented. The instruction sessions on dynamic CCCR were recorded and available online for students
who were absent so that a student’s absence would have no effect on his/her CCCR-related performance.

Subjects’ Backgrounds

The subjects of this study are all international graduate students who were required to take ESL Writing Service Courses at the graduate level. As discussed earlier, there are two levels for the graduate ESL Writing Service Courses: 500 and 501. These students are at the 501-level, which means they are comparatively more advanced in terms of English grammar and the basic understanding of English academic writing. These students were either placed into 501 directly based on their EPT (English Placement Test) scores or have already completed the ESL 500 level course. Students for this study came from a diversified educational background in terms of their disciplines and their ages range from 25 to 35. As shown in Table 1, more than half of the students had no prior explicit instruction on academic writing in their L1s (no freshman composition).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-name</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Previous Academic Writing Experience in L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yueyue</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Crop Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Human Resources Development</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Human Resources Development</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmeng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Human Resources and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongjong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuxu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huahua</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobo</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaochen</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Political Economics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanfan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Political Economics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanhan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songsong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengheng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Civil engineering</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiajia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haohao</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Materials Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Piano Performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minmin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Students’ Backgrounds
The students’ native languages include: Chinese (Mandarin), Korean, Farsi, Spanish and Turkish. They also represent a large variety of academic fields such as, statistics, communication, economics, human resource and industrial relations, computer science, civil engineering, materials science and engineering, biochemistry, environmental Engineering, biology, architecture, policy economics, finance, piano performance, kinesiology, as well as mechanical engineering. These students’ years of English study range from five to twenty, with an average of eight years.

**CCCR Instructional Content**

1. Rhetoric Styles
2. Rhetorical Organizations
3. Clauses
4. Transitional Connectives

Throughout the semester, the above four areas of comparisons between English academic writing and academic writing in students’ L1s were covered and discussed in the experimental group. Rhetoric styles and rhetorical organizations were conducted as the whole-class discussion in every single class in the experimental group where students were divided into groups of three to four and shared with each other their cultural way of writing compared to that of English. The groups consisted of students from different cultures and this gave students the opportunity to see that none of them is alone on the path of acquiring the American norm of English academic writing.

The CCCR discussions on clauses and cohesive devices aim at giving students the opportunity to compare the use of clauses and cohesive devices in their L1 and English. However, this is not contrastive language but contrastive rhetoric because
students were guided to conduct comparison activities within the context of two academic papers in their discipline after they analyzed the similarities and differences at the sentential level. The ultimate purpose was for them to understand that English academic writing could utilize cohesive devices to improve the coherence of a piece of writing between sentences and paragraphs, and clauses are one way to improve their language complexity in English academic writing. As grammar instruction is not included in the syllabus, this discussion not only raises students’ awareness of the differences in these areas between their L1s and English, but also provides students the opportunity to focus on the basics of English writing. The syllabus of the experimental group is summarized as following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Both Control and Experimental</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit One- Diagnostic Revision</td>
<td>Rhetoric styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- General introduction of cultural contrastive rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Two-IMRD paper Introduction, Method, Research and Discussion</td>
<td>Rhetorical organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Three- Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td>Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Four- Problem-solution Paper/ Argumentative Paper</td>
<td>Transitional connectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Syllabus 1

The left column of Table 2 shows the four units that both the control and experimental group covers and the right column includes the treatment given the experimental group covering four areas of CCCR. The design is such that in each unit, the experimental group will conduct a contrastive study of one area. For example, in Unit One in which both groups discuss their diagnostic essay and the basic writing skills related to the
argumentative essay, the experimental group also includes study and discussion on the rhetorical styles of both English academic writing and academic writing in students’ L1s. Table 3 below is a more detailed syllabus of the experimental group on cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric. (Any screenshots provided later may be clicked. Doing so will take you directed to the videos online.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>The objective of Unit 1 General Instruction on the Cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students’ Self-Introduction&lt;br&gt;The self-introduction form collects students’ background information including their native language, years of learning English and previous knowledge of academic writing. &lt;br&gt;Pre-instruction survey was done on Day 1 <a href="http://tinyurl.com/nllbqlr">http://tinyurl.com/nllbqlr</a> &lt;br&gt;Students were asked to submit an academic paper in their L1 into the shared folder <a href="http://tinyurl.com/noon5wj">http://tinyurl.com/noon5wj</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At the very beginning of Day 1, students were engaged in the discussion of their understanding of the differences between writing in their L1s and English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Audience Lesson&lt;br&gt;Students were asked to refer to their academic paper in their L1 and find the intended audience after the lecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Lesson on Thesis Statement and PIE&lt;br&gt;Students were asked to finish the short-response questions after the lesson <a href="http://tinyurl.com/kgzgtns">http://tinyurl.com/kgzgtns</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coherence: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/k4dw674">http://tinyurl.com/k4dw674</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic Style: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/mzkgunl">http://tinyurl.com/mzkgunl</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (cont.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Punctuation: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/pvlof6s">http://tinyurl.com/pvlof6s</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8 | Submit an IMRD paper in your L1 in the following folder (remember to put your name in the file name.)
   | [https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0BwWscJq3dMpYUTVrdE1kSTJ3Ujg&usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0BwWscJq3dMpYUTVrdE1kSTJ3Ujg&usp=sharing)  
   | Then, answer the short-answer questions:
   | [http://tinyurl.com/kv6t8xo](http://tinyurl.com/kv6t8xo) |
| **Unit 3** | **Subject-Prominent vs. Topic-Prominent** |
| 9 | - Watch the video and answer the questions in the following link:
   | [http://tinyurl.com/krkdc4m](http://tinyurl.com/krkdc4m)  
   | Video Link: [http://tinyurl.com/qhfjppn](http://tinyurl.com/qhfjppn) |
| 10 | Adjective Clause: [http://tinyurl.com/ldr4r5l](http://tinyurl.com/ldr4r5l)  
   | Video Link: [http://tinyurl.com/kjz3y9g](http://tinyurl.com/kjz3y9g) |
| 11 | Noun Clause: [http://tinyurl.com/mjt9jpr](http://tinyurl.com/mjt9jpr)  
   | Video Link: [http://tinyurl.com/qb2k4k3](http://tinyurl.com/qb2k4k3) |
| 12 | Adverbial Clause: [http://tinyurl.com/mkk5dhl](http://tinyurl.com/mkk5dhl)  
   | Video Link: [http://tinyurl.com/p5z4ujh](http://tinyurl.com/p5z4ujh) |
| **Unit 4** | **Coherence-Cohesive Devices** |
| 13 | [http://tinyurl.com/mk7bapn](http://tinyurl.com/mk7bapn)  
   | Video Link: [http://tinyurl.com/qgk6e8s](http://tinyurl.com/qgk6e8s) |
| 14 | Connectives: [http://tinyurl.com/ntduvae](http://tinyurl.com/ntduvae) |
Table 3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connectives I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read the second page of the handout (<a href="https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BwlEgmYu1jHZTDhuS2xVSVjNNjg/">https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BwlEgmYu1jHZTDhuS2xVSVjNNjg/</a>) on cohesive devices and finish the following short-answer question: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/kmmusws">http://tinyurl.com/kmmusws</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Connectives II: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/q9fkghf">http://tinyurl.com/q9fkghf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Connectives III: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/pge6afx">http://tinyurl.com/pge6afx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 CCCR Syllabus

As shown in Table 3, students completed an online form for each lesson that consisted of a comparison activity that students have to finish, for example, the example below is one of the online forms that students had to fill up when they finished analyzing the similarities and differences in general between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s.
1. What is the organization of academic writing in your L1 like? *
Is it similar or different from the organization of English writing? If you can, please elaborate on your understanding.

2. By reading the academic paper you found in your L1, what are the differences between the academic writing in English and the academic paper in your L1? *

Figure 1

The online form for each lesson covered a specific area of CCCR instruction which was also closely related to the topic discussed in the existing ESL writing syllabus. Students at this point had already uploaded an academic paper in their own discipline in their respective L1 and one academic paper in English in their field. The analyses were based on the uploaded published papers.

For the later part of the study on language use, videos were included and the links for videos were also provided. Unit One focused on rhetorical style in which students were asked to discuss their understandings of similarities and differences in terms of rhetorical styles and elements including audience, body paragraphs, thesis statement, coherence, punctuation and coherence. The emphasis of Unit Two was on rhetorical organization, especially as it pertains to scientific texts—introduction, methods, research
and discussion (IMRD). Units Three and Unit Four focused on language-related content: dependent clauses and cohesive devices respectively.

**Delivery Modes**
Throughout the semester the CCCR instructions were delivered in three different methods, including in-class instruction, videos, and reading at home. The three different delivery modes represent three different means that ESL instructors have been using in the ESL writing courses in delivering different types of information. These three delivery modes encompassed the exact same content: the introduction of the topic, an active comparison activity on students’ part, either individually or collectively, and the writing up of their findings in the online form.

In-class instruction included traditional group discussions in which students were divided into groups of three to four and given a topic. Then, they were also provided a list of questions designed to help them share their personal knowledge and experience.

The videos made for this study incorporate the fundamental activity that encouraged students to find similarities and differences between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s. Each video was divided into three parts: a short introduction of the topic for the study, such as adjective clause, and briefly explains to students in the video what an adjective clause is. Then, English sentences with adjective clauses were provided for them to generalize the grammatical rule of English adjective clauses. At the end of the video, students were directed to the online form where they tried to analyze the structure of their L1s and were prompted to find out whether there is adjective clause in their L1s and what the similarities and differences are between adjective clauses in English and their L1s. The following are the screenshots of the video on adverbial clauses:
The video started with recognition slides where sentences were introduced to students and guided them in finding the relevant adverb clauses as shown in screen Capture 1. Later on, different types of adverb clauses were then introduced one by one. In the end, students were asked to think about how the same sentence was expressed in their L1 and they would be asked to compare the similarities and differences in the sentence structures in Screen Capture 2 and 3.
The readings were integrated in the first unit of rhetorical style, but in the later part it showed that as students tended to regard these readings as extra workload and did not respond well this particular delivery mode. It was only used at the beginning of the study when students were asked to note the differences of rhetorical style and organization between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s. Students were given a short academic paper by Chen (2005) titled “why does my English Writing Sound So Chinese? A contrastive rhetoric for Taiwanese instructors of English writing.” At the end of this paper, there were two sample papers in the appendix, which depict both the English Style and Chinese Style. In order to generate a more in-depth discussion, a pre-reading is needed before the in-class discussion. Strictly speaking, the readings were the pre-step for the in-class discussion.

Data Analysis

The data collected for the research consisted of two parts: students writing samples throughout the semester and the interviews with the students regarding their understanding of CCCR and their opinions about L2 writing. The writing samples of the
two groups will be compared in terms of different variables which will be covered in the CCCR instruction: rhetoric styles, rhetorical organizations, clauses and transitional connectives (cohesive devices). The topics covered in the CCCR instruction were from general to specific.

Students writing performance is evaluated from two aspects: the grades given by the panel of raters recruited for this study and the analysis of the elements discussed in the experimental group including clauses and connectives.

ESL instructors and raters from the university have rated the two sets of assignments from both the control and experimental groups—the Unit One assignment that is the revision of students’ diagnostic test and the Unit Four assignment, which is a research paper..

In order to analyze the use of clauses and connectives used by students, a statistical comparison between the experimental group and control group was conducted. The following data were collected: the number of correct use of noun clauses, adjective clauses and adverbial clauses used by each student and both groups in both their first and final assignment; the number of correct use of connectives used by each individual student and both groups in both their first and final assignment. The mean of correct use of various clauses of two groups will be calculated to evaluate whether the instruction of contrastive rhetoric assists students correct output of these specific areas.

In order to demonstrate how the dependent clauses and cohesive devices were calculated, one paragraph of a student’s writing sample for their first assignment is provided here. In the sample paragraph, cohesive devices are italicized and dependent clauses are underlined:
In the first place, students who received cash reward can directly use that money to pay for colleges to continue their education. According to the study released by MDRC, who conduct this cash reward system on low-income students in Louisiana community colleges, participants were 30% more likely to register for the following semester. The significant result shows that financial rewards do alleviate the toll burden for low-income students. For those students who are denied access to college education because of lacking sufficient money, the cash incentives are able to help them for further education. (See Appendix C for full assignment)

This is the first body paragraph of the first assignment from Hanhan. In order to calculate the percentage of use of cohesive devices and dependent clauses, the total number of sentences in this essay is counted. Then, the number of dependent clauses and cohesive devices were counted. Taking the sentence: “In the first place, students who received cash reward can directly use that money to pay for colleges to continue their education” as an example, “students who received cash reward” is counted as one clause, in the same sentence, “in the first place” is counted as a cohesive device (connective).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) classified cohesive devices include conjunction (connectives), substitution (repetition of key words), ellipsis and reference (pronouns). All the three areas were discussed in the class. However, in the final analysis, only students’ use of connectives were counted as students from the control group also received discussions in the area of repetition of key words and pronouns. Only the experimental received very detailed analysis of use of connectives to demonstrate different relations as shown in Appendix.
CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Findings of Research Question 1

a. Do students who receive dynamic CCCR instruction and participate in the
CCCR discussions have an overall better performance in their writing
assignments than their counterparts who do not receive dynamic CCCR
instruction as determined by the grades given by raters? In other words, do
students from the experimental group perform better than those from the control
group?

b. Do students who receive dynamic CCCR instruction and participate in the
CCCR discussions perform better than their counterparts in specific areas,
including dependent clauses and cohesive devices, in comparison to those who do
not receive dynamic CCCR instruction?

Research Question 1a

Four ESL Writing instructors from the department, all of whom have received the
same rater training and a minimum of three semesters’ experience of rating ESL writing
papers, rated the participants’ essays before and after the contrastive rhetoric discussions.
Both the average grade for each student and the average grade for the whole class were
calculated. The average grade of Assignment One for the control group was 1.07, which
is approximately 1% higher than the average for the experimental group for the first
assignment (See Tables 3 & 4). This assignment is submitted before the contrastive
rhetoric instructions and discussions were implemented in the experimental group.
Therefore, students writing samples for this assignment work as the baseline to compare
their English proficiency level. This also functions as a validation for the EPT test results.
As stated in the introduction, international graduate students were placed into different ESL Writing Classes based on their EPT results. Since students of different groups were placed in the same level based on their English Placement Test, their writing proficiencies should be roughly the same. The minor difference between the average scores between the two classes suggests\(^1\) that the English Placement Test results are accurate and that the students in the two classes are of similar levels before the cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric study was implemented. In the following section, quantitative data demonstrating the students’ writing scores, percentage of use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices for their first assignments and final assignments from both the control group and the experimental group is presented.\(^2\)

The following sets of data were processed by Independent two-sample t-test to determine the significance level between the data from the control and experimental group. Student T-test was chosen here because of the sample size and the comparison nature of two sets of data.

\(^2\) Moreover, in the final tabulation of students, two students from the control group were not included as one student dropped the course and the other student did not finish their assignments according to the assignment requirements. Therefore, there were 12 students in the control group and 14 students in the experimental group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Joan</th>
<th>Jenny</th>
<th>Ivy</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yueyue</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmeng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongjong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuxu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huahua</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobo</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class Average 90

Table 4 Rating Results for First Assignment from Control Group

The first columns of table 4, 5, 6 and 7 are the names of the students in the control group and L1 refers to their native languages. Alice, Joan, Jenny and Ivy are the names of the four ESL raters and each column under their names is the grades they gave to each student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Joan</th>
<th>Jenny</th>
<th>Ivy</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaochen</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanfan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanhan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songsong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengheng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiajia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haohao</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minmin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class Average 89

Table 5 Rating Results for First Assignment from Experimental Group
As seen in Table 4, the class average for the first assignment is 89.79 with a range from 82.50 to 95.75 and a standard deviation is 4.17. Table 5 shows an average score of 88.71, with the range of results for the students’ first assignments from the experimental group is from 77.50 to 92.75, and a standard deviation of 4.09.

As mentioned earlier, the similar class averages for this first essay suggests that the two groups’ English academic writing proficiency were similar at the beginning of the Cross-Cultural Contrastive Rhetoric study. Comparing the standard deviation as well as the grade range of both groups, it could be seen that the control group has a more evenly distributed grade at the beginning of the semester.

While the information above shows that these control and experimental groups have similar scores on essay one, it was also necessary to examine their performance in their final essay in order to determine if the CCCR instruction had a positive impact on their overall grades on that paper.

Table 6 and 7 are the scores of students’ final assignments. T-test is run here again to check whether there is a significant difference between students’ performance from the control group and the experimental group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Joan</th>
<th>Jenny</th>
<th>Ivy</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yueyue</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmeng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongjong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuxu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huahua</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Alice</th>
<th>Joan</th>
<th>Jenny</th>
<th>Ivy</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bobo</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class Average 91

Table 6 Rating Results for Final Assignment from Control Group

From Table 6, the range of rating results for students’ final assignments from the control group is from 88.25 to 95.00 and the standard deviation is 1.89, with an average score of 91.37.

Table 7 Rating Results for Final Assignment from Experimental Group

From Table 7, the range of rating results for students’ final assignments from the experimental group is from 86.5 to 94.25 and the standard deviation is 2.70.

T-test results show that the T-value is 0.040 and the P-value is 0.097. The result is not significant at p<0.05.

Comparing the class average, grade range as well as the standard deviation, it could be seen that the grades of the control group are more evenly distributed. However,
since the control group demonstrated a smaller grade range at the beginning of the semester, this result for the final assignment is not unexpected.

Comparing Tables 6 and 7, it shows that the class average for the experimental group is 0.29% higher than the control group. However, at the beginning of the semester, the class average of experimental group was 1.07% lower than the control group. This means that over the course of the semester, the experimental group’s average increased by 2.95% (91.66% on the final paper versus 88.71% on paper 1) while the control group average increased by only 1.58%. This results in a 1.37% greater increase for the experimental group. However, despite these numerical differences, the results of the t-test did not find this difference to be statistically significant. While this result did not show that the use of CCCR resulted in overall higher grades for the experimental group, it does demonstrate that CCCR instruction and discussions have improved students’ use of cohesive devices. This conclusion is also worthwhile because some ESL instructors fear the integration of CCCR instruction and discussions as they are afraid that activities as such would take too much of students’ time both in and after class and hence, have a detrimental effect on student outcomes. The above data showed that CCCR activities would not interfere with the existing curriculum.

Perhaps the primary explanation for the lack of statistical significance for Research Question 1a is that the overall grade of each piece of writing consists is determined by a large number of factors. In order to demonstrate this point, the grading rubric for the students’ final assignments, used by both instructors and the study essay raters, is provided in Table 8. The rubric was used by 501 Courses of ESL Writing Service Courses at UIUC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ABSTRACT</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT: Abstract is appealing and concise and follows the chronology of the paper, introducing the purpose in a way that is clear for a general audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INTRODUCTION/CONCLUSION</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION: Background information sufficiently sets up the situation with unity, coherence and development of ideas. Discusses the importance of the issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>THESIS STATEMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THESIS STATEMENT: Thesis Statement clearly and specifically states the question/ scope/purpose of the paper indicating either argumentative or analytical approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONCLUSION</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUSION: It starts out with a brief summary and flows smoothly into broader discussion of the future/broader implications. Does not introduce new information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BODY PARAGRAPHS</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE SYNTHESIS: Information from reliable/relevant sources is well incorporated in the supporting details. Multiple sources are synthesized according to common themes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POINT</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POINT: The main point of the body paragraph is well established and highly relevant to the thesis statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ILLUSTRATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILLUSTRATION: Main point is reinforced with relevant and sufficient supporting evidence from sources with minimum use of quotations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXPLANATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANATION: Supporting points, quotes, and paraphrases are explained and analyzed to help describe the connection/relevance of the illustrations to the main point of the paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GLOBAL CONCERNS</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COHERENCE AND UNITY: Demonstrates clear and logical relation of all parts to the thesis. Each sentence is logically connected with other sentences, transitioning smoothly into the following sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CLARITY</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLARITY: Grammar errors and incorrect word choices do not distract the reader from understanding the important points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (cont.)

| ACADEMIC STYLE: The three aspects of academic style are taken into account: 1) precision, 2) formality, and 3) responsibility |
| CITATION: At least 6 sources are cited both in-text and in the references page using the citation style of your discipline correctly and consistently. |
| FORMATTING: Font Times New Roman, Size 12, Double-Spaced, Margins 1-inch, Title, Abstract and Reference page in an appropriate citation style |

Table 8 Rubric for Assignment

As seen in this rubric, the final grade on each essay is determined based on a wide variety of criteria. These features included in the rubric were discussed by ESL Writing Instructors in the ESL Writing Service Courses so that students could meet the minimum requirements of the assignment. For example, the rubric required students to incorporate students to include a minimum of six sources in the anticipation that they would conduct minimum research necessary for their assignment. This could mean that the CCCR instruction did make a difference for the experimental group, but that the other factors that determine the final grade on a paper simply “drowned out” the CCCR effect. For instance, the introduction needs to have at least the background information and a thesis statement and the body paragraphs needs to contain points, illustrations and explanations and demonstrate a certain level of source synthesis. Other areas that the rubric emphasizes include coherence, unity, academic style citations and formatting. Although these areas have been touched upon in the CCCR instruction and discussions, the major four units of rhetoric style, rhetoric organization, dependent clauses and cohesive devices only constitute a small part of the whole rubric. For instance, one core grading aspect of the academic research paper is citation, which is shown in the rubric. This was not
covered in CCCR curriculum, but it has a strong influence on the raters’ overall impression of any essay. To be more specific, some students’ grades were marked down simply because they did not include enough sources. Furthermore, although the basic point, illustration and explanation structure of a body paragraph has been explored extensively in the CCCR curriculum, the idea of source synthesis was not included in the CCCR curriculum as the control group also received detailed instruction on the necessity of source synthesis in English academic writing. A student might have attempted to use the basic point, illustration and explanation structure in his or her body paragraphs, due to a lack of appropriate logical source synthesis; the raters will have to mark the writing down. Even in the areas of grammar, it is understood that proper grammatically correct English sentences are not only dependable on dependent clauses and cohesive devices. Dependent clauses and cohesive devices were emphasized in CCCR curriculum because 501 students in the ESL writing service courses have demonstrated universal problem in these areas at the beginning of the semester. These language areas were introduced into the CCCR syllabus in an attempt to connect contrastive language with specific academic genre for specific discipline. In other words, students were prompted to conduct closer analysis of sentential expressions in connection with academic writing in both their L1s and English. Even though a student who has received CCCR improved in their dependent clauses and cohesive devices, s/he might still be marked down due to other language issues such as constant incorrect use of articles (a, the, an, /) or issues with prepositional phrases. Last but not least, assessment of writing itself is an ongoing topic of debate and even though four ESL raters received the same training and have been
rating students’ writings for three semesters, there is still some level of discrepancy in terms of how they perceive a successful paper.

In conclusion, the numerical grades of students’ assignments indicated that CCCR activities do not interfere with existing ESL writing curriculum. However, non-significant results of numerical grades did not translate into non-effectiveness or effectiveness of CCCR instruction and activities in ESL writing courses because the grade of each paper is dependent on multi-faceted aspects as shown in the rubric.

Research Question 1b

Research question 1a investigates whether there is a correlation between CCCR instruction and discussions, and students’ overall writing performance. Research Question 1b, on the other hand, focuses on two specific elements explored by the experimental group: the use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices. Dependent clauses were chosen as one focus area here because these were the two main topics surfaced in students’ beginning-of-semester questionnaire as well as their diagnostic analysis. Students’ grammatical errors lay in dependent clauses and their writings in general lacked coherence. These two areas were two of the surfaced themes from students’ beginning-of-semester questionnaire. However, it is important to note that the statistical analysis here is not suggesting that the number of dependent clauses and connectives is proportional to the quality of writing. The purpose of the statistical analysis is to investigate whether CCCR instruction and activities lead to more production of dependent clauses and connectives and hence demonstrate students’ improvement of metacognition of CCCR.
The following data showed students’ use of dependent clauses in both the control and experimental group for their first assignment. Chi-square test was conducted to calculate whether there is significant difference between two groups at the very beginning. Non-significant data reveals that students’ uses of dependent clauses were at roughly similar level at the beginning of the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Number of Dependent Clauses</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yueyue</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmeng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongjong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuxu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huahua</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobo</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class Average 26%

Table 9 Percentage of Use of Dependent Clauses for First Assignment from Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Number of Dependent Clauses</th>
<th>Total Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaochen</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanfan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanhan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songsong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengheng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiàjia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haohao</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 Percentage of Use of Dependent Clauses for First Assignment from Experimental Group

In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the experimental group and control group, Chi-square test is conducted on the data from Table 9 and Table 10. In Table 11, numbers in the column of dependent clause and non-dependent clauses are the average of the whole class.

Table 11 Chi-Square Analysis of Dependent Clauses for First Assignment

Although class average of experimental group is 11% higher than the control group, there is no significant difference between two sets of data. This is because from Chi-square-test at the significance level of 0.05, the P-value is 0.41. The result is not significant at p<0.05. This shows that students’ use of dependent clauses were at similar level at the beginning of the semester. As first assignment is an argumentative essay, students from different disciplines were asked to write an argumentative response to a provided topic. This statistical data showed a clear reflection of students’ understanding of English argumentative writing.

With the similar use of dependent clauses at the beginning of the semester, findings from the use of dependent clauses at the end of the semester provided
meaningful information about whether CCCR instruction and discussions improve students’ use of dependent clauses. Table 10 shows the percentage of use of dependent clauses for final assignment from the control group and it could be seen that the class average for the control group is 25.21%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Number of Dependent Clauses</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yueyue</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmeng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongjong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuxu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huahua</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobo</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class Average: 25%

Table 12 Percentage of Use of Dependent Clauses for Final Assignment from Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Total Number of Dependent Clauses</th>
<th>Total Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage of dependent clauses used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaochen</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanfan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanhan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songsong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengheng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiajia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haohao</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minmin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Class Average</th>
<th>31%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 13 Percentage of Use of Dependent Clauses for Final Assignment from Experimental Group

Table 13 shows the data from the experimental group with the class average of 31%. In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the experimental group and control group, Chi-square test is conducted on the data from Table 12 and Table 13. In Table 14, numbers in the column of dependent clause and non-dependent clauses are the average of the whole class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dependent Clause</th>
<th>Non-Dependent Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Chi-Square Analysis of Dependent Clauses for Final Assignment

By the end of the semester, students’ use of dependent clauses and connectives were calculated again. Only students from the experimental group has received specific instruction and participated in CCCR activities in the areas of connectives and dependent clauses. Comparing the two groups, it could be seen that the class average of the experimental group is 5% higher than that of the control group. Chi-square-test is used to run the data between control and experimental group in terms of use of dependent clauses for final assignment. The Chi-square statistic is 0.7568. The P value is 0.384332. This result is not significant at p < 0.10. The data shows that there is no significant difference between the use of dependent clauses for final assignment between the control group and experimental group.

Other than dependent clauses, another area of focus for CCCR instruction and discussions is connectives. Table 15 and 16 demonstrate students’ use of cohesive
devices from both the control and experimental group for their first assignments. The data for first assignments was collected because it served as the baseline for the comparison at the end of the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Sentences with Connectives</th>
<th>Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yueyue</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmeng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongjong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuxu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huahua</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobo</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class Average 45%

Table 15 Percentage of Use of Cohesive Devices for First Assignment (Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Sentences with Connectives</th>
<th>Total Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaochen</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanfan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanhan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songsong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengheng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiajia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haohao</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minmin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class Average 29%

Table 16 Percentage of Use of Cohesive Devices for First Assignment (Experimental)
Table 15 and Table 16 demonstrate the percentage of sentences with connectives for first assignment from both groups.

In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the experimental group and control group, Chi-square test is conducted on the data from Table 15 and Table 16. In Table 17, numbers in the column of Sentences with Connectives and Sentences without Connectives are the average of the whole class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sentences with Connectives</th>
<th>Sentences without Connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Chi-Square Analysis of Connectives for First Assignment

The Chi-square statistic is 0.9466. The P value is 0.330592. This result is not significant at p < 0.10. In other words, students’ uses of connectives from both groups were at similar level at the beginning of the semester before the CCCR instruction and activities.

At the end of the semester, students’ sentences with connectives from both groups were calculated to investigate whether students’ use of connectives change after CCCR instruction and activities. Table 18 and 19 demonstrate the final data of two groups on sentences with connectives in relation to total number of sentences.
Table 18 Percentage of Use of Cohesive Devices for Final Assignment from Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Sentences with Connectives</th>
<th>Total Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yueyue</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunsun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwon</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengmeng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongjiong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuxu</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huahua</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobo</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Class Average 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 Percentage of Sentences with Connectives for Final Assignment from Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Sentences with Connectives</th>
<th>Total Number of Sentences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaochen</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanfan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanhan</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songsong</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hengheng</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiajia</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haohao</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minmin</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Class Average 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sentences with Connectives</th>
<th>Sentences without Connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 Chi-Square Analysis of Connectives for Final Assignment

Chi-square test is used to run the data between control and experimental group in terms of use of cohesive devices for final assignment. At the significance level of 0.10, the Chi-square statistic is 3.0645. The P value is 0.08. This result is significant at $p < 0.10$.

Based on this data, it could be concluded that experimental group’s sentences with connective are more than the control group at the end of the semester when CCCR study is completed. Again, this is not suggesting that writing performance is proportional with the number of connectives, but rather students from the experimental group showed an increase of connectives after CCCR instruction and activities. This change needed to be interpreted together with students’ reflection and interviews so as to show the improvement of their metacognition of CCCR by the end of the semester.

Among the data collected including students’ scores for their first and final assignments, their use of dependent clauses for their first and final assignments, and their use of connectives, the most significant improvement is seen in their use of connectives, which were used in the attempt to present a more coherence piece of writing, followed by the use of dependent clauses which were used to improve the complexity of the sentences used in their writing and their change in their numerical scores is not significant.

Answering the first research question of whether students who receive CCCR instruction
and participate in CCCR discussions perform better in their writings: from the rating results, students in the experimental group did not seem to be significantly better than those in the control group based on the numerical grades despite of the 0.29 differences in their grade. However, based on the significance result of the data of connectives, it could be concluded that students in the experimental group showed an increase in the use of connectives in their writing compared to the experimental group. The grades of the experimental were not significantly higher than the control group because these two only constitutes part of the grade.

Implications of the findings of Research Question 1 are that ESL instructors should be free from the worries and concerns over the inclusion or integration of CCCR activities, as they have proved to be not counterproductive. Furthermore, all the existing components that are listed in the writing rubric could be shaped into a CCCR-related activity. Finally, in order to obtain a more significant data in students’ writing grades, a more extensive and detailed CCCR curriculum that could span over a longer period of studies is needed.
Findings of Research Question 2

a. Do students actively see the connection between the instruction of CCCR and English academic writing?

b. Does the study of employing CCCR instruction and discussions raise students’ metacognition of rhetorical style, organization and language use in English academic writing?

Students’ Beliefs

—Students’ Beliefs on How their Cultural Backgrounds Influence their English Academic Writing

At the beginning of the semester, a start-of-term questionnaire was conducted to investigate students’ basic understanding of contrastive rhetoric. According to the start-of-semester questionnaire, 45% of all the students in both the control and experimental group have learned how to write academic papers in their respective L1s before they took ESL 501 Course. Among these students, 77% think that culture plays a role in their academic writing, and this group of students provided some responses regarding what ways they think culture influences their writing. The following are the comments from Chinese students who believe that culture influences their writing: “The way that Chinese people think is quite different from the western people. We tend not to point out what is not good directly”, “In Chinese writing, the author is always modest”, “and we do not go directly to the point as Americans do. We first go for long introduction and then to the main point.” A Korean student, Kim, thinks that English writing is logically different from Korean writing, especially conclusion parts. Ibrahim, whose native language is Farsi, says that he also uses some metaphors and allegories that make sense in his language.
For the 19% of students who did not think that culture plays a role in their academic writing, their responses are very similar which highlights the essence of academic writing. One Chinese student, Xuxu stated, “Because my major is Mechanical engineering, a lot of technical vocabulary is from other languages. Also, in academic writing of science of engineering, the main concern is to deliver the author’s information in a clear and precise way. So I think culture plays little role in my writing. If I were a literature student, my writing would be affected by my culture for sure.” Oscar, a Turkish speaker, provided a similar response: “I believe academic writing has its own style regardless of the culture. This style, however, depends on the academic field. For example, structure of the papers in the field of engineering may differ from the ones in social science.” A Chinese student, Haohao, also pointed out the dominance of English in academia stating that “…the majority of academic papers are writing in English, even those papers written in Chinese are finished by the people who are familiar with English academic writing. They are all written in an English way. As a result, for those who major in natural science, there is no so-called Chinese academic writing.”

In the start-of-semester questionnaire, students were also asked about their understanding of the differences between English writing and writing in their L1s. The majority of the students mentioned the differences in vocabulary, grammar and writing style. These students generally think that their lack of English vocabulary is one cause contributing to the differences between their English writing and writing in their L1. Minmin (Chinese) responded “…I don’t know how to express myself well in English. I can use many different ways to describe one thing in Chinese, but in English, there are only a few options. “An Iranian student explains, “Mine (writing in my L1) does not have
a structure like American, and has more poetic features and subjective languages. Like I may say in Farsi that your ideas are like ocean, it means that you have many diverse ideas.” A Chinese student, Jiajia, gave a more detailed response: “the structure in Chinese writing is totally different from English. We use introduction, support, negative point, and conclusion as a four-step writing method. Unlike the English writing which always put the most important thing (usually the main idea) as the first sentence, we put some background information or description before the main idea.” Didi gave an even more subjective response: “I think English writing is more logical than the writing in my mother tongue.” Bobo went beyond the level of writing and stated that Chinese people are sometimes very shy and they like to use a great number of implicit words to express their ideas, however; he does see the expectations of native English speakers saying that, “…native speakers want you to be straightforward.” A number of students also see the differences of writing styles between English and their L1s. One Chinese student, Jiajia, also specified that “in my opinion, English emphasizes the logic and paragraph structure in writing while Chinese focus on the usage and variety of author’s vocabulary,” and a Korean student, Kwon, thinks that “usually, the conclusion part of Korean writing provides a reader with the summary of the content. But, English writing points out new directions for the future in the conclusion part.” From this part of the response, it could be observed clearly that the large majority of the students, both from the experimental group and control group have some understandings, if not quite profound understandings, of the differences between English writing and writing in their L1s. This foundation serves as the basis for the analysis of the possibility of integrating some contrastive rhetoric pedagogical approaches in the ESL writing service course.
From students’ responses in beginning-of-semester questionnaire, it could be seen that even before CCCR instruction and discussions, students had some ideas about similarities and differences between Chinese. To be more specific, they had relevant CCCR knowledge, but not organized and properly applied in their English academic writing before the study. Students’ responses from beginning-of-semester questionnaire showed where they were before CCCR instruction and discussions and these served as the baseline for the comparisons in the end.

At the end of the start-of-semester questions, students were also asked to suggest the most significant difference between English writing and writing in their L1s. Based on the data collected, one area that could be incorporated in the study is the flow of the writing and forming of English sentences. This response led to the creation of the instructional content for the experimental group, including clauses that contribute to the correct formation of English sentences and transitional connectives, which generates the seamless flow of English writing. In other words, the start-of-semester questionnaire not only serves as the pre-test survey but also the needs analysis that generates useful information for the content creation of the instruction for the contrastive rhetoric study.

Reflection Report
During the middle of the semester, students in the experimental group were asked to write a reflection on the CCCR instruction and discussions that they have received and participated in at the end of Unit One. At this point, students had been involved in the discussions of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s from the perspective of rhetorical style and organization. A table was provided for them to summarize their findings regarding the similarities and differences between English academic writing and writing in their L1s. (see appendix)
Students’ responses were positive in terms of the usefulness of CCCR instruction and discussions. Piaopiao summarized his observed differences between Chinese and English writing in this way: “In Chinese writing, it is the reader’s responsibility to understand the article, which is the opposite in English writing. Sometimes in Chinese writing, writers may make the article hard to understand intentionally, which would never happen in English writing. In English writing a writer would like to make the article simple to understand for readers no matter how obscure the topic he is writing about. ” Although Piaopiao’s comments might not be characterized as being accurate, these demonstrate his understandings of CCCR between Chinese academic writing and English academic writing. Piaopiao concluded in the end that “… all the differences are worth to pay attention to in order to produce more effective academic essay. For example, I will write the thesis statement in the introduction part. Also, for the body paragraphs, I would focus on the PIE structure and coherence to make the article in English writing style. The most important, give enough evidence to support my point and make the article easy to understand for readers.”

Another student, Hanhan provided the Table 21 in her reflection demonstrating her findings and understandings after a series of cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric activities were completed:
She gave a detailed analysis of the differences and similarities between English academic writing and Chinese academic writing in the areas of introduction, body paragraphs and conclusion:

In the introduction part, academic paper in my L1 is a little different from papers in English. Although both of them include background information and summary of points, the introduction in L1 paper does not have the thesis statement. If it’s an argumentative essay, sometimes the summary is not included in my L1 either. In addition, there’s no thesis statement in my L1 paper, and I think in Chinese writing we seldom put the main point at the beginning. Sentences that emphasize the main idea or cover all the points often appear at the end in a Chinese essay, which is the conclusion part in English essay.

As for the body paragraphs, my L1 paper does not have PIE structures. In my L1 the most common structure is: Illustrations, explanations and conclusions. Moreover, my L1 paper has a conclusion for each subtopic, while in English writing there’s only one final conclusion for the whole essay.

Finally in the conclusion part, papers in L1 and in English are very similar; they all contain summary and further suggestion or call for action. I think in Chinese paper it’s very important to address potential improvements in the conclusion. In addition, for the coherence and academic style of the essay, there are also differences between L1 paper and English paper. Since there’s no clause in Chinese, almost all the sentences are complex sentences that contain several parts, and they are connected by comma, but in English short sentences would be changed into clause or connected by cohesive devices. In English, pronouns are common cohesive devices, but I think in Chinese academic paper pronouns are seldom used.

Despite the several differences, however, the academic paper in my L1 in my field is very similar to English paper. Statistics is a new field in China, and most of the achievements in statistics are from U.S., therefore the academic references
are all in English. Influenced by these references, L1 papers in this field would follow the similar pattern as English writing. For my writing I think I’m aware of how to follow the PIE structure, and I need to work on introductions and conclusions so as to make sure that I have included all the elements of them. For the coherence, I can check the cohesive devices in the paragraphs to make the sentences more coherent.

From Hanhan’s detailed reflection, it could be seen that she actively compared the similarities and differences between English academic writing and Chinese academic writing. Not only did she report her findings about those comparisons in introduction, body paragraphs and conclusion. She also stated that what she would attempt to improve her writing. She found that academic writing in Chinese in her field of statistics is very similar to English and even proposed the reason behind it, which is that the field is new in China and Chinese papers on statistics tend to follow the English writing pattern.

Fanfan, who demonstrated a comparatively higher proficiency in his English academic writing at the beginning of the semester from the grades given by the ESL instructors and his use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices, wrote in his reflection:

Academic writing in Chinese is originated from English academic writing, so there are a large number of similarities between academic writings in these two languages. However, due to cultural and traditional factors, differences still exist in many aspects.

In his reflection, the cultural and traditional factors that he explained in depth are how Chinese writing tends to put the main points at the end instead of the beginning and how they hid the thesis statement. Similar to what Hanhan has found, Fanfan also saw the increasing trend of Chinese academic writing following the accepted norms of English academic writing. He believed that both Chinese academic writing and English academic writing values the importance of academic writing being specific and original.

In a typical English writing, the introduction should include background information, thesis statement and the main points of the article. In Chinese writing,
however, while most authors would also like to include background information in the introduction, they prefer to put main points and thesis statement at the end of the article, as a conclusion. In addition, Chinese writers tend to clarify the objective of research in the introduction.

In English writing, there is usually a thesis statement in one sentence or several sentences, however, in Chinese academic writing, sometimes it is hard to identify a thesis statement, because writers may raise several points that are of the same importance, these points as a whole can be viewed as a thesis statement. However, in sense of being specific and original, academic writing in these two languages share the same standard.

In their body paragraphs, although there are an increasing number of Chinese writers using “PIE” structure in recent years, not all of them accept this norm. In contrast, they adopt an “IEP” structure, which means putting the point they want to make at the end of the paragraph. The reason why they write in this way is probably that they think putting the point in the beginning appears assertive and reduce the incentive of further reading.

He also compared the use of language in the writing and concluded that both academic writings emphasize unity, cohesion and coherence despite some nuances in the understanding of these terms. He especially used connectives as an illustration here to explain that these connectors were omitted in Chinese writing and he believed the reason behind this phenomenon is cultural as Chinese authors put the responsibility of understanding on the readers and including these cohesive devices will “seem redundant”.

As for the characteristics of language, Chinese academic writing also put emphasis on unity, cohesion and coherence, as those in English. However, the understanding of these terms is not completely the same. For example, in order to achieve cohesion, English writers always uses cohesive devices, such as “for example” or “such as” before she gives illustration. In Chinese writing, though not all of them, cohesive devices are omitted in some cases, especially before examples are introduced. As far as I am concerned, the reason behind this difference is culture difference; Chinese authors sometimes assume their readers can understand there idea without a cohesive device, in which case adding those words seems redundant.

Another interesting finding from Fanfan’s reflection is that Chinese writings put more weight on the conclusion because they do not state the main idea (thesis statement
and main points) at the beginning. Therefore, they need to include all of these ideas in the end.

Chinese authors often put more emphasis on the conclusion part than English writers do, because instead of restating their thesis and main points, they often raise their points here for the first time in the whole article here. Furthermore, Conclusion in Chinese academic writing is longer compared with English ones, and Chinese writers usually separate their conclusion into two parts, one is the conclusion of previous researches and discussions, the other being expectations and suggestions based on the conclusion. As for the content of calling for action and further research, we can see some similarities in academic writings in these two languages.

The following paragraph demonstrates Fanfan’s awareness of these cultural differences between English academic writing and Chinese academic writing. He addressed the issue of his identity as an international student from China and because of this, he needed to pay extra attention to his target audience and how he could make his writing more coherent by utilizing more cohesive devices and following the English writing style and organization such as placing the thesis statement in the introduction and main ideas at the beginning of body paragraphs.

Given these differences between academic writing in Chinese and English, and the fact that I am an international student from China, I should be cautious when writing an academic paper in English. On the one hand, I should make sure my sentences make sense to my target audience, and never simply translate from Chinese to English. On the other hand, in order to achieve cohesion, I should use appropriate cohesive devices in and between sentences. Most importantly, I should follow the standard structure of English academic writing in my papers, putting the thesis statement in the beginning, following PIE structure in my body paragraphs and restating my points in the end.

Lili summarized his observations of differences between academic writing in Chinese and English Table 22:

Interestingly, Lili doubted the validity of PIE structure in the writing of body paragraphs in both English and Chinese academic writing in his field as he stated that
“Both my L1 and the English paper are not typical PIE structure.” This shows that CCCR activities engage students in individual thinking and this is possible in different fields such as Lili’s field: biochemistry. As explained in the introduction, the main objective of introducing CCCR introduction and discussions is to make sure that students can inject their autonomy in their writing and they are the owner of their final produced paper. ESL writing instructor will not be able to be fully familiar with the norms of writing in each discipline and it is indeed the students’ jobs to apply what they have learnt in the ESL writing courses and adapt that knowledge and those skills in their own writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Writing in Your L1</th>
<th>Academic Writing in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>The introduction part is very similar to English academic writing</td>
<td>The introduction part is very similar to my L1 academic writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Statement</td>
<td>The thesis statement of my L1 paper doesn’t elaborate clearly of the overall idea of the paper.</td>
<td>The thesis statement of my English paper clearly explained the overarching idea of the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Paragraphs</td>
<td>The body paragraphs are very similar. They describe their experiments and the results they get.</td>
<td>The body paragraphs are very similar. They describe their experiments and the results they get.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE structure</td>
<td>Both my L1 and the English paper are not typical PIE structure without the subtitle.</td>
<td>Both my L1 and the English paper are not typical PIE structure without the subtitle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence (type of cohesive devices)</td>
<td>My L1 paper is weak at coherence. I cannot find many cohesive devices.</td>
<td>The English academic paper is cohesive. They state the key words several times in a paragraph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hengheng compared the use of pronouns in his reflection, reporting, “In my L1 writing, pronouns are not used very often while the repetition of the key words is more likely to occur within one paragraph or the whole article.” Another area that he looked into is the use of passive voice and he attributed the difference in the use of passive voice is caused by the fundamental language differences: “In English academic writing, the passive voice is frequently used to make the article more objective which is a basic requirement of academic writing. Due to the original differences of the two languages between my L1 and English, passive voice is limited used in my L1 academic writing.”

Alma, whose L1 is Farsi, summarized her comparisons between English academic writing and Farsi academic writing in Table 23:

Table 22 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>The conclusion is included in the discussion part. It is similar to the English papers, which compare previous studies about the research and draw their own conclusion.</th>
<th>The conclusion is included in the discussion part. They usually just compare their results with previous studies about the research and draw their own conclusion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Writing in Your L1</td>
<td>Academic Writing in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Background- summery of main point-no clear thesis statement</td>
<td>Background- summary of main point-thesis statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Statement</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>Specific-focused-original-make an assertion-not an announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Paragraphs</td>
<td>Body paragraph is the same in Farsi -with main point, illustration and explanation. In terms of explanation, It is more than we have in English and it goes beyond the explanation of illustration. Also in the first of paragraph, we have some sort of background.</td>
<td>PIE structure, unity that means the whole paragraph has one main point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE structure</td>
<td>We have pie structure, but explanation is not really clear.</td>
<td>Main point (p), Illustration (I) and explanation (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence (type of cohesive devices)</td>
<td>We have also cohesive devices in Farsi.</td>
<td>Addition, comparison, contrast and other cohesive devises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>It is similar</td>
<td>Restate thesis statement, summary of main point in paper, call to action, possible future research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Flowery sentences, does not go to the main point directly</td>
<td>Goes to main point directly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 Academic Writing in Student’s L1 and English by Alma

Alma added to the existing categories provided for comparison and explained that Farsi academic writing contains more flowery sentences and does not go to the main point directly, which is the opposite to English academic writing. At the end of her reflection,
Alma voiced her understanding of the importance of identifying the differences: “To address these differences, we should read and reference more academic papers in English to adjust them and identify more differences in details between academic writing in L1 and English.”

Kim, whose L1 is Korean, reflected on the differences between English academic writing and Korean English academic writing. He found that the introductions of both contain similar elements, however; there are some subtle differences:

In my L1 academic writing, the introduction part is composed of background, main points and thesis statement. However, occasionally, the background of main points is too general in my L1 writing. Same as my L1 writing, introduction in English academic writing are made of background information, summary of main points and thesis statements. However, the contents in the introduction are condensed and directly related with the topic in English writings, which shows the different academic style between Korean and English.

When Kim discussed the thesis statement and main points, some interesting findings surfaced: the writing convention of Korean academic writing and Chinese academic writing seem to converge in this area of thesis statement:

In addition, the characteristics of thesis statement are different between my L1 writing and English writing. In my L1 paper, thesis statement is located at the end of introduction. However, the thesis statement is not clearly stated with author’s main unique idea. The statement is more introductory or informative than directly stated. However, in English writing, the thesis statement should be located at the end of the introduction. The thesis statement should be focused on the main point and include author’s own unique debatable ideas.

Similar to what some Chinese students have found, the thesis statement is not clearly found in Korean academic writing. This is another benefit of conducting CCCR instruction and discussions in a multilingual ESL Writing Courses as students could relate to each other when they realize that their respective L1 academic writing share some common characteristics. During whole-class discussion, these shared characteristics
Ibrahim, whose L1 is Persian, employed the English writing style to write his reflection. He demonstrated a clear introduction, body paragraphs and conclusion structure and PIE (point, illustration, explanation) structure for body paragraphs is also seen in his writing. In the introduction, he attempted to use three elements: attention grabber, summary of the main points and theme sentence.

One of the interesting aspects of learning different languages is to realize the differences and similarities between those languages. I have learned and understood some variations in terms of organization and structures of sentences and paragraphs, specifically in academic writing. I would like to write about some of these differences between my native language, which is Persian and English regarding academic style.

The very first sentence in the above introduction functions as the attention grabber that instigates the readers’ interest in reading this piece of writing, and the second sentence summarizes his main points for the reflection. The last sentence is his summary of main points clarifying the purpose of this reflection. The structure of his reflection shows how students apply what they learn in their writing in a very short period of time.

**Introduction, Thesis Statement, PIE Structure and Body Paragraphs**

The idea of having introduction in both Persian and English is very close to each other. However, we will still find some differences. I would like to mention that the structure of sentence in Persian and English is a little bit different from each other which in turn might cause some significant differences in terms of the final meaning each sentence have to be associated with. For instance, in English if we want to draw organization of simple sentence, it would be like: Noun + Verb + Subj. While, in Persian arrangement of sentences is different from English. In Persian sentences organization would base on below module: Noun + Subj. + Verb. We need to be aware of this type of differences when it comes to English. Otherwise, our sentences would not make any sense. For providing further information please look at the below example:

**English:** I love to play basketball (noun + adv. + verb + subj.)
If we want to use the structure of Persian and then translate it to English the previous sentence would be converting to: I love basketball to play (noun + adv. + subj. + verb)

Ibrahim provided detailed analysis of sentence structure between English and Persian and he believed these differences could be reasons behind some of his English sentences not making sense.

This following paragraph is Ibrahim’s analysis of the differences between English academic writing and Persian academic writing from the perspective of introduction, thesis statement, body paragraphs and conclusions.

Introduction of academic writing in English we can find some backgrounds about the related topic. Also it provides us some key points about the topic and along with those points we can find thesis statement. Thesis statement in turn is crystal clear and would be associate with the PIE structure (having points, illustration and explanation) in next supporting body paragraphs. While in Persian, we still have this system of organization, we might see that sentences are a little bit longer and they are having some unnecessary parts. We still have chain system of having introduction, thesis statement and supporting body paragraphs along with having the PIE structure. However, you might be able to eliminate some parts of sentences in Persian academic writing due to being irrelevant. Body paragraphs in English academic writing would mainly start with demonstrating the point(s) of that paragraph, then illustration of point(s) in conjunction with creative explanation. While, in Persian you will still find the PIE structure, you might not be able to find a crystal clear boundaries or differences between illustration and explanation. Or differentiate them very quick with first glance.

Ibrahim thought that there was a general alignment between English academic writing and Persian academic writing. However, he pointed out that Persian writing tended to have more “unnecessary parts” which were irrelevant.

In the following paragraph discussing coherence in English academic writing and Persian academic writing, Ibrahim believed that the use of cohesive devices between Persian and English is similar. This explains why in Ibrahim’s final assignment, he kept using the cohesive device “by means” throughout the paper. According to his ESL
instructor, whose native language is also Persian, “by means” is a direct translation from Persian that means “as a result.” Ibrahim’s inaccurate understanding of cohesive devices between English and Persian is the reason behind his incorrect use of cohesive devices. In the following paragraph from his reflection about coherence sheds some light about his understanding of coherence:

Coherence/Cohesive
In English sentences are brief, to the point with appropriate linking devices (cohesive devices). In Persian, we have a very close definition and structure in terms of linking devices and using of punctuations to provide audiences a clear understanding about the topic.

It seems that to him cohesive devices in English and Persian are very similar and this is probably why he constantly used the wrong cohesive device of “by means”.

Santiago whose L1 is Spanish also demonstrated his attempt to include the reader-oriented writing style in his reflection. In the following introduction, he clearly stated his aim of reflection:

In this essay I want to highlight the main differences I have encountered between academic writing in my L1 (Spanish) and English. I will follow each of the unit we have worked with in our ESL 501 class. My main concern during this learning process is related with the rules of English academic writing, and how they help to understand US academy practices.

Santiago also summarized that Spanish introductions are more extensive while English introductions are brief and precise in the following paragraphs. He also reflected on his previous writing assignments, which did not include the summary of the main points and a thesis statement.

Introductions in Spanish tend to be extensive. Although the introduction serves to present all the content of the article or paper, it is not mandatory to include a thesis statement that must be restated at the end of the text. Most of the time, to hook the reader, introductions tend to be very decorated, without too much concern about the background of the reader. On the contrary, Introductions in
English are very precise. Since I learnt about this technique of writing I’ve been reading papers in a different way. I could highlight the thesis statement at the beginning of the article, and try to find some specific arguments across the paper. This has helped me to get a broader idea of the whole, since the introductory statements shows me the main argument contextualized by the summary and the background. I remember lots of critiques to my writing, because I did not gave the reader neither a summary nor a background of my thesis.

In the following paragraph, Santiago, like Lili, also found the unique feature of academic writing in his own discipline that a narrative approach is possible in history.

The thesis statement is not necessary writing in a specific part of the text. Moreover, you can suggest some ideas around your thesis but just write it in the conclusion, similarly to the thesis re-statement that we learnt in ESL 501. I guess this is also related with different academic fields, as in history, scholars are allowed to write in a more narrative way. However, as English writing is aimed to the public, this kind of clear statement gives solidity and clarity to arguments.

In the following paragraph, Santiago explained how coherence is achieved through different means. He argued that in Spanish academic writing, it is not cohesive devices like used in English writing that played a role in creating coherence, but how authors utilize the references to demonstrate the link between evidence and points. Reading Santiago’s reflection, we could see that his personal preference of not being explicit in expressing his ideas which could spring from his discipline or personal writing style.

For that reason, coherence for Spanish and English is similar in theory but not in practice. Coherence, in Spanish writing, means to drive your idea from one point to another, without any reliance on how to achieve it. It is not that phrases could be of any kind, without grammatical order, but also that you have to bring the reader illustrative references for create connections. This could be misleading as authors defend, in some cases, their use of language as a way to describe the complexity of some ideas. However it is also a possibility to saturate the text with lots of reference and Tables, just to demonstrate an intellectual superiority. In English, complexity is described in simple phrases, giving the reader quick highlights to put the reader into broader discussions. It is not only a matter of writing, but also of planning and designing the arguments, allowing a limited use of the more relevant concepts.

Like other students, Santiago also believed that academic writing in Spanish would be more and more English academic writing. In the end, he proposed, “in self-
reflecting disciplines on writing like anthropology, history, education or communication, some of these rules are being reconsidered, which describe that rules of academic writing are not written in stone.”

Minmin, majoring in engineering, also found a number of similarities between English academic writing and academic writing in his L1—Chinese, and he attributed these similarities to “increasing intercommunication”; at the same time, he also noted the differences in Chinese and English thesis statements.

Basically all introduction parts in Chinese and English papers I found are corresponding. They started with background information, introducing the main topic of the paper, and showing specific limit or restriction. Chinese papers are likely to put more space for background info, mostly society connection with the topic, and English papers tend to focus on the target itself. There could be no obvious thesis statement in Chinese paper’s introduction part; it could be replaced by limits of the topic. This is quite different from the English style in Thesis statement.

In the following paragraph, Minmin tried to find the reason behind the Chinese writing blurring the line between illustration and explanation. This is one common problem as observed in many Chinese students’ English academic writing: it is likely that they omit the explanation part or they did not have clear explanation. Minmin concluded that this was due to the western and eastern philosophy of explaining observed phenomenon:

As body paragraphs, both of two papers are made of methods and materials, results and discussion. While English papers usually have a clear PIE structure, Chinese papers are vague in this aspect: illustration and explanation are often combined with each other, and could be difficult to separate apart. Maybe this difference actually show the difference in two culture: West philosophy focus on describing separate things, classing the world and putting different labels on it; East philosophy try to explanation (explain) the whole world by a single rule.

Minmin tried to find general similarities between all languages from the perspective of cohesive devices: he argued that despite the differences between the use of specific
cohesive devices in English and Chinese, the ultimate goal of these cohesive devices, regardless of the language, is the same: to make the writing more coherent.

Despite the words, phrases and punctuations difference in two languages, Chinese and English have some sort of similarities in using coherent device. They may unlike in specific cases, such as quotation mark and colon usage, because and so structure, etc. However in general, all of these components have the same intention: to make the sentence more cohesive and fluent, easy to be understood. With a perfect handling of Chinese and English expressing parlance, these two languages could be easily interpreted. (Maybe this is similar in all languages of human being)

In the follow paragraph from Minmin’s, it could be seen that before he stated his findings of comparison, he tried to explain the conclusion section in English academic writing and this style of writing is in alignment with the English academic writing style. However, Minmin also pointed out that in his discipline

In a typical argument conclusion, the writer should rephrase thesis statement, make a summary of all body parts, and closed by an interesting end, like a call for action, a question or prediction.

As illustrated from several tables and accounts provided by the students, it could be found that the CCCR activity which involves students’ comparing English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s not only prompts students to find out the similarities and differences between the two, but also gives students another opportunity to review the topics that has been covered in the courses. For example, they have to understand and state the norms of English introduction, body paragraphs and conclusion before they moved onto comparisons in different realms.

Answering the first half of the second research question which asked whether CCCR instruction and discussions facilitate students in seeing the connection between the contrastive studies and their writing performance: students’ reflection showed that they saw the connection between academic writing in their L1 and academic writing in
English as well as how L1 might influence their English academic writing regardless of their L1s. For some disciplines like biochemistry, as mentioned by Lili (Chinese), similarities were found between the structure of academic writing in English and academic writing in his L1, which is Chinese. This finding agrees with Taylor, G., & Tingguang, C. (1991)’s research conclusion that some variations are discipline-based rather than culture based when they compared the introductions to papers written in variety of related disciplines by three groups of physical scientists. All students have reported their findings that academic writings in their L1s are becoming more and more like English academic writings in terms of organization and structure.

By the end of the semester, responses from the control group were also collected. The following is the summary of control group’s responses to the question: If you are to introduce to your friends from other cultures the cross-cultural differences between your L1 (mother tongue) writing and English writing, what would you say? These responses were directed quoted from students’ online responses and arranged by bullet points (each bullet point represents one student’s idea):

- English writing is more logical than Chinese writing.
- There are really big differences in terms of grammar especially in sentence structure. There is not a PIE structure in L1 and L 1 has more flexible writing style.
- Different grammar and structure. English writing is more direct and explicit.
- The order of writing is different between two cultures and in here, avoiding plagiarism is very important when people write
- The nuance is hard to say in one word.
- Grammar: Articles and prepositions Writing : logics of academic writing
- Our L1 writing focus less on conjunctions
- I didn't learn L1 writing like this. So I'm not sure.
- The organizing strategy is different between these two languages.
- The structure of the sentences between two cultures is very different. In my culture, we always put the time (eg: today, 3:00p.m.) at the beginning of the sentences, while English writing sometimes put the time at the end.
Way of expression. Chinese tend to think more abstract whereas English is more straightforward.
Although there are some differences such as expression, grammar, and idiom, there are not significant difference between each writing such as general structure and logical structure.

Compared to the responses from students in the experimental group, it is not difficult to find that the control group’s descriptions of the differences between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s were more general and less detailed and this shows that their understanding still lies at a more general level. Furthermore, their understandings of CCCR were more binary, in which they conclude that one culture only writes in certain way. However, those students in the experimental group challenged the possible claims of academic writing in different cultures. For example, Liang from music questioned the legitimacy of IMRD structure in academic writing in music in both his L1 and English, Lili believed that PIE paragraph structure was not found in his discipline biochemistry.

The control group’s responses to the question about how they felt their L1 influenced their English writing by the end of the semester also shed some light on the significance of CCCR study. The following is the summary of their responses and these responses were directed quoted from students’ online responses and arranged by bullet points (each bullet point represents one student’s idea):

- I would state the main point in the last of the paragraph, but that is not the good style in English writing
- I have to pay more attention on how to make the writing more logical.
- When I am doing the English academic writing, sometimes I cannot come up with the vocabulary or usages that I want. I have to use Google translate to help me.
- As language aspect, L1's developmental methods for write are different between English. However, logical context (background knowledge and logical sequence) is not different, so strong logical structure highly influenced my English academic writing.
If my L1 is European, it would be much easier to learn English writing.
Way of thinking.
Preferring to translate my L1 to English word by word.
It takes much more time in writing in English.
Sometimes I don't know a word, I might straightly translate the word from my L1.
Korean language does not have articles Also, academic writing logics are different from English
Probably after the high school, I wrote academic articles in English so the influence is small.
Well, I think I am not influenced by my L1 when I write English academic essay.

The first statement is that s/he puts the main idea at the end of body paragraph in his/her L1 academic writing, and s/he claims it is “not good” writing. Interestingly, throughout the CCCR study, no participant in the experimental group used the word “good” to describe English academic writing, or “bad” to refer to academic writing in L1s. The objective of CCCR study was to provide students opportunities to do contrastive studies so as to find similarities and differences, and at the same time let students realize that no particular academic writing is superior or inferior to others. This shows that students who did not receive CCCR instruction and participate in CCCR discussions did not demonstrate such understanding of English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s.

The second half of Research Question 2 concerns the implementation of CCCR instruction and discussions on raising students’ awareness or improving their metacognition of rhetorical style, organization and language use such as the use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices. Students’ reflection showed their metacognition of the different rhetorical styles and organizations between English academic writing and academic writing. All the students proposed ways they could address problems in their English academic writing, which might be due to the fundamental language differences
and style preferences between their L1 and English as well as between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s. A point worth noticing is that CCCR instruction and discussions are student-oriented, as instructors did not provide prescriptive rules or findings based on research between English academic writing and academic writing in students’ L1s, instead more engaging CCCR activities were designed and incorporated in such a way that students engaged in the discovery of these differences. Sometimes, these findings have not even been reported in the existing research of the field of contrastive rhetoric, as it is unique in one particular discipline as shown in students’ reflections.

Change of Metacognition

In the end-of-semester questionnaire, students were also asked the question of “If you are to introduce to your friends from other cultures the cross-cultural differences between your L1 writing and English writing, what would you say? “Students’ responses from the experimental group could be summarized into the overall structure, the organization of paragraphs and the use of clauses and connective.

Lili explained that Chinese had a different logic system compared to English and Chinese had more simple sentences while English tended to use more embedded clauses. Ibrahim stated that he would tell people that Farsi was more liked to include more than necessarily needed. Kim reported that the main difference between academic writing style between Korean and English was the order of introducing main ideas, and in Korean writing, the main idea or topic sentence appeared at the end of each body paragraph, whereas in English, topic sentences came at the beginning of the body paragraph.

Interviews with Experimental Group
Supplementary to the end-of-semester questionnaire in which students in the experimental group were asked to rate their experience of CCCR activities on the scale of 1 to 5, one-to-one online conferences were conducted with the experimental group to check with students their understanding of the major content discussed throughout the semester and at the end of the conference, a short interview was carried out on their feedback about CCCR instruction and discussions. Interviews function as the more detailed explanation of students’ rating feedback regarding their confidence level, their understanding of how much their L1s influence their English academic writing and how they perceive the helpfulness of the CCCR study. The main questions asked in the interviews include:

1. Throughout each unit, we conduct comparisons between English academic writing and academic writing in your L1, do you find these comparisons activities useful?

2. Do you see any improvement in your later assignments? In which areas?

3. What are the most important differences between English academic writing and academic writing in your L1?

4. In terms of organization, do you see any differences between English academic writing and academic writing in your L1?

5. In the later half of the semester, we looked at the language similarities and differences. What are your major findings?

From extracts of students’ transcripts of interviews below, we could analyze their perceptions towards English academic writing and their metacognition level of
similarities and differences between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s.

Hanhan (Chinese) gave the following responses for each question:

It is helpful in helping me construct fluent body paragraphs. …The most significant difference I found is that in English writing, the presentation of ideas starts from the main idea whereas Chinese starts with evidence. …We seldom use clauses in Chinese. English clauses are complex but I believe I’m confident in using these English clauses. …When you gave us the handout of English connectives, I realize that we have similar ones but they have some subtle differences. In Chinese, we do not have as many different connectives for the same function.

Hanhan’s numerical grade for her final assignment was the highest in the experimental group and she demonstrated great level of confidence in the end-of-semester interview. She talked about her understandings of the different structure of Chinese academic writing and English academic writing. She emphasized her confidence in using English clauses even though the interviewer did not ask the question about it.

Maryam’s (Farsi) responses in the interview is in the following:

First of all, I think, the voice I used at the first one has changed. Also, the connectives were very useful to me. I didn’t know how to use connectives. The PIE chart was very useful for me. And I think, I don’t know the changes. But now when I write, I found it easier. …To be honest, in Farsi, we didn’t have that really a structure. …We have introduction, body and conclusion…but we don’t have someone to tell me what to put in introduction, body and conclusion…we don’t have PIE chart and details of each part… …In Farsi, the location of clauses are different…many of the words have the same meaning in Farsi…we don’t have so many variations…

(Interviewer: If you are to give the opportunity to re-read your writing, do you think you could figure out some errors in your English clauses?)

Yes, I think I can.

Maryam has stated several times during the semester that she found the structure in Farsi academic writing and English writing are similar. However, in the interview, she pointed out that even though the general structure that includes introduction, body paragraphs and
conclusions are there, the detailed elements were not clear in Farsi writing. She pointed out at the very beginning that cohesive devices were very helpful to her. Her opinions are consistent with the final data that students in the experimental group improved most in the area of cohesive devices.

Fabian’s (Spanish speaker) responses in the interview:

(Interviewer: What are the things you that you think have changed in terms of academic writing?)
Well, I think that my main improvement has been revising my own writing because all the work that we have done about cohesive devices and different kinds of dependent clauses have taught me to be more aware about how to construct paragraphs and phrases into my own writing…
I think that the structure…that we looked at this semester…were similar to what we learnt in 500…but now I’m more aware of different kinds of academic writing that could be used in US academia…yes, the organization of my writing, and also my clarity of the statement I make…
(Interviewer: I still remembered that at the beginning of the semester, you used a great number of very long sentences, which make the understanding of the meaning difficult. In your final writing, I found that you tried to cut down the number of these long sentences and make sure your readers understand you. I just want to ask you: is this an intentional effort?)
Well, I think I was starting to note that long sentences could mess with my writing…here as I told you…I tried to create more easy-to-read sentences…sometimes, I wrote things that, when I read again, I don’t even understand…Because of my L1, this is something that I do…and I am more reflective about how to make sentences… I have been looking at how they… When I read in English, I tried to see how they create sentences…sometimes; I tried to connect what we learn here with my own readings…

Fabian, as a Spanish speaker, in his first assignment, used very long sentences that did not follow the English structure of embedded clauses and this impeded the understanding of his intended meaning. Different from those Chinese students in the class who tried to combine their short and simple sentences into complex sentences, Fabian tried to cut his “very long” sentences into shorter ones with subordinators and conjunctions. In his interview, it could see that Fabian has actively connected what he has found in his reading and tried to generalize rules from his readings.
Xiaochen, (Chinese) responded in the interview as following:

I think, ehm, I have a deeper understanding of the structure of PIE. In the past, I always used some different examples… Now I know I didn’t use more convincing examples…or statistics, data or specific examples…Without PIE, I really don’t know what to write…
…I see some difference, but not many…I just know how to write paper in my field. I’m not sure about other field…
I think, to me, the most important difference from comparisons, is…when I read academic paper…I can see the structure…different outline.

At the beginning of the semester, Xiaochen used personal examples in his first argumentative essay to support his main point and he found that he did not have enough words to finish one piece of writing. In the interview, he stated that PIE (point, illustration and explanation) structure helped him to generate ideas. He found that the contrastive rhetoric comparison activity assisted him in finding the structure and outlines in English academic writing.

Lili (Chinese) is from the discipline of biology and his responses are as following:

Well, the most important part is about using resources. I think in my diagnostic paper I just kept restating my point without providing supporting resources. Throughout the semester, I learnt how to find resources to support my point. …Since I already got my masters degree, I read a lot of papers. It’s just that I did not know the PIE structure. Now when I read academic papers, I pay attention to the structure.
…When I was in China, I wrote academic paper in both Chinese and English. For me, I think, like, in my field, biology. I think I have already talked in my assignment. When we write academic papers, we learn from English. I think Chinese doesn’t use clauses as much as English. I think if we use clauses in Chinese, it will be more confusing. I think we use simple sentences in Chinese. …I didn’t pay attention to this before.
I, ehm, how to say…I took grammar class in China before. I don’t know what I learnt from that. I don’t know. When you speak, you don’t realize it helps you.
…It (those videos) reminds me to pay attention to it (sentence structures) …I will try to use cohesive devices in my future writing…when I did the assignments to look for cohesive devices in Chinese academic writing, I found that we are weak in this area.
Lili talked about how he found biology academic papers are similar to those in English and how his personal experience in writing Chinese academic papers when he was doing his Masters in China helped him to have background knowledge. He explained that CCCR instruction and comparison studies helped him to connect his previous grammar knowledge with writing in the area of dependent clauses. He also realized that Chinese academic writing did not use cohesive devices and also stated that he would make an effort in using more cohesive devices in his future writing.

Liang (Chinese speaker), majoring in Piano performances communicated some interesting findings about academic writings in his field in China:

(Improvement and changes)
Em, I think most of the, knowledge, in Unit One, I have already learnt them in ESL 500. From the Unit One, I just get the further understanding of the writing skill and some writing ideas.
…I think it’s helpful, especially for different aspects for both languages…
(IMRD structure comparison)
I think it’s necessary to make some comparisons between two academic fields. In music, we don’t have IMRD structure in Chinese academic writing. Actually, the academic writing in China is not very good. (Laugh) The writer just copies the ideas of Western researchers and music scholars. I don’t know why. It just happens. When you read academic paper in Chinese, you found the ideas very similar because they got it from somewhere else. …I didn’t know this until I came to the US and started to read some papers in English.
…Those videos (on clauses) helped me get further understanding of clauses…
(Do you think that you do not have as many connectives in Chinese?)
No, in Chinese, one connective can be used in many situations. While in English, one connective has only one meaning.

In Liang’s interview, he noted that IMRD structure in Chinese academic writing was not found. This is an important area to note as in the discipline of music, there is no IMRD structure to be seen. CCCR activities and instruction in this aspect help to clarify doubts students have regarding the existing curriculum. For the current 501 ESL curriculum in the Service Writing Service Courses, as students are from different fields, it
is difficult to cater to all students’ needs specifically. In Liang’s case, he also studied IMRD structure, yet he later realized that he did not need to have or apply this in his discipline. Liang also stated that after he came to the US and read academic writings in English, he realized that those previous academic papers that he read in Chinese were copying ideas from western scholars and researchers. He also found that in Chinese one connective could be used in many different contexts, whereas English connectives are more specific.

Haohao (Chinese) reported his attempted changes in his writing in the following:

(Improvements and changes)
At the beginning of this lesson, eh, I don’t know how to write a paper. Now, at least, I can write something.
Ehm, for now, I think that basically they (English academic writing and Chinese academic writing) are the same. I think because that I am not good at either one. I think they (Chinese and English clauses) are different. Actually, I know some basic structure of English clauses. But, I don’t know the structure of Chinese sentences…I think I can correct some errors in my English clauses, but not all…I think this ESL course helped me with my English sentences…I learnt more English connectives…I tried to apply these connectives in my final writing.

Haohao did not think he was an expert in Chinese academic writing and felt that English academic writing and Chinese academic writing is the same. However, he did find that there were differences between Chinese sentence structures and English ones. In this case, Haohao focused more on the sentential level and this would be considered contrastive language analysis more than contrastive rhetoric. Compared to other students in the experimental group, Haohao is comparatively less confident mainly due to the fact that he felt that he did not know Chinese academic writing.

Fanfan (Chinese), majoring in economics, admitted that he used to have Chinese style of English writing because he did use Chinese proverbs in the introduction.

(Improvements and changes)
First, maybe the introduction part, before this class, I always put some, maybe confusing, Chinese proverbs in the introduction (laugh)… and in the body paragraphs, although I knew the PIE structure in the past, I did not include the E (explanation), only P (point) and I (illustration). I learnt something new about conclusion part, which is call for action and future research; I have never done this before.

I think nowadays, Chinese academic writing and English academic writing are more and more close…because Chinese academic writing is introduced from America.

…I think, in this aspect, there are many differences, clauses. In Chinese, we often use two separate sentences, sometimes without connectives, people can’t understand them…I didn’t pay special attention this…Connectives are similar.

Like other Chinese students in the experimental group, Fanfan found there are similarities in terms of structure between Chinese academic writing and English academic writing; however, his findings about cohesive devices and dependent clauses resonate with the other Chinese students.

In retrospect, despite insignificant grade difference between the control and experimental group, the more use of dependent clauses and cohesive devices as well as positive responses showing increased metacognition of contrastive rhetorical styles, organizations and language use from the experimental group predicts a promising future for ESL teachers to integrate CCCR instruction and discussions into existing ESL Writing Service Courses. ESL instructors do not have to be experts of students’ L1s to conduct CCCR activities, as students are the major players in the activities. What ESL instructors are expected to contribute in such CCCR activities is a successful understanding of the objective of each activity and a seamless integration of CCCR syllabus into the existing syllabus of writing courses. Throughout the course of teaching, instructors also need to facilitate these CCCR activities to ensure students’ participation and in-depth analysis.
All the CCCR activities included in this study have raised students’ awareness of the importance of understanding the fundamental structure of English academic writing and those language devices that they could make use of. Instead of providing them with a list of cohesive devices or explain to them the grammar of English clauses, the instructor guided students in the discovery of the similarities and differences between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s. From students’ reflection and interviews, one frequent phrase is “I become more aware”, and “I didn’t pay attention …before”.

For a pedagogical study, one of the concerns is that students will form an affective filter towards the course because of the study. However, from students’ final ICES feedback to the instructor: students from the experimental group gave 4.8/5.0 for the effectiveness of the course on the scale of 1 to 5, with 1 the lowest on the continuum and 5 the highest, it could see that they CCCR instruction and discussions in the course did not cause them to form a negative attitude towards the course in general. Even for those students who at the beginning of the semester, believed that L1 did not play a role in their writing in the end believed the comparison work helped them in the improvement of their English academic writing.

Responses to End-of-Semester Questionnaire
The findings so far has shown that students’ performance in connectives has shown significant difference after CCCR instruction and discussions and no observable differences were seen in other aspects such as overall writing grades, and use of dependent clauses. This section presented students’ ratings of the four areas of CCCR instruction and the three delivery modes of CCCR instruction from students’ perspectives so as to generate some implications for ESL instructors. Throughout this section, figures
showing a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 the lowest end of the spectrum and 5 the highest, were provided to demonstrate students’ subjective perceptions about CCCR instruction and discussions in terms of content and delivery modes.

By the end of the semester, students’ responses to the study of CCCR instruction were collected. Their responses reflected the areas of CCCR instruction and discussions that the participants believe influenced their writing more and their preferred delivery modes of CCCR instruction and discussions. Among the experimental group who received the CCCR instruction, their responses to the question of “On the scale of 1 to 5, how much do you think that your L1 influences your English academic writing?” are summarized below:

There were 14 students in the experimental group. Among these students, three students were in the middle of the spectrum and 1 student rated this 2. This finding is strongly reinforced by the experimental participants’ written responses explaining their ranking. Xiaochen (Chinese) stated that, “although the
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Among 14 students, three students were in the middle of the spectrum and 1 student rated this 2. This finding is strongly reinforced by the experimental participants’ written responses explaining their ranking. Xiaochen (Chinese) stated that, “although the
English sentences she wrote was grammatically correct, they seem strange to native 
speakers,” and Lili (Chinese) also shared the same sentiment: “I’m not used to writing 
sentences with (dependent) clauses. Sometimes, when I use clauses, I confuse myself. In 
Chinese, we have the same translations for some of the connectives and when I write 
academic papers, I don’t know which one to use. ”Kim (Korean) focused more on the 
sentence structural differences between Korean and English as the verb is always placed 
at the end of a sentence with a verb conjugation whereas this is not the case in English. 
He felt that this is the reason behind his incorrect English sentences. From the perspective 
of rhetorical organization, he contended that the body paragraph in Korean has the 
structure of IEP, which are illustration, explanation and point. He believed that he used to 
use the IEP structure instead of PIE structure in English academic writing in which the 
point is stated first and then the illustrations are provided with the explanation at the end 
connecting the illustrations and the main point of the body paragraph. Hanhan (Chinese) 
reported her understanding of the influence of L1 in her English academic writing as 
following, “my L1 influenced my English writing in the way that I’m not good at 
connecting the sentences. Because in Chinese, even if there are no connection devices 
between two sentences, the paragraph is still regarded to be fluent, but in English writing, 
I need to apply different ways to make my article as a unity. ”Hanhan also agreed with 
the reading materials provided on the Chinese style of writing (Chen, 2005) about the use 
of Chinese sayings: “sometimes I use proverbs in my L1 which only make sense to 
Chinese speakers, and that causes confusion.” Jiajia (Taiwanese), summarized how she 
perceived her L1 influenced her English academic writing in the following, “The way I 
structure my essay, the way I use the connectives or transitions, and sentence structure”.
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Alma (Farsi) thought that her L1 influenced her use of punctuation marks and clauses she used in English academic writing. Haohao (Chinese) realized some problems of his shifts in English grammar were caused by direct Chinese translation, saying that, “I prefer to use long sentences. Sometimes, I just translate the Chinese sentences into English. Besides, there are a lot of shifts in my English writing, because I never heard of the concept of shifts in Chinese.” Based on the above illustrations, it is clear that students in the experimental group demonstrated metacognition about how their L1 influences their English writing after the cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric study was finished.

Following the question of how much L1 influences students’ English academic writing, students were also asked about how they perceive the helpfulness of the study. Students’ responses to the question of “On the scale of 1 to 5, how helpful is the study of the differences between your L1 and English to you?” are demonstrated in Figure 6:
Figure 6 shows a high percentage (74%) of respondents maintained that the rhetorical study of academic writing across languages was helpful or very helpful. It could be interpreted that those students who believed that their L1 plays a role in their English academic writing also found the CCCR instruction helpful to their English academic writing. Their detailed responses depicted their active attempt in improving their English clauses to make it more natural to their readers who could be both native and non-native speakers of English.

Students were also asked to rate how much the course changed their understanding of academic writing, and their responses are shown below in Figure 7:

![How much the course changed your understanding of EAW?](image)

Figure 7 Students’ Perceptions of How Much the Course Changed Their Understanding of EAW

Similar to previous responses, majority of the respondents (79%) gave a 4 or 5 and none gave a 1 or 2. The graph denotes students’ positive responses towards the
course in general. From this graph, it could be seen that students’ attitudes towards the course are positive. In pedagogical studies, students’ attitudes could be a significant factor as the undesired results may be due to students’ affective factors. This also reassures that this study will not be affected by the negative attitudes.
Findings of Research Question 3

What are the areas of CCCR instruction that play a more important role in students’ writing assignments from students’ perspectives?

*CCCR studies and instruction*

CCCR studies and instruction were divided into four aspects: rhetorical styles, rhetorical organization, clauses and connectives. In this paper, only use of clauses and connectives were calculated. Rhetorical styles and rhetorical organizations are comparably less quantifiable and it is difficult to evaluate students’ progress of rhetorical styles and organizations using quantitative data. Instead, students’ subjective opinions in their reflections and surveys showed their understandings of rhetorical styles and rhetorical organizations. Students from the experimental group were asked to rate each of them in terms of how useful they think it is in improving their English academic writing. The following graphs are respective summaries of students’ responses towards the CCCR instruction and discussion on rhetorical styles, rhetorical organization, clauses and connectives:
Figure 8 indicates that 93% of students gave a 4 and 5 on the scale of 1-5, with 1 the lowest and 5 the highest, for rhetorical styles. The rest of the students gave a 3. It shows that students in general perceived rhetorical styles as helpful in CCCR curriculum.
Among 14 students, 93% of them contended that the CCCR instruction organization was helpful. Both rhetorical style and organization were discussed at the beginning of the semester, and students have repeatedly referred to these two in their reflections and questionnaires. This result informed ESL instructors that CCCR activities could be a very effective to grab students’ interests in ESL writing courses that could be implemented in the courses.
Among the 14 students in the experimental group, 10 students think that CCCR studies and instruction on dependent clauses are helpful as they rate this as 4 or five. Four students rated this as 3 and this may be due to the fact that these students are more confident with the English clauses in the first place. This could be seen in students’ performance in the first assignment. There are a few students who did much better than average by analyzing the percentage of clause usage in the assignment.

4. Connectives (cohesive devices)
Connectives, among the four aspects of the CCCR studies, received the lowest rating from the experimental group: 65% of the students think it is helpful whereas 7% of the students think it is not as helpful and 29% of the students gave a rating of 3. Students’ subjective perception about connectives is the opposite of their performance in their writings. Among the four categories, students’ use of cohesive devices is the only one data that shows significance difference between the control group and the experimental group by the end of the semester. This data also shows that sometimes students’ subjective opinions of certain aspects of English academic writing are not accurate in making the most informed decisions.
Finding of Research Question 4

What are the delivery modes of CCCR instruction and discussions that students respond well to?

Answering Research Question Four: What are the delivery modes of CCCR instruction and discussions that students respond well to? CCCR instructions were delivered in three different modes: in-class instruction, videos, and reading at home. The content covered by these three delivery modes is exactly the same including the introduction of the topic, form of guidelines for students to compare the academic writing in English and in their respective L1, and the writing up of their findings in the online form. In-class instruction is the traditional group discussions in which students share their personal knowledge and experience into groups of three to four and were given a topic. The videos made for this study mainly covers the language aspect—dependent clauses and connectives. The readings were used at the beginning of the semester when the class was exploring the differences and similarities of rhetorical style in Unit One.

The following graphs are students’ ratings on each type of delivery mode in terms of how effective they think it is in helping them understand the differences and similarities between their L1s and English. Figure 8 demonstrates students rating of in-class instruction of CCCR: 86% of students rated it at 4 or 5 and 7% rated it at 2 and 3 respectively. Figure 9 is students’ ratings of videos of CCCR: all students gave it a rating equal or above 3 with 79% of the students rated it as 4 and 5. Figure 10 shows students’ ratings of readings of CCCR: 21% of students rated it at 2 and 43% rated it at 3, and only 35% of students rated it at 4 or 5.
Figure 12 In-class Instruction

Figure 13 Videos
From Figure 12 to 14, it could be seen that students rated the videos as most effective, in-class discussions second, with readings ranked as least effective. This information provides some important implications to teachers who intend to incorporate some CCCR instructions in the English academic writing courses in terms of which type of delivery mode to use for different types of topics. This finding also brings up an important implication for conveying information to students in general since reading, the traditional way that large amounts of information are conveyed to students in many courses, were seen as the least effective overall.

Both the experimental and control groups were also asked at the end of the semester about their confidence in writing in English. As seen in Figures 11(experimental) and 12 (control), the responses from these two groups were different.
Figure 15 shows that 64% of students in the experimental group gave a 4 or 5 for their confidence level which is better than the control group shown in Figure 12. c
Figure 16 shows that 0 students gave a 5 on their confidence of English academic writing. Comparing students’ confidence level in the control group and experimental group, it could be seen that bars in Figure 11 that reveals students’ confidence about their writing at the end of the semester are more towards the right end of the continuum of 1 to 5 compared to Figure 12. In the experimental group, 100% of students’ confidence level is above level 3, whereas in the control group 83.3% of the students’ confidence level is above level 3. The major purpose of this study is to equip students with the necessary writing skills to ensure their success in their major courses. The fact that students became more confident in English academic writing proves the possibility of applying this CCCR model in ESL writing courses and it deems its efficacy in reducing the possible affective filter that international students might have in the endeavor of English academic writing.
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION
Summary of the Findings

From both the quantitative and qualitative data, it could be seen that subjects in the experimental group who received instruction and conducted CCCR discussions showed improvements in metacognition of English academic writing. Analyzing the subjective grading from the four ESL raters, the experimental group has a comparatively higher class average, although the difference is not significant. In more local aspect of cohesive devices, there is a more significant difference between the experimental group and control group. Although the experimental group used 6% more dependent clauses in their final assignments, the differences between the experimental group and the control group are not significant. The use of dependent clauses indicates the comparative level of English complexity in the writing and the use of cohesive devices denotes the attempt to make the writing more coherent for the readers. This change shown in the data demonstrate students’ active efforts in presenting a reader-oriented piece of writing by the end of the semester. However, these data could not be used alone to conclude that CCCR instruction and activities lead to an increase in the use of connectives. This increase in connectives together with students’ reflections and interviews reflected their active efforts in using correct connectives whenever necessary in their academic writing so as to improve the coherence level of their writing in English.

From students’ feedback and reflection about CCCR instruction and discussions, it could be seen that not only did students reflected on the categories proposed in the CCCR activities, they also went beyond the provided guidelines and even challenged the prescriptive norms of English academic writing. Furthermore, other than the structure and organization of the main ideas of an academic paper, students went into the analysis of
the fundamental sentence structures of two languages. ESL teachers could encourage this type of analyses if students have difficulties with production of grammatically correct English sentences.

Implications of the Study

The promising results indicate that the pedagogy exploiting cross-cultural contrastive rhetoric could be implemented as a model for various courses of English academic courses. First of all, CCCR instruction and discussions recommended by this study is student-centered. Instead of providing students the model, rule and formulae to follow, the instructor facilitates students in the process of finding and recognizing similarities and differences between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s in different aspects including rhetorical styles, rhetorical organization, and use of English language such as dependent clauses and cohesive devices. Secondly, there are no prior language prerequisites on the instructor’s part; both native English speakers and non-native English speakers are capable of conducting CCCR activities. For a multicultural and multilingual ESL writing course, the instructor is very likely to face students from different backgrounds and cultures. It will be beneficial for instructors to have some understanding of different languages and cultures, however; this is not a must as it is up to students to Table out the underlying similarities and differences. Thirdly, CCCR instruction and discussion does not take away a large amount of class time. To the contrary, efficient incorporation of CCCR activities of instruction and discussion into the existing syllabi could lead to the emphasis of students’ metacognition of rhetorical styles, organization and use of language. The growth of students’ metacognition reflected students’ knowledge of their own thinking (Kellogg, 1994) and the trajectory of their
discovery of contrastive rhetoric throughout the semester traces their metacognition development which in turn helps them see how English academic writing could be shaped using their knowledge and experience of their native languages and academic writing in their native language.

This study of including CCCR instruction and discussions as one of the pedagogical approach to engage students in the comparison between English academic writing and academic writing in their L1s not only allow them to become aware of the differences and similarities between the two, but also provide students the opportunity to challenge the existing norm as for some disciplines the PIE body structure might not be observed as stated earlier by Lili whose major is biology. Instead of teachers providing a list of dos and don’ts for students to follow, students were actively engaged in the finding of the “authentic” writing for their own discipline. In summary, this study showed that by providing students opportunities to do contrastive studies so as to find similarities and differences, and at the same time let students realize that no particular academic writing is superior or inferior to others.

Limitations of the Study

It should be noted that for pedagogical research, there are many uncontrollable confounding variables. This particular study involves subjects from various disciplines and different native languages. For a study investigating the pedagogical application of contrastive rhetorical analysis, the discussion of contrastive language is unavoidable. This is why in students’ reflections and interviews, such reports were found. Furthermore, although weekly meetings were conducted between the instructors of the experimental and control group to ensure that control group received minimum level of instruction on
contrastive rhetoric. Occasional discussions were unforeseeable and non-controllable. Because of such confounding variables, in the quantitative analysis, very specific features were calculated. For example, only connectives were calculated instead of all aspects of cohesive devices such as repetition of key words and pronouns.

Furthermore, some instructors might question this CCCR awareness-raising as binary: L1 vs English. However, the reality is that although during individual tasks, students were analyzing the texts between English and their respective L1s. In classroom discussions, students were placed into groups of different L1s and they were asked to share their responses with each other. The awareness is not only between English and their L1 at the end, but English and other non-English languages in general.

On the one hand, since the ESL Writing Service Courses in UIUC has a strict class size upper limit, which is fifteen, the current study is limited by the sample. In the optimal situation, a larger sample size in both the experimental group and control group would be more ideal. On the other hand, the research is conducted at the 501 level which is the advanced level of graduate ESL writing courses, students’ writing performance and progress is only monitored within the time range of one semester. If the study could start from 500-level which is the less advanced level and continue to the end of the 501-level, as more writing samples could be collected over a longer period of time, students’ longitudinal progression could be recorded and hence a more panoramic picture could be drawn.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future possible research could be generated based on this study: as this study lasted only one semester, students’ further writing performance could not be reported. For
some students, it takes longer to internalize the findings and discoveries from CCCR activities. Furthermore, the grade difference between the experimental group and control group is not significant which might be due to the fact that the sample size is small. A larger sample size will be preferable to make a more reliable conclusion based on the statistical data. Most importantly, all the findings were based on one study. In order to confirm the validity of the CCCR model in the ESL Writing courses, the same experiment could be replicated with different subjects; for example, the same research design could be replicated with undergraduate ESL students.
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APPENDIX A ALL THE SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

Start-of-Semester Questionnaire
* Required

Name *

Mother Tongue *

Major *

Years of Learning English *
E.g. 1 year, 2 years, 3 years and etc.

1. Have you learned how to write academic paper in your L1? *
   L1 is your native language.
   □ Yes
   □ No

2. Do you think that culture plays a role in your academic writing? *
   □ Yes-Proceed to Question 3
   □ No-Proceed to Question 4

3. If yes, in what ways do you think that culture influences your writing?

4. If no, why?

5. What are the differences between English writing and writing in your L1? *
   L1 is your mother tongue
6. Do you think that these differences between English writing and writing in your L1 pose any difficulty in your writing in English? *

7. Among the differences between English writing and writing in your L1, which one do you think is the most significant? *

8. Have you ever received any formal training or instruction regarding the cultural differences between English writing and writing in your L1? *
   L1 is your mother tongue.
   - Yes
   - No

9. What do you expect to learn if you were to receive instruction regarding the cultural differences between English writing and writing in your L1? *
Academic Writing in Your L1 vs. Academic Writing in English
* Required
Top of Form
1. What is the organization of academic writing in your L1 like? *
Is it similar or different from the organization of English writing? If you can, please elaborately on your understanding.

2. By reading the academic paper you found in your L1, what are the differences between the academic writing in English and the academic paper in your L1? *
Thesis Statement and PIE Structure

* Required

Name*

1. Could you find thesis statement in the academic paper in your L1? *
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

2. Where is the thesis statement in the academic paper in your L1? *

3. Copy and paste a body paragraph from the academic paper in your L1 here (The academic paper in your L1 that you found). Identify the PIE structure if there is any. Use brackets to indicate the sentences and type P,I or E beside the brackets to indicate the specific part. *
   eg. [Writing is an essential skill for graduate students.] Point

4. Based on the analysis above, do you see any differences between academic writing in your L1 and English in terms of thesis statement and PIE body paragraph structure? What are the differences? *

Submit
Unity, Cohesion and Coherence
* Required
Name

1. Before today's class, did you know the concept of unity in academic writing in your L1?*
   - Yes—Proceed to Q2
   - No—Proceed to Q3

2. What is unity in academic writing in your L1? Please elaborate. Is it the same as or different from what we have discussed in class today?

3. From today's lecture, what is unity in academic writing? How could we achieve unity in academic writing?

4. Do you also have cohesive devices in your L1? Please give 10 (or more) examples of cohesive devices in your L1 (both L1 and English words are required).

5. Copy and paste a body paragraph from the academic paper in your L1 (the one you have submitted to the folder), please specify any cohesive devices we have talked about today. eg. he, she, they-pronouns
6. Copy and paste another body paragraph from the academic paper in your L1 (the one you have submitted to the folder), please specify the key word (K), old information (O) and new information (N). You could underline the words and use brackets to specify. Eg. [Education] K is important for the development of one's personality. The building of [one's personality] O is not solely dependent on the [DNA] (N).
Academic Style, Introduction and Conclusion

The following questions should be answered based on the L1 academic paper that you have submitted in the shared folder.

* Required

Name

1. Were you aware of academic style before today's lesson? *
   - Yes
   - No

2. Is the definition of academic style in your L1 similar to or different from English? *

3. Provide some examples of academic style in your L1. (in terms of complexistion and precision) *
   Please give specific examples (words, phrases and sentences). You could give the examples in L1 and translated the examples in English.

4. Provide some examples of academic style in your L1. (in terms of formality) *
   Please give specific examples (words, phrases and sentences). You could give the examples in L1 and translated the examples in English.

5. Provide some examples of academic style in your L1. (in terms of responsibility) *
   Please give specific examples (words, phrases and sentences). You could give the examples in L1 and translated the examples in English.
6. Compare the introduction in your L1 academic paper and the introduction we have discussed in class today (introduction of academic paper in English), what are the similarities and differences? *

Please copy and paste the introduction of your L1 academic paper here. Your answer should be supported with specific sentences from the introduction of your L1 academic paper.

7. Compare the conclusions in your L1 academic paper and the conclusion we have discussed in class today (conclusion of academic paper in English), what are the similarities and differences? *

Please copy and paste the introduction of your L1 academic paper here. Your answer should be supported with specific sentences from the conclusion of your L1 academic paper.
1. Is the definition of a sentence in your L1 similar to or different from that in English? How? *
Please provide specific examples. You may also want to look at the PPT we discussed today in class.

2. Based on the lesson today, what are the differences between academic writing in your L1 and academic writing in English in terms of punctuation? *
Use examples from the paper in your L1 (the one you submitted to the folder).
IMRD in your L1
* Required
Name*

1. Is it difficult to find IMRD paper in your L1? *
☐ Yes
☐ No

2. Is the IMRD paper in your L1 the typical IMRD paper that we have discussed in class?*
☐ Yes
☐ No

3. If it is the typical IMRD paper we have discussed in class, find the similarities between the I, M, R and D (paper in your L1) and the I, M, R, and D in English IMRD paper. *

4. If it is not the typical IMRD paper we have discussed in class, find the differences between the I, M, R and D (paper in your L1) and the I, M, R, and D in English IMRD paper. *

5. Why do you think there are such similarities/ differences between the I, M,R and D of the paper in your L1 and the I,M, R and D in English IMRD paper? (briefly elaborate your thoughts)*
Is English topic-prominent or subject-prominent? 
* Required
Name 

Is English topic-prominent or subject-prominent? *

How would you say the sentences mentioned in the video in your L1? Write them in your L1 first and then translate the L1 sentences into English word-by-word. *

Is your L1 topic-prominent or subject-prominent? *

Does the understanding of topic-prominent vs. subject-prominent help you understand some of your problems in English sentences? How?
1. Give me an example of an adjective clause.*

2. Which part is the adjective clause in the sentence: Our apartment, which was built in 1930, had excellent heating. *

3. How to say the following sentences in your L1? My primary school, which was built in 1820, is beautiful. My bag that you see on the table has been used for 10 years. The building that is near Lincoln hall is Foreign Language Building. My new phone, which was expensive, was bought in Japan. *

4. Do you have adjective clauses in your L1? How are they different or similar to English adjective clauses? *

5. From the two mini-lessons we did on adjective clauses, how confident are you in using adjective clauses in your writing now? *

   1  2  3  4  5
Not confident at all  □ □ □ □ □ Very confident
Noun clauses
In the video, you will see sentences A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H. Read the English sentences and think about how you would say those sentences in your L1. Write those sentences down in your L1 and translate them word-by-word into English ignoring the English grammar and sentence structure for the translation.

* Required
Top of Form
Name*

1. Sentence A. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).

2. Sentence B. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).

3. Sentence C. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).

4. Sentence D. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).
5. Sentence E. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).

6. Sentence F. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).

7. Sentence G. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).

8. Sentence H. *
L1 then translate L1 into English following the L1 syntax (sentence structure).

9. Based on the eight sentences, do you think there are any similarities or differences between the noun clauses in your L1 and English? What are they? *

10. How confident are you in using noun clauses in English now? *

1 2 3 4 5
Not confident at all  □ □ □ □ □ Very confident

Submit
Adverb Clauses
* Required
Top of Form
Name*

Sentence A *
How to say this sentence in your L1?

Sentence B*
How to say this sentence in your L1?

Sentence C*
How to say this sentence in your L1?

Sentence D*
How to say this sentence in your L1?

Sentence E*
How to say this sentence in your L1?
What are the similarities and differences between adverbial clauses in English and those in your L1? *
Question 1. In your L1 academic writing, do you observe the repetition of a key term or phrase? Provide an example from your sample L1 academic paper.

Question 2. In your L1 academic writing, is the use of synonyms also valued? Why do you think is the case?

Question 3. In the academic writing in your L1, do you use pronouns as cohesive devices the same way as you do in English? Do you see any differences?

Question 4. Do you have as many transitional words in your L1 as in English? Provide as many transitional words in your L1 as you could and translate them into English.
Connectives

* Required
Name*

Look for 10-20 connectives in the academic paper you found in your L1. *
Provide both the L1 and English translation for the connectives.

Look for 10-20 connectives in the academic paper you found in the academic paper in English. *

What are the connectives you have never used before but found them in the academic paper in English? *

Do you find any connectives in the academic paper in English that would not be used in the academic paper in your L1? *

Submit
Cohesive Devices I
Read the handout of cohesive devices and finish the following questions
* Required
Name*

Addition. (a) 1 Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. * As you could see from the example, in order to show your understanding of the connectives, you need to have at least two sentences for each connective.

(a) 2 Translate all the connectives under (a) Addition into your L1. *

(a) 3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation. *

(a) 4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of addition connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *

Comparison. (b) 1 Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. * As you could see from the example, in order to show your understanding of the connectives, you need to have at least two sentences for each connective.
(b) 2 Translate all the connectives under (b) Comparison into your L1. *

(b) 3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation. *

(b) 4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of comparison connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *

Contrast and concession (c) 1 Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *

(c) 2 Translate all the connectives under (c) Contrast and concession into your L1. *
(c) 3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation.

(c) 4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Contrast and Concession connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer.

How confident are you now with the use of these connectives in academic writing?

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all  □  □  □  □  □  Very
Cohesive Devices II
Read the second page of cohesive devices and finish the following questions
https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BwlEgmYu1jHZTDhuS2xVSJVNNjg/
* Required

Name *

Enumeration. (d)1 Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *
As you could see from the example, in order to show your understanding of the connectives, you need to have at least two sentences for each connective.

(d)2 Translate all the connectives under (d)Enumeration into your L1. *

(d)3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation.*

(d)4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of enumeration connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *
Exemplification.(e)1 Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. * As you could see from the example, in order to show your understanding of the connectives, you need to have at least two sentences for each connective.

(e)2 Translate all the connectives under (e)Exemplification into your L1. *

(e)3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation.*

(e)4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Exemplification connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *

Inference (f)1 Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *
Translate all the connectives under (f) Inference and concession into your L1. *

Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation.*

Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Inference connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *

Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *

(g) 2 Translate all the connectives under (g) Summary and concession into your L1. *
(g)3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation.

(g)4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Summary connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer.

How confident are you now with the use of these connectives in academic writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cohesive Devices III
Read the third and fourth page of cohesive devices and finish the following questions
https://docs.google.com/file/d/0BwlEgmYu1jHZTDhuS2xVSVJNNjg/

* Required

Name *

Time.

1 Choose three connectives from the provided list other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *
As you could see from the example, in order to show your understanding of the connectives, you need to have at least two sentences for each connective.

(h)2 Translate all the connectives under (h)Time into your L1. *

(h)3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation. *

(h)4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of time connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *
Result.

(i)1 Choose three connectives from the provided list other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *
As you could see from the example, in order to show your understanding of the connectives, you need to have at least two sentences for each connective.

(i)2 Translate all the connectives under (i)Result into your L1. *

(i)3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation. *

(i)4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Result connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *
Reformulation (j)1. Choose three connectives from the provided list other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives.

(j)2 Translate all the connectives under (j)Reformulation into your L1.

(j)3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation.

(j)4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Reformulation connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer.
Replacement (k)1. Choose three connectives from the provided list (other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *

(k)2 Translate all the connectives under (k)Replacement into your L1. *

(k)3 Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation. *

(k)4 Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Replacement connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *

Transition (l)1. Choose three connectives from the provided list other than the ones illustrated by the examples) and create sentences using the provided connectives. *
(l) Translate all the connectives under (l)Replacement into your L1. *

(l) Choose two of the translated connectives in your L1 and create sentences using the connectives in your L1. Provide the translation. *

(l) Do you see any similarities or differences in the use of Transition connectives between your L1 and English? Be specific in your answer. *

How confident are you now with the use of these connectives in academic writing? *

1 2 3 4 5

Not at all  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very
End-of-Semester Questionnaire
* Required

Name *

If you are to introduce to your friends from other cultures the cross-cultural differences between your L1 writing and English writing, what would you say? *

On the scale of 1 to 5, how much do you think that your L1 influences your English academic writing? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did your L1 influence your English academic writing? *

On the scale of 1 to 5, how helpful is the study of the differences between your L1 and English to you? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the scale of 1 to 5, how much does this course change your understanding of academic writing? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have covered four aspects of contrastive studies: rhetorical styles, rhetorical organization, clauses and connectives. Please rate each of them in terms of how useful you think it is in improving your English academic writing. *

1. Rhetorical style.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
2. Rhetorical organization *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not useful at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Clauses *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not useful at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Connectives (cohesive devices) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not useful at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have used in-class instruction, videos, reading to deliver the content of contrastive rhetoric. Please rate each type of instruction in terms of how effective you think it is in helping you understand the differences and similarities between your L1 and English.

1. In-class instruction *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Videos *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Readings *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How confident are you now with English academic writing? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B ASSIGNMENT PROMPTS

ESL 501, Unit 1: Diagnostic Revisions and Analysis Assignment Overview
Student Assignment Prompt (20% of final grade)

Purpose: This unit will help you to provide retrospective analysis of your writing and be introspective about your thinking process and your background as a writer.

Type of Assignment: For this assignment, you will be 1) analyzing and 2) revising the original Diagnostic Exam Essay that you wrote during the 1st week of class. Both of these skills will be essential to your future writing career, as the ability to analyze writing for its strengths and weaknesses and then to revise it effectively are necessary for writing in any discipline.
Task: During the first week of class, students will take a timed “Diagnostic Exam”. Based on the essay produced during this exam, students will submit two items:

1. Diagnostic Essay Revision: Based on your Analysis Portfolio, you will revise your Diagnostic Essay to reflect your best work. The final draft of the Diagnostic Revision must incorporate skills learned during Unit 1, such as thesis statements, logic and argument, audience, purpose, tone, coherence and unity, PIE structure, and introductions and conclusions.

Formatting Requirements: The Analysis Portfolio should be a minimum of 3 paragraphs, on 3 different topics. The Diagnostic Essay Revision should be 2-3 pages, with a title. Both should use Times New Roman font, 12-pt., double-spaced, with 1-inch margins on all sides.
Source Requirements: The article provided for the Diagnostic Exam MUST be used at least once in the Diagnostic Essay and should be introduced in the introduction of the essay.
Plagiarism Disclaimer: Students should "give credit" to the author whenever using the article in order to avoid plagiarism. However, correct paraphrasing and APA citations are not expected at this point. Copying and pasting significant portions of the article, particularly without mentioning the author, will result in losing points.
Purpose: Through this assignment, you will be able to write a research paper with either argumentative or analytical approach that includes an abstract, introduction, synthesis of scholarly sources and conclusion with appropriate language and style for a lay-audience. The main purpose of this assignment is to practice logical and critical thinking skills and source-based writing skills (evaluating, synthesizing, and documenting sources).

Types of Research Paper (Task): You will write a non-empirical, secondary research paper that synthesizes earlier publications on the subject of research with either argumentative or analytical approach and discuss their implications for future research.

- **Argumentative Approach:** In this approach, you need to take a stand on a controversial issue in your discipline and use the sources to support your argument as well as to refute the opposing views.
- **Analytical Approach:** In this approach, you ask a research question on which you have taken no stance and answer it (or draw a conclusion) by analyzing and evaluating the sources. Common analytic designs to guide your research may include problem/solution, compare/contrast, cause/effect, change over time (major trends and developments in research over time).

Topic: Using the same topic approved by your instructor for the Unit 2 Annotated Bibliography, your research paper should be relevant to your field, but written for a general (lay) audience. In the paper, you will give your reader as much information as they need to understand your topic and why it is important to talk and write about.

Formatting Requirements: Your Research Paper should be 7-10 pages long. The 7-10 pages do not include the title page, abstract, or references page. Format the Research Paper according to the rules of your discipline, but include a title page, abstract, introduction, body structured into subsections, conclusion, and references page. Your paper should be in Times New Roman, 12-pt., double-spaced lines, with 1-inch margins on all sides. (Paper size: 8 1/2 x 11-inches)

Source Requirements: Use a minimum of 6 scholarly academic sources. Feel free to refer to change some of your sources from what you chose in the Annotated Bibliography or add more. ALWAYS remember to CITE the sources in-text and in your reference list at the end of the paper, according to the citation style in your discipline.

Plagiarism Disclaimer: AVOID PLAGIARISM: Summarize and paraphrase whenever possible, minimizing your use of quotation to specific wording or phrasing of particular importance only. This is your paper; make it so that the majority of the writing is work you have produced. This is the final paper to demonstrate your understanding of American academic writing; ANY PLAGIARISM AT ALL, even if unintentional can result in FAILURE OF THE COURSE. Contact your instructor if you are concerned with your abilities to avoid plagiarism effectively as it is 100% your responsibility at this
point in the course.
# APPENDIX C TABLE TEMPLATE FOR REFLECTION ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Writing in Your L1</th>
<th>Academic Writing in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence (type of cohesive devices)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A social-policy research group initiated a “pay-for-performance” program (Laura Fitzpatrick, 2009) among public schools in Louisiana. Low-income students in that program had been offered cash incentives for their high performance. Not all people hold a positive view to this financial incentive, but in reality the financial incentive is an effective method for schools to help low-income students continue their education and achieve high performance.

In the first place, students who received cash reward can directly use that money to pay for colleges to continue their education. According to the study released by MDRC, who conduct this cash reward system on low-income students in Louisiana community colleges, participants were 30% more likely to register for the following semester. The significant result shows that financial rewards do alleviate the toll burden for low-income students. For those students who are denied access to college education because of lacking sufficient money, the cash incentives are able to help them for further education.

The financial incentives encourage students to concentrate on their studies as well. The same experiment of MDRC also showed that participants in that program were more likely to attain a C average than nonparticipants. Because those participants were offered money only for high performance, it is important for them to allocate sufficient hours to their studies so as to maintain a well performance. As the result, students are more devoted to study and are more likely to be enrolled in universities afterward. Critics argue that this cash reward will lead students to take easier courses for the money, and their focuses on study will be distracted by the external reward. However, those speculations will not happen if the reward is valued on basis of different aspects. In fact most of the high schools and universities have their own scholarship systems, which reward students for their excellent performance based a comprehensive level. Schools also set required courses in case students only take easy courses. Under such a system, it is unlikely to win reward by simply taking easy courses or making a high score on the transcript.

Moreover, cash incentives help to build the confidence of the students; consequently they will possess a positive attitude toward both themselves and their abilities. MDRC had reported that more positive feelings were noticed for those participants. Though long-term effect have not been identified, it is highly possible that students who received cash incentives will be motivated to achieve success, because their experience with cash reward had convinced them that their ability to accomplish their goal is adequate.

The cash incentive has demonstrated its positive influence on both the study attitude and performance of the low-income students. It would be beneficial for both students and schools to participate in this financial reward system. With increasing participations in this program, schools and educator can work together to improvise a method to complete and enhance this system, and apply it national wide.