

Promoting Aspects of Discourse Macrostructure and Microstructure in EFL Expository Writing through Reading: A Case Study of Second Year Constantine University 1 Students

Abstract

The present study sets out to investigate the extent to which comprehension of discourse structure levels accounts for competence in EFL writing organization. More specifically, it seeks to enhance the students' awareness regarding the significance of the macrostructure and microstructure notions in writing through reading as a main source of language input and accumulation. The study has been conducted with two writing classes assigned to an experimental group and a control group. To compare the subjects' performance in terms of the effective use of some aspects of discourse structure levels, a pre-test prior to a treatment and a post-test after the treatment have been administered in the form of in-class expository essays. Following the collection of the post-test essays, a questionnaire has been given to the experimental group subjects to elicit their opinions about the role of reading in the comprehension of discourse structure levels. The findings of the study have demonstrated a significant improvement of the experimental group in all aspects of discourse structure, while the control group has actually lowered its scores on some aspects and made insignificant improvement in others. Ultimately, the study has indicated that reading could be the best technique to develop the sense of discourse organization.

Khadija KOUICEM

Department of English
Faculty of Letters and Languages
University of Constantine 1
(Algeria)

ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى البحث في مدى أهمية فهم مستويات بنية الخطاب في تحسين كفاءة تنظيم الكتابة في اللغة الانجليزية كلغة اجنبية. وبشكل أكثر تحديداً، فهي تسعى إلى تعزيز وعي الطلاب حول أهمية البنية الكلية والمحلية للخطاب في الكتابة من خلال القراءة باعتبارها المصدر الرئيسي للمزود للغة. وقد أجريت هذه الدراسة مع مجموعتين: المجموعة التجريبية والمجموعة الضابطة. ولمقارنة أداء الطلاب في كلا المجموعتين من حيث الاستخدام الفعال لبعض جوانب مستويات بنية الخطاب، أجرى الطلاب اختبارين في القسم على شكل كتابة

Introduction

Reading and writing are two necessary skills that students need while learning a new language. The investigation of the relationship between them has a long history in educational research. Traditionally, the literature on the relationship between these two subjects was scant and most pedagogies separated between them. In part, this is because reading was seen as a passive act while writing as a productive one and thus active. However, until quite recently researchers have increasingly called for the

مقالة تفسيرية: الاول قبل تدخل الباحث والاخر بعده. ثم بعد ذلك تم توزيع استبيان لطلاب المجموعة التجريبية وذلك لاستخلاص آرائهم حول دور القراءة في فهم مستويات بنية الخطاب. دلت النتائج التي توصلت إليها الدراسة على وجود تحسن كبير في المجموعة التجريبية في جميع جوانب بنية الخطاب، في حين خفض طلاب المجموعة الضابطة نقاطهم في بعض الجوانب وتلقوا تحسينات ضئيلة في جوانب أخرى. في الأخير اشارت الدراسة كذلك إلى أن القراءة يمكن أن تكون أفضل تقنية لفهم تنظيم الخطاب.

necessity to introduce reading and writing in an integrated way as they both rely on the representation of various aspects of linguistic knowledge levels and are affected by similar contextual constraints.

Unlike the above last view, in English department at Constantine University 1, it is unusual to make out this association practiced in the classrooms. In other words, writing has a prominent position in the design of foreign language teaching programs, while reading is absent almost totally in writing and completely as an official program, and therefore most students

tend to apply their perception of learning Arabic to write in English. Given this situation, this particular study is partly motivated by concerns over the importance of the reading construct to improve writing, especially if it is devoted to reinforce a specific writing skill that most students have difficulties with.

On the other hand, writing is viewed hugely important, yet it is a daunting task which involves the management of a complex array of traits. One of these important traits is organization or the logical progression of ideas in the text. When the organization is strong, the piece of writing begins meaningfully and provokes in the writer a sense of anticipation that is ultimately and systematically fulfilled. Moreover, the reader never loses interest as the ideas proceed logically and the information is given in the right doses at the right times.

Organization should be mastered at the beginning levels so that the students can go beyond the basics and pursue other aspects with less anxiety in the higher levels. However, this seemingly very important writing aspect appears to be a common stumbling block due to several different reasons. Therefore, providing efficient instructions that particularly lead to the development of that aspect appears to be a writing priority for foreign language teachers. As such, the instruction in the current research was based on raising the students' awareness of some basic aspects of discourse structure levels through adhering to the reading construct as Koda (2005: 139) candidly puts it "its acquisition [discourse structure] occurs only through formal training and substantial reading experience."

1. Expository Writing

Expository writing is probably the type most frequently encountered in all types of reading materials. As the learners advance through the higher levels, the expectations and requirements for such kind of texts increase. In contrast to the narrative or descriptive modes which attempt to evoke the reader's emotions or senses, the expository mode "provides facts, gives true information, explains, informs, persuades, and/or describes various topics and phenomena" (McCormack and Pasquarelli, 2010: 133).

The main difficulty with expository writing seems to be attributable to the students' lack of knowledge about the text organization used in comprehending and producing expository texts, especially, this type of texts usually demands such characteristics as focus on the main ideas, relevant and sufficient supporting details, strong organization, a logic order of ideas, cohesion and coherence, and clarity. As a result, teachers need to provide expository texts and consistently expose student to them so as to gain familiarity and confidence in constructing content and thus improve their writing. Grabe (2002: 263) supports "a more coherent and focused effort to teach expository writing and to practice such writing consistently would improve students' writing abilities."

2. Reading-Writing Connection

The relationship between reading and writing encompasses a network of parallelism. According to Fitzgerald and Shanahan (2000), reading and writing are markedly related and similar with regard to knowledge representations, cognitive processes, and contextual constraints. The connection between these two constructs is classified into two ways: reading to write and writing to read. However, a common task in university setting is reading to write.

The importance of reading for writing development is well acknowledged among writing researchers. This is best described by Eisterhold (1990: 88) who puts:

...reading in the writing classroom is understood as the appropriate input for acquisition of writing skills because it is generally assumed that reading passages will somehow function as primary models from which writing skills can be learned or at least inferred.

Reading, therefore, serves as primary models, in which learners grasp the art of language, exponentially enrich their vocabularies, learn different styles of writing and become better spellers. Similarly, Krashen (1984: 67) on his part indicates the contribution of reading in writing as it provides the students with comprehensible input. He claims:

Reading, which builds the knowledge base of written texts, helps L2 learners acquire necessary language constructs such as grammatical structures and discourse rules for writing, and facilitates the process of language acquisition.

3. Discourse Structure

The term 'discourse analysis' is used to mean different interpretations depending on what school or approach of discourse analysis one adheres. Schiffrin et al. (2001) claim that most definitions of discourse analysis can be grouped into three main categories: the study of linguistic structures beyond the sentence, the study of language in use, and the study of social practices that is mainly associated with language. Of the three preceding definitions, only the first one is a linguistic-based approach since it mainly focuses on the internal organization of texts. To be more precise, this classical definition of discourse analysis which is derived from the formalist or structuralist

views owes its origin to Harris (1952) who was the first linguist to introduce this term (McCarthy, 1991). He viewed discourse analysis as the next level in a hierarchy of morphemes, clauses, and sentences. As such, discourse is constructed from sentences, and these small units are used to build the larger units that make up discourse itself. In short, discourse structure, in this study, is simply referred back to this ordinary definition of discourse analysis: the organization of language above the sentence level.

However, the structural organization of discourse can be described as having multiple levels or dimensions of analysis. One of the models of discourse processing which is applicable for different genres is the one outlined by Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983). According to them, the model distinguishes between three levels of discourse organization: microstructure, macrostructure, and superstructure. Discourse microstructure and macrostructure pertain to the text content in which propositions are the basic building blocks. Put differently, these propositions that are taken to be as the microstructure of text are linked together into larger units constructing the text macrostructure. Discourse superstructure, not of direct relevance to the aim of this study, is described as the conventional global schema of the discourse; that is, the form in which the macrostructure is presented. (*ibid.*)

3.1 Discourse Macrostructure

Macrostructures have been defined in several different ways because they are employed in different disciplines. In linguistics and discourse analysis, “the notion of macrostructure has been introduced in order to provide such an abstract semantic description of the global content, and hence of the global coherence of discourse” (Van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983: 189). Along the same line, Renkema (2004: 94) provides “a macrostructure is the global meaning of discourse.” These semantic condensed versions of the text that embody the most important information and concepts become clearer as there are more global structural signals; they are typically expressed in for instance, topics, headlines, titles, abstracts of scholarly articles and the like. In this particular study, they are referred to the main content and the rhetorical organization of the essay from where readers can draw the global meaning such as the general statements, thesis statement, topic sentences, supporting sentences, organizational pattern, restatement of the thesis statement and a brief summary at the end.

Discourse macrostructures have two main different functions. The first function, according to Van Dijk (1980), refers to the organization of complex macro-information. Without these macrostructures one is able to understand a discourse as it is built up of a large number of links between information units at the local level, but he is unable to link larger chunks as having their own meaning and function. It would be impossible to sidestep these macrostructures since they are the most vital type of thinking language users can employ to organize and hence to get the global meaning of the text. In fact, one is not only in need to know how to organize the complex information, but also how to handle this organized information. The second main function of macrostructures, therefore, corresponds to the reduction of complex information; in other words, they highlight the more important, relevant, abstract, or general information from a complex information unit.

3.2 Discourse Microstructure

Another foundational aspect of discourse analysis is this ability to approach a text's individual sentences or microstructures. The latter, also termed text-bases, is described by Van Dijk (1980:29) as "those structures that are processed or described, at the local level or short-range level (viz., words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and connections between sentence)". This level of structure, then, is the lowest or most detailed analysis of discourse meaning that can be understood from words, sentences, propositions, clauses, and phrases.

Discourse analysis procedures have specified different features of discourse microstructure that may be provided in the text. For Johnson (1990: 279), "the term of microstructure is used to refer to the information within a particular unit of connected discourse". Lojek (2009:03) further specifies "the microstructural level is characterized in terms of cohesion and coherence. Cohesion refers to the syntactic and lexical means of connecting sentences [...]. Coherence corresponds to the relationship between propositions". Similar to Lojek's features, Bloom et al., (2013: X) support "microstructure analysis evaluates how the use of specific linguistic devices affect cohesion or the semantic relations that bind linguistic items together across sentences". Thus, in this study, discourse microstructure centers around three features namely information structure, particularly in terms of theme and rheme, cohesion, and coherence relations with adopting the sentence as the basic unit of microstructural description.

3.2.1 Thematic Structure

Thematic structure plays a major role in organizing information in a text at the local level. It is concerned with how the sentence is built as a piece of discourse that conveys a message. The theoretical concepts that are useful in understanding the thematic structure and how the information generally works in terms of linguistic complexity are theme and rheme. A functional definition of these two concepts is available in the work of Halliday (1994: 37) who states: "The Theme is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message [...] the part in which the theme is developed, is called [...] the Rheme. The theme, therefore, is identified by its initial position, providing an alternative understanding of the way messages are organized within the clause. However, the identification of the rheme comes from the assumption that everything that is not the theme is rheme.

Based on the different sequences of thematic and rhematic choices made through the text, different thematic progression patterns are found to be essential for the understanding of individual sentences in their given position within the text. Danes (1974 cited in Nwogu and Bloor, 1991) puts forward three basic thematic progression patterns: the simple linear thematic progression, the thematic progression with the continuous or constant theme, and the thematic progression with the derived theme. These three patterns have been later on extended by other scholars.

3.2.2 Cohesion

Halliday, one of the linguists credited with the development of systemic linguistics and functional grammar, first elaborated the concept of cohesion. Then, the publication of *Cohesion in English* by both Halliday and Hassan (1976) made cohesion a popular term in text linguistics. According to them, cohesion is a semantic concept which refers to meaning relations that link the parts of the text and specify it as a text. Without these semantic ties, sentences or clauses would seem to lack any type of relationship to each other. In a related vein, the concept was referred to by Grabe (1985: 110) as “the means available in the surface forms of the text to signal relations that hold between sentences or clausal units in the text.” Halliday and Hasan (1976) offer a taxonomy of the type of cohesive relationship which can be formally established within a text. These major cohesive devices are of two main categories: grammatical and lexical devices. While grammatical cohesion embraces four different devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction; lexical cohesion encompasses reiteration and collocation.

3.2.3 Coherence Relations

Further, coherence relations are among the most important factors to determine discourse structure at the local level and hence the larger meaning of the text. According to Van Dijk (1980: 52) “local coherence is defined for (pairwise) relations between sentences of a textual sequence”. In other words, they are meaning relations which connect two text segments minimally the clauses. The category of these relations is either made explicit by means of connectives such as: conjunctions (and, but, although, if ... then, for, because, or, unless, and despite), sentence adverbs (therefore, however, consequently), and adverbial compounds (on the contrary, as a consequence, or on the one hand and on the other hand) (Van Dijk, 1985). Or it is entirely implicit, and thus readers need to infer these relations via other means such as context clues and background knowledge.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Participants

The participants being investigated were selected out from the large population of second- year students of English Department at Constantine University 1, during the academic year of 2012-2013. They were assigned to an experimental group (n= 35) and control group (n= 35). The participants in the two groups have approximately the same educational background as they have been studying English for seven years at least.

4.2 Research Procedure

The research method for this experimental study was based on pre-test-post-test control-group design. At the outset of the study, both experimental group and control group took the pre- writing test at the same time. The aim behind this test is to make sure that there was no significant difference between the writing performance of both groups. Then, the experimental group was provided with a treatment which was based on reading and that aimed at raising the subjects’ awareness to use appropriately some basic aspects of discourse structure levels.

The instruction consisted of three phases: macro level, micro level, and overall practice. Macro level included the analysis of three elements: introduction, body, and conclusion organization with their main parts. Micro level focused on three aspects namely: thematic structure, cohesion and coherence relations. And finally, in the overall practice, the participants dealt with analyzing all the aspects together of a given text and then transferring them to writing.

Specifically, in each lesson, the experimental group participants were introduced to one aspect of discourse structure levels. The researcher selected a given text to read first, discuss the reading assignment which were comprehension questions, and finally analyze the selected aspect. In terms of a writing assignment, the subjects were asked to write a paragraph or an essay with a special consideration to that aspect.

The treatment period lasted twelve weeks with an average of two sessions per week; that is, a total of twenty four sessions, each lasted ninety minutes. As materials, the researcher used detailed handouts related to each aspect and sixteen expository texts on different topics. The texts were selected from different sources according to their good structure, readability and content suitability.

On the other hand, the control group subjects who received the same hours of instruction were not introduced to the notions of discourse macrostructure and microstructure and all their basic aspects equally. They were taught organization globally through a set of compiled handout providing lessons on some types of expository essays with few models without stressing the importance of reading. The researcher's main emphasis was to have students write more essays in order to provide feedback about aspects of writing in general.

Immediately, after the treatment was over, a post-test was administrated to both experimental group and control group under similar environmental conditions as were available for pre-test. Additionally, the experimental group was given a questionnaire to collect information mainly about the subjects' attitudes towards employing reading as a technique to teach writing in general and aspects of discourse structure levels in particular.

4.3 Data Collection and Scoring Procedures

The main instruments used for data collection were the students' pre- and post-writing tests, in addition to a students' questionnaire. In both tests, the participants were instructed to write one expository essay within ninety minutes on the topic of "people do many things to stay healthy". The tests can be described as a simplified assignment as the instruction purposefully did not direct the subjects' attention to the experiment's aim.

As far as the scoring is concerned, an analytical rubric was used. The researcher examined equally the three aspects of discourse macrostructure (introduction, body, and conclusion) and the three aspects of discourse microstructure (thematic structure, cohesion, and discourse relations). Each aspect was given a score which was allocated in the rating scale from 05 points to 00 according to a specific guideline. In other words, each aspect was worth a total of five marks, which totaled up to 30 marks (see

Appendix). In order to establish validity of the scoring according to the guideline, assays were doubled examined and marked by another teacher. Discrepancies in the pair marking were resolved by having a third teacher.

The questionnaire of the experimental group subjects, on the other hand, covered five sections. The first section was meant to gain better understanding of the respondents' attitudes towards learning writing. The next section was designed to elicit the subjects' perception of the importance of reading in writing. The third section was about the importance of reading in raising discourse structure awareness. The fourth section was meant to gather information about the participants' attitudes towards teaching discourse macrostructure and microstructure to foster writing organization. Finally, in the last section, the participants were kindly requested to add any suggestion they see relevant to the aim of the questionnaire.

4.4 Results and Discussion

4.4.1 Writing Tests

The scores obtained from both groups were presented in tabulator form for the purpose of interpretation. For the analysis of data, the mean scores and standard deviation of the overall performance on the pre-test and pos-test in the experimental and control groups were computed. Significance of difference between the mean scores of both groups on the variable of pre-test and post-test scores was tested at 0.05 level by using the independent t-test.

Table 1: Comparison of the Overall Performance between the Experimental and Control groups

Tests	Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	p
Post-test	Experimental group	20.03	3.14	68	5.52	0.000
	Control group	15.71	3.39			
Pre-test	Experimental group	14.71	3.20	68	0.56	0.28
	Control group	15.14	3.15			

$p < 0.05$, one-tailed

From the independent samples t-test in Table 1, the results of the analysis show that the difference between the achievement of both groups on the pre-test is not statistically significant though the mean scores of the control group (15.14) was slightly higher than that of the experimental group (14.71). Accordingly, p- value (0.28) which is greater than 0.05 (the significance level) is indicative of the equality of the two groups before the treatment. On the other hand, the mean scores of the post-test of the experimental group and control group show a highly significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level ($t = 5.52$, $p = 0.000$).

The insignificant improvement in the performance of the control group is a result of the subjects' unawareness of the basic aspects of discourse structure. However, the significantly higher scores obtained by the experimental group at the end of the treatment explain the evidence that providing the students with such treatment that makes them aware of the levels of discourse structure through reading organized texts can effectively help them structure the content of their essays (see Table 2).

Table 2: Comparison of the Pre- and Post-tests of the Experimental and Control Group

Groups	Tests	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	p
Experimental group	Pre-test	14.71	3.20	68	7.02	0.00
	Post-test	20.03	3.14			
Control group	Pre-test	15.14	3.15	68	0.72	0.23
	Post-test	15.71	3.39			

p < 0.05, one-tailed

Differences in Individual Aspects

As a further check, the findings of each aspect are presented separately, and a t-test was used to test the significant difference of the means between the post-test and pre-test.

Table 3: Comparison of the Use of Aspects of Discourse Structure Levels between the Pre-test and the Post-test of the Experimental Group and the Control Group

Aspects	Tests	Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	p
Introduction	Post-test	EXP group	3.51	0.78	68	2.80	0.00
		CTR group	2.89	1.05			
	Pre-test	EXP group	2.74	0.82	68	0.25	0.40
		CTR group	2.69	0.80			
Body	Post-test	EXP group	3.08	0.78	68	5.09	0.00
		CTR group	2.11	0.83			
	Pre-test	EXP group	2.11	0.76	68	0.26	0.39
		CTR group	2.31	0.72			
conclusion	Post-test	EXP group	3.08	0.71	68	3.45	0.00
		CTR group	2.57	0.65			
	Pre-test	EXP group	2.17	0.71	68	0.17	0.43
		CTR group	2.20	0.72			
Thematic structure	Post-test	EXP group	3.25	0.66	68	4.11	0.00
		CTR group	2.57	0.74			
	Pre-test	EXP group	2.40	0.65	68	1.05	0.14
		CTR group	2.57	0.70			
cohesion	Post-test	EXP group	3.22	0.68	68	5.77	0.00
		CTR group	2.48	0.56			
	Pre-test	EXP group	2.34	0.77	68	0.75	0.22
		CTR group	2.37	0.61			
Coherence relations	Post-test	EXP group	3.80	0.63	68	4.27	0.00
		CTR group	3.08	0.66			
	Pre-test	EXP group	2.91	0.74	68	0.41	0.34
		CTR group	2.97	0.66			

p < 0.05, one-tailed

It is apparent from table 3 above that the scores of the pre-test were not significantly different in the six aspects of discourse structure levels across the two groups. However, in the post-test, the results show a notable difference because of the positive performance of the experimental group in all aspects. Specifically, the control

group made insignificant improvement in the introduction organization, conclusion organization, coherence relations, and cohesion, similar performance in thematic structure, and worse performance in body organization. The subjects from the experimental group, on the other hand, leaped forward in their performance with some reductions in the number of errors in the chosen six aspects. The mean score of the introduction organization increased from (2.74) to (3.51), body organization from (2.11) to (3.08), conclusion organization from (2.17) to (3.08), thematic structure from (2.40) to (3.25), cohesion from (2.34) to (3.22), and coherence relations from (2.91) to (3.80). These significant differences indicate that the experimental group had positive responses towards bringing the notion of discourse structure levels in writing.

The pre-writing means of all aspects further implied that the most problematic areas in both groups were in body organization, conclusion organization, cohesion, thematic structure, introduction organization, and coherence relations respectively. At the global level, the problems of body organization that appeared to be quite obvious to anyone who goes through the participants' writing were: insufficient supporting details, unclear or no topic sentence, irrelevant details or shift in focus, or wrong or no organizational pattern. Like body organization, the conclusion mean was lower in comparison with the other aspects. This explains the thoughts of the students that they have stated everything they know in the introduction and body paragraphs, so the conclusion is an unimportant bit tagged on the end of the essay and then becomes merely an afterthought. The frequent types of problems encountered in the subjects' papers were: no personal comment, mere repetition of the thesis statement, no restatement of the thesis statement, or no summary or synthesis. The introduction organization mean, on the other hand, was slightly higher than that of the two previous parts, and this might be due to the fact that the participants gave too much attention to it. Its main problems attributed to the ways of maintaining relevance, wrong placement or absence of the thesis statement, or wrong/ no clear pattern of organization.

At the local level, it was noticed that the subjects' essays lacked some cohesive elements between sentences, in addition to other problems associated to pronoun shift, overuse of repetition, faulty pronoun reference, or wrong use/ misuse/omission of conjunctions. The participants also had some troubles with thematic structure, specifically their essays lacked a clear thematic progression pattern, contained too much empty rhemes, or wrong textual themes. As far as coherence relations are concerned, lack of elaboration relations, incorrect use of explicit connectives, or lack of identifiable implicit relations were the most problematic areas of that aspect.

4.4.2 Students' Questionnaire

The outcome of the students' questionnaire revealed that all participants from the experimental group considered reading as an important technique to develop writing specifically when it is devoted to foster one specific aspect. They agreed that reading and writing should be better taught in one course than separating them. Particularly, the subjects were satisfied with the role reading played in raising their awareness to the notions of discourse macrostructure and microstructure as well as their aspects.

Put succinctly, it is ultimately incorrect to replace all the different writing instructions with reading, but, based on the subjects' opinions, reading can be the most effective method when intertwined with writing instruction because it helps them to build the knowledge base of written discourse.

Conclusion

This study sought to bring the discourse dimensions to assist students to produce more organized writing. According to the discussion of the results presented hereinbefore, the experimental group made significant improvement in writing organization than the control group did. What seems quite likely to have differentiated the subjects in the experimental group was their awareness of the use of aspects of discourse macrostructure and microstructure that they grasp through reading.

Based on the conclusion above, some suggestions can be put forward as follows:

- Teachers of writing should stress the importance of organization and build a habit of considering it as a matter to be taken notice of whenever the students write or read a text.
- Teachers of writing should teach levels of discourse organization equally for stressing one level over another may affect negatively the students' writing performance.
- Teaching writing through reading is highly recommended for this integration can open up new avenues towards writing instruction in specific and language learning in general.
- Reading together with discourse can be a step forward in adapting a more suitable writing teaching program.

References

- Bloom, R. L., Obler, L. K., De Santi, S., & Ehrlich, J. S. (eds). (2013). *Discourse analysis and applications: Studies in adult clinical populations*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eisterhold, J. C. (1990). Reading-writing connections: Towards a description for second language learners. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: research insights for the classroom*, (pp. 88- 101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35,39-50.
- Grabe, W. (1985). Written discourse analysis. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Annual review of applied linguistics*, (Vol. 5, pp. 101–123). New York: Cambridge University.
- --- . (2002). Narrative and expository macro-genres. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*, (pp. 249-267). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. (2nded.). London: Rnold.
- Johnson, R. K. (1990). Developing teachers' language resources. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) *Second Language Teacher Education*, (pp. 269-282). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1984). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Lojek, E. (2009). Imaging communication in the brain. In k. Bryan (Ed.), *Communication in healthcare*, (pp. 1-67). Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCormack, R. L., & Pasquarelli, S. L. (2010). *Teaching reading: Strategies and resources for grades K-6*. New York: The Guilford Publications.
- Nwogu, K., & Bloor, T. (1991). Thematic progression in professional and popular medical texts. In E. Ventola (Ed.), *Functional systematic linguistics: Approaches and uses*, (pp.369- 385). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies*. Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Schiffirin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. (eds.). (2001). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- --- . (ed.). (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis, Vol. 2: Dimensions of discourse*. London: Academic Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

Appendix: The Analytical Rubric for the Assessment of the Participants' Essays

		5 marks	4 marks	3 marks	2 marks	1 mark
Macrostructure	Introduction	(1) Relevant general statements about the topic. (2) Very clear pattern of rhetorical structure . (3) Very clear thesis statement .	The paper executes all the three elements mentioned before, but there may be very few problems with one of the elements.	The paper executes all the three elements, but there may be few problems with more than one element.	The paper executes all the three elements mentioned before, but there may be many problems with all elements.	Many serious problems with all the elements. Or lack of one of the elements.
	Body paragraphs	All the paragraphs have (1) very clear topic sentences (2) relevant and sufficient supporting details , and (3) clear pattern of organization .	All the paragraphs have the three mentioned elements, but there may be very few problems in one paragraph.	All the paragraphs have the three mentioned elements, but there may be few problems with more than one paragraph. Or many problems in one paragraph.	All the paragraphs have the three mentioned elements, but there may be many problems in more than one paragraph. Or lack of one element in one paragraph.	Lack of more than one element in more than one paragraph. Or lack of paragraph division.
	Conclusion	(1) Restatement of the thesis statement. (2) Brief summary of the main points. (3) Final relevant comment .	The paper executes all the three elements mentioned before, but there may be very few problems with one of the elements.	The paper executes all the three elements, but there may be few problems with more than one element.	Lack of one of the three elements mentioned before.	Lack of more than one of the three elements mentioned before.

Microstructure	Thematic structure	Theme and rheme and thematic progression patterns are used effectively and appropriately in/ between all the sentences.	Very few sentences have problems with theme and rheme or lack thematic progression patterns.	Some sentences have problems with theme and rheme or lack thematic progression patterns.	Many sentences have problems with theme and rheme or lack thematic progression patterns.	Almost all sentences have problems with theme and rheme or lack thematic progression patterns.
	Cohesion	The cohesive elements are used effectively and appropriately between all the sentences.	Very few sentences are not linked appropriately with the cohesive elements.	Some sentences are not linked appropriately with the cohesive elements.	Many sentences are not linked appropriately with the cohesive elements.	Almost all sentences are not linked appropriately with the cohesive elements.
	Coherence relation	Coherence relations are used effectively and appropriately between all the sentences.	Very few sentences are not linked with the appropriate coherence relation.	Some sentences are not linked with the appropriate coherence relation.	Many sentences are not linked with the appropriate coherence relation.	Almost all sentences are not linked with the appropriate coherence relation.