Full Length Research Paper

The writing strategies that students with less and high exposure to the internet adapted while writing

Mohammed Jwaied Irtaimeh, Siti Hamen Stapa

National University of Malaysia

This study was aimed at investigating the writing strategies that the Arab students adopt while writing in English as well as the influence of their exposure to the Internet on the strategies adopted in their writings. The researcher selected a sample that comprised 40 subjects. These subjects were 17-year old Jordanians in their first year secondary school. They were asked to perform two tasks., the first task was to fill out a questionnaire. Later, 6 subjects were selected purposively to perform think-aloud protocol to examine the writing strategies they adopt while writing. The selection was based on their exposure to the internet which was revealed by the questionnaire. The most exposed and the least exposed to the internet students comprised the sample of current study. The results reveal that the students who were most exposed to the internet adopted different strategies than the ones who were less exposed to the internet.

Key words: Writing strategies, internet, exposure to the internet, thinks aloud protocol

INTRODUCTION

Generally, learners face many problems in second or foreign language acquisition. These problems could be intralingual or interlingual. Whereas intralingual problems reflect the notion that a certain target language item influences another item of that language, like overgeneralization, interlingual problems are caused by the transfer of the learner's L1 rules into the L2.

Arab learners encounter several difficulties in learning English. This field has been the concern of many researchers and scholars. Including but not limited to Abbad (1988), Hisham (2008) and Rababah (2003) who carried out research in the Arab world aiming to explore the problems that Arab learners face when acquiring English. However, according to Rabab`ah (2003), the low writing proficiency is attributed to formal instruction by non-native speakers of English and the limited exposure to English.

In Jordan, the same conditions apply. The goals of teaching English at the secondary stage are to write organized, grammatically correct English passages, and to understand and communicate using everyday situations (Rabab'ah, 2003). Moreover, the students are expected to develop native–like facility, that is, to communicate spontaneously, effectively and confidently. The results of the studies conducted in Jordan led to the conclusion that the goals set by the Ministry of Education were very ambitious when compared with the actual situation for teaching English in the country.

When dealing with language beyond its semantic and syntactic features, there is an intriguing problem, not evident in grammar. In other words, Arab learners of English face other sort of difficulties in acquiring English as a second/foreign language which is rhetorical transfer. Rhetorical transfer embodies the process of transferring stylistic feature of L1 into L2 such as coordination and digression.

Al-Makhzoumi (1986) noticed that even if they have learnt to write correctly in English, including correct grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, the write-ups do not appear to sound English. Similar views were noticed by Ostler (1987). Besides, Kaplan (1972) explains the problem of the 'foreignness' is evident in the writings of

EFL students as follows:
It is apparent but not obvious that, at least to a very large extent, the organization of a paragraph, written in any language by any individual who is not a native speaker of that language, will carry the dominant imprint of that individual's culturally-coded orientation to the phenomenological world in which he lives and which he is bound to interpret largely through the avenues available to him in his native language. (p. 1)

The above account suggests that write-ups are flooded with L1 and its cultural rhetoric. This practice not only brings elements of 'foreignness' but also makes writing ineffective.

Eggington, (1987) found that many Jordanian Arab EFL students translate the content from Arabic into English, but retain the rhetorical structure of Arabic. This makes students' English writing sound more like Arabic, rendering them strange, out of focus, incoherent, inappropriate, and misleading. This problem was highlighted by many researchers including Al-Jarrah (2001), Al-Jubori (1984), Inani (1998), Kaplan (1972) and Koch (1983). No doubt, the translation method helps L2 learning but from the above account it is clear that overwhelming use of L1 interferes with the process of English learning and leads towards poor proficiency.

The Internetmay influence the quality of writing positively or negatively for the new young generation, the language used in the Internetexemplifies all levels of language from simple to complicated passing by slang, jargon and colloquial. The length of exposure to the Internetplays another important role in determining the kind of language acquired. The kind of material and subject being exposed to on the Internetis another factor which determines the kind of language acquired. The area of interest i.e. (politics, economics, science,...etc.) is another factor that specifies the kind of language acquired. So an Internetuser can gain language of good quality or language of bad quality depending on what has been mentioned above.

To recapture things, the learners' language proficiency, especially in the writing skill, is affected by the learners' L1 style of writing. This involves transferring extra linguistic features. However, the use of the Internet can help language development. The core this work is examining the transfer of Arabic stylistics and its culture into English and the effect of the Internet on this transfer. There are many issues in second language writing research. Among them, one can notice that some researchers such as Bitchener and Basturkmen (2006) and Hinkel, (2004) assert that the first language writing processes are different from those of the second language. On the other hand, others such as Matsumoto (1995) and Schoonen et al. (2003) emphasize the resemblance of the two processes. For some researchers, like Scollon (1999), it is the cultural difference that causes problems in students' rhetorical organisation when writing in the second language, while others, like Hirose (2003), rejected it.

It is acknowledged that culture influences L2 writing, but there are several other factors that affect the writing process such as the genre of the writing task done by the learners, cognitive development and inter-language development. Such factors should be borne in mind when analyzing such writings. Another conflicting issue is that, some researchers like Woodall (2002) argue that writing strategies of the first language can be positively transferred into L2 writing, whereas others, like Wu (1995), maintain negative transfer from the first language to writing in the second language. A straightforward conclusion should not be made here for it is significant to reflect on the different stages of the L2 writing processes. For instance, Arab learners of English were found to use L1 in generating ideas and controlling the whole process positively, but they utilized L2 to generate sentences in English writing using the same Arabic rhetorical patterns. In this regard, Arab researchers such as Al-Jubori (1984) and Inani (1998) showed the use of some Arabic rhetorical features, for example repetition, digression and parallelism, among university students when writing in English.

Statement of the Problem

The researcher who is of Arab origin, specifically Jordanian, was affected by the Jordanian students' poor English language performance at the university level. He is also concerned that no significant remedial measures have been taken into consideration. In evaluating the English competence of the graduates at Yarmouk University- Jordan, Rabab'ah (2010) found that most faculty members are unhappy with the quality of English proficiency of the graduates. Consequently, they are hesitant to recommend the graduates for jobs.

The reasons according to Rabab'ah (2000) seem to be of many folds, including the use of English interference with native language, non-native speakers, EFL Arabic instructors, prescribed syllabus and time constraint. The situation is aggravated at the university level, where students have to read and write on much more demanding subjects usually of a technical nature. Again, even if this task is accomplished with a certain degree of success, the students generally spend too much time and struggle to write effectively. They can write on familiar topics but labour on unfamiliar topics.

The above problem is elaborated further by some EFL researchers who complained that their students generally can write sentences correctly, in terms of grammar, vocabulary and mechanics, however, their writings sound unacceptable. Their writings are out of focus, incoherent, strange, inappropriate, meaningless, ambiguous, disorganized, confusing, or difficult to follow (Connor, 1996; Kaplan, 1972; Ostler, 1987). These problems in EFL writing have been attributed to the transfer of rhetorical patterns from the first language (L1) and culture. Usually, students can write simple sentences in English correctly but when they combine these sentences

into larger pieces of discourse, they are affected by the rhetorical patterns of their L1 (Kaplan, 1972). As a result, the students' writings deviate from the readers' expectations, especially those who are native speakers of English. It is observed that EFL writing teachers can often guess the L1 of their EFL students from their writings (Kaplan, 1972).

Research Objectives

The purpose of the study is to explore t the different strategies that are adopted by the different categories of students ranging from the leat exposed to the internet and most exposed to internet

Research Question

This study seeks to find answer to the research question guide this study:
1.   What are the writing strategies that the students with least exposed to internet and high exposed employ?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The ability to write professionally is not a skill that is acquired naturally. Research has shown that this process is a culturally learned or transmitted skill due to continuous efforts of instruction and teaching (Grabe, 2001). The problem of the non-native students who are willing to write professionally in another language rises from their inability to make grammatical judgments and their unconscious use of inappropriate constructions due to their L1 interference and the lack of their understanding of the writing models that appear to dominate all aspects of writing. Basically, Academic writing has been shown recently as an enormous challenge to many students. And especially for those who write in the L2 in academic contexts. Goldstein (2001) indicates that great efforts have been made so as to approximate the students' ability to write well in the second language. So that, many theories have appeared lately, that started to bring up credible solutions to the ongoing problems of writing in a professional way. The theories of Second Language acquisition and the theory of transfer have come to the scene aiming at finding proper answers to the intricate problems of writing rhetoric in the Second Language.

Second Language Acquisition theory presents the theoretical part of the problem in a way that it tries to provide a substantiated background explanation for the process of Language Acquisition with great focus on the multiple factors that enhance the process such as the personal motive, the age, and other needs to mention some. The theory also concentrates also on the limitations and the constraints that hinder and delay the ability of the learner in acquiring the second language such as the age, the motive, and personal attitude. Many

scholars and research such as Lantolf (2000) have highlighted this theory in a vehement way so as to find proper answers to the problems that if solved will help ease the comprehension and understanding across culturally. The theory also presents crucial answers and explanations to the human's ability in acquiring the basic skills of any language such as speaking, listening, reading and writing. Writing, for example, has always been a subject of paramount importance because of its necessity and dynamicity. The problems that students face in writing in L2 are many, and are coming from different resources and aspects. The reasons for these problems are back to nature of education received. Many students with low verbal abilities are being so because of certain factors such as their age, their attitude, and the motive behind the L2 acquisition. These factors delay a lot and in a varying degree the ability of the students as well as the learners in acquiring the language skills.

Research results have referred to the fact that writing is an accumulation of a group of language skills; listening, speech, reading, …etc. And this is what is approved by most of educators (Shehata 2000, sam 1998)

Writing is a basic mental activity through which we communicate our thoughts and feelings. Writing is sending and reading is a receiving process. It is a means of communication between human beings and the expressive tool of thinking. (Shehata 1993)

Writing is not only a tool for communicating ideas, but also a technique and a tool for generating knowledge and organizing it in a professional way. (Naser 1999).
It is a dynamic process that helps writers check their thoughts in a continuous process. It is not only ready made verbal moulds but also a work that encompasses the outer world of knowledge that help understand the inner compromise.

Scholars assert the relationship between thinking and writing development because writing is directed to thinking, so that the writing process is a cumulative hierarchy that includes the form and the content. This means that writing process entails all and everything of thinking, organizing, or improvement.

It is a tool for reflecting the thoughts of humans, so that the logical thoughts in the mind will be an image on writing. This trend has lead educators to stand by the ideas of solving problems via critical and argumentative thinking.

It is apparent that writing is one of the most difficult skills of language because of the probability of committing mistakes. Chomsky states that writing is an amazing process that transforms thoughts into written forms and sentences.

The purpose of writing

Writing learning is highly related to the learning process. That means that writing contains in essence all the skills of the language. Writing has given all the societies the

chance to communicate in all life aspects. In fact, it is through writing that the human legacy has been saved and transferred over generations. It is also the expressive tool that enables us to express our feelings and thoughts and convince people and communicates effectively. It is a method for developing the knowledgeable skills.

The educational development conference 1987 has stressed on the great status of writing. It focused also on developing and improving writing so that students can be able to express themselves in writing skillfully.

The document of the general educational output of the Arabic Language curriculum determined the goals of the writing process teaching of the second secondary stage. The document was all about teaching Arabic language in the year 2005. The document predicated that y the end of the year; the student will have been able to write in a skillful way employing all that he knows of the possible skills he taught during the year. It predicated that these skills will be developed, polished and maintained. Such skills are the critical thinking and solving the mental problems. Moreover, the student will be able to develop positive values and trends about himself and the society in a way that make him a critical thinker and a creative critic of the issues related to him and his society.

Fletcher and Atkinson (1972) conducted one of the earlier studies in which children of the experimental group received 8 to 10 minutes of the computer assisted instruction per day for 5 months. Results of the posttest gain scores showed that most students who received CAI performed better than that those who did not.

Arroyos (1992) examined the effect of using computer on reading achievement. The subjects of the study consisted of 75 seventh grade students. The result showed that the use of the computer appeared to increase students' motivation to learn.

Chan (1993) sought to understand the uses of computer in ESL education and to examine how the interactions between technology, ducation, language and culture defined the way computers were used in he ESL classroom. The study focused on what kind of learning environment was created by ESL teachers using the computer on ESL teaching and learning.

De Ridder (2000) argued that the case for the evaluation of some of the additional feature of CALL material designed to enhance second language reading comprehension was important. Her findings demonstrated that randomly highlighting words in a text on screen influenced the amount of vocabulary incidentally learned by the reader. Moreover, the results strongly indicate in highlighted setting were fundamentally different from reading a text in unmarked condition. She stated that this calls for reflection on how to present the learner with the enhancements of CALL.

Berge and Collins (1995) believed that the classroom of the past is no longer applicable to the world we live in which we are attempting to prepare our students to function in language. According to them, computerized classes and specially the on – line classroom offers opportunities to mentoring/ tutoring, project-based instruction (individual and group), retrieval of information (from on-line archives and database), course management, interactive chat, personal networking and professional growth, peer review of writing, and practice and experience using modern technology.

Sivin-Kachala and Bialo (2000) reviewed 311 research studies on the effectiveness of technology on students' achievement. Their findings revealed positive and consistent patterns when students were engaged in technology-rich environments, including significant gains and achievement in all subject areas, increased achievement in preschool through high school for both regular and special needs students, and improved attitudes toward learning and increased self-esteem.

O'Dwyer, Russell, Bebell, and Tucker-Seeley (2005) found that, while controlling for both prior achievement and socio-economic status, fourth-grade students who reported greater frequency of technology use at school to edit papers were likely to have higher total English/ language arts test scores and higher writing scores on fourth grade test scores on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)

Abu Naba'h, A., Hussain, J., Al-Omari, J. and Shdeifat, S. (2009) investigated the impact of using an instructional software program of English language on the achievement of Jordanian secondary school students. Their sample comprised 212 students who were distributed randomly on four experimental groups and four control groups. They used an instructional software program to teach the passive voice and an achievement test. They employed analysis of covariance to find out the effect of the instructional program on the students' achievement in the passive voice. They concluded that (1) there were statistically significant differences (< 0.05) between the students' achievement mean scores in grammar attributed to the instructional method of teaching. This difference was in favor of the students in the experimental group; (2) there were statistically significant differences (< 0.05) between the students' achievement mean scores in grammar attributed to gender. This difference is in favor of male students; (3) there were statistically significant differences (< 0.05) between the students' achievement mean scores in grammar attributed to stream of study. This difference is in favor of the scientific stream students

METHODOLOGY

The research involved a mixed method of data collection and analysis. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were adopted for the thorough investigation of rhetorical transfer variables affecting the writing of the Jordanian students in English. An analysis was performed on the basis of the think loud protocol. On the other hand, statistical data were obtained from the writing task that was given to the participants of the study.

The importance of choosing such a mixed method embodies in the total understanding of a research problem. Thus, when a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was used in a study, both methods complement each other and permit more complete analysis of the research problem.

To recap, the study involved a mixture of both quantitative and qualitative techniques with the qualitative one dominating. In this regard Strauss and Corbin (1998) stated that "data collection and analysis can be done in both modes, and in various combinations, during all phases of the research process" (p. 31). The questionnaire used in the study forms the quantitative technique of data collection and analysis, though two instruments, the writing task and the think-aloud protocol, were the instruments of the qualitative aspect of the study.

The present study was conducted utilizing a quantitative research design accompanied with a qualitative one for two reasons. Firstly, the study sought to investigate the students' behaviour while performing a language task, i.e. essay writing (Merriam, 1998). Thus the aim of the study was to provide a detailed description of rhetorical transfer in the students' writings. Secondly, the research aimed at probing the strategies that the new young generation of Jordanian students employ while writing. This urged the researcher to consider a research design that effectively elicits the students' overt and covert behaviours that could be interpreted in terms of writing strategies. These strategies were directly linked to rhetorical transfer and the effect of L1 and its culture on the students' L2 writings.

As questionnaires and surveys, as data collection instruments are viewed as less effective instruments because of the fact that they fail to provide clearer insights of the inner processes involved in the learners (Kasem, 2008). Therefore, Cohen (1998) suggested research methods that examine the qualitative aspects of the strategies that the learner adopts such as interviews, verbal reports and observations. Such methods pave the way for the researcher by getting deep description of strategy use in task performance. These two reasons underlay the researcher's choice of the qualitative research along with the quantitative one.

The actual study was performed on the participants who belonged to sample (1) which comprised 60 first secondary class students. The duration of the task was 40 minutes (i.e. a period of a lesson). Unlike the pilot study, the actual implementation of the study was conducted in the classroom during the English language classes where each class of students did the task under their teacher's monitoring to get the participants feel relaxed when performing the writing task.

After finishing the task, the students submitted their papers to the teachers. The scoring process took place at the same school and the scorers were the researcher and two teachers of English. While scoring the students' works, the scorers emphasized the RT of the eight features which were pattern, root and word repetition, parallelism, redundancy, digression, coordination and subordinate clauses. Neither grammatical errors such as tenses and spelling, nor vocabulary misuse were emphasized during the scoring phase. The participants' works were scored, then the researcher collected the data necessary for the study; he categorized the rhetorically transferred features and interpreted them in terms of frequencies and percentages.

The problems that emerged during the implementation was that the participants kept asking about meanings and vocabulary. According to them they were not ready enough. Another difficulty was that few participants needed extra time to complete their essays. On the other hand, the salient advantage of the writing task was that the researcher observed the participants' behaviour during the writing process. This behaviour reassured that researcher that the think aloud protocol would be fruitful as they were thinking loudly while writing.

The Questionnaire

The Questionnaire is usually administered in research to gather data about behavous. Also, it is helpful in gathering information that is unique to individuals such as attitudes, beliefs or knowledge. (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). According to Hyland (2003), the questionnaire is the most widely instrument for data collection. In this study, the questionnaire was distributed on the participants of sample (1). Its purpose was to investigate the participants' exposure to the internet. The duration that the participants usually spend using the internet, the place where they use the internet and the purposes for which the participants' use was emphasized in the questionnaire items as they may affect the participants' proficiency in writing. The data gathered by means of the questionnaire was correlated with their writings in order to reveal whether the internet-exposure influences rhetorical transfer

The actual implementation of the think-aloud technique was carried out on the four participants, Ali, Hasan, Yousef and Zaid. As was the case in the pilot study, the researcher met the four students individually at the schools counsellor's office. Similarly, the participants were asked to articulate loudly their thoughts while performing the writing task. During the protocol session the researcher was recording their thoughts using a pen and paper to take notes on their performance. The study took about two weeks to perform the four sessions.

Think-aloud Protocol has been used for data collection in many writing process studies. For instance, Schmidt (2001) stated that think-aloud protocols are trustworthy evidence as to whether something has been consciously perceived or noticed. Liu (1997) and Cheng (1998) argued that the protocol may help uncover writing processes that are invisible to other methods like analyzing the written output or interviewing writers after they have produced their compositions.

The Think-aloud Protocol involves participants describing their action but not giving explanations. This method is thought to be more objective in that participants merely report how they go about writing rather than interpreting or justifying their actions (Ericsson & Simon, 1994).Due to the fact that the presence of more than two observers often makes a participant nervous, which impairs their ability to complete the task, only the researcher himself manipulated this method. It was more optimal to have two observers, because one would notice things that the other misses. However, the researcher did it alone. As think-aloud should only be done with multiple participants if the task itself would normally require multiple users, one participant was tested at a time by the researcher.

In this study, the participants of sample (2) were subjected to Think-aloud Protocol for further understanding. The strategies that the participants used while writing the composition were recorded, documented, analyzed and categorized according to the strategies that were observed and reported during the sessions.More knowledge and understanding on the rhetoric transfer were gleaned from this procedure.

The researcher matched the participants on all demographics, including age, educational level and level of proficiency in writing. In addition, the observations took place in a relaxing environment where the participants feel free and unstressed. The researcher prepared the task via reading through the document he tested to ensure that the steps are in a logical order and that it is free of spelling and grammatical errors and made sure he had all necessary materials for the task. In addition, he prepared the participant to the task by describing the goal of the task. Then the researcher gave an account of the Think-aloud technique to the participant as well as presenting a practice Think-aloud task to familiarize them with the technique.

The researcher adopted an example to explain the think-aloud protocol procedure by asking the participant to count the number of windows in their houses asking them to speak loud while thinking about the rooms and the numbers of windows in each rooms. The researcher tried to make the participants feel relaxed and unstressed by informing them that he was testing the instructions, not them, and that any difficulties emerged were his fault, not theirs. Also, they were informed that they could stop working whenever they felt uncomfortable, confused or stressed. The participants were allowed to ask questions whenever they wished and they were allowed to determine when to finish the task on their own.

The researcher had verified that the participant had no remaining questions about the task or process before the participant began the task. The participant was asked to utter words while writing essays. The researcher prompted the participant with questions and sometimes with phrases such as 'please keep talking', yea, aha, speak up please … etc. the researcher took extensive notes on everything the participant's speech, gestures or any relevant actions.

When the participant completed the given task, the researcher thanked him for participating, asking him he had any additional feedback. After that the researcher prepared for the next participant and reduced redundancy in his data through correcting any errors in the document identified in one Think-aloud before beginning another. The same procedures were repeated with the rest of the other participants in this TAP.

During the actual protocols, two main difficulties faced the researcher. Firstly, the participants seemed to be silent while writing for they could not accommodate the writing with the verbalization process. In this regard, Seremon et al. (1994) explained that this happens when the participants encounter synchronization problem between their cognitive processes and the think aloud process. Secondly, some participants were hesitant to speak up their thoughts. Such a problem may be due to the fact that they were afraid of showing wrong responses or that they tended to show perfection in mental processing. On the other hand, the merit of this method was conspicuous in the data obtained simultaneously from the participants. This indicated that the data were directly recalled from the participants' short-term memory without any attempt to modify or distort them.

RESULT OF STUDIES

A 22-item questionnaire was created that is related to amount of internet exposure on the students, where the students were divided into groups and according to their responses to the questionnaire by giving scores to their responses that that begin with 1 and end with 6 for some questions and for others they begin with 1 and end with 5, and for 2 questions they were only from 1-2.

The total number of the students who were considered the least exposed to the internet was 15 students and they scored between 1 and 49, and there were 25 students who scored between 50 and 100 and were considered the most exposed to the internet.

The researcher chose the highest three students and the lowest three students from the sample. The study reveals that the six students chosen adopted the following strategies identified below by means of think aloud protocol technique while writing their composition.

Table .1

Code1	Reading about the topic
Code 2	Reading the task instructions
Code 3	making writing skeleton
Code 4	writing a short introduction
Code 5	Giving examples to support ideas

Table 1   cont'd

Code	
Code 6	writing a conclusion
Code 7	Drafting and reviewing
Code 9	Writing an introduction starting with general ideas and then narrowing the idea.
Code 10	Giving examples to support ideas
Code 11	Reviewing the text to check grammar

The Table 1 illustrates the writing strategies that were used by the six respondents.
The table above represents the use 11 strategies that were applied during writing and were recognized by having the respondents express it loudly.

Table 2: The strategies used by the most exposed to the internet (Merza, Mohammed, Yosef).

Code	Strategy
Code 1	Reading about the topic
Code 2	Reading the task instructions
Code 3	Making a writing skeleton
Code 4	Writing a short introduction
Code 5	Giving examples to support ideas
Code 6	Writing a conclusion
Code 7	Drafting and reviewing

We can note from the table above that the strategies used by the respondents are general to writing in the English language but with a observation concerning the order of strategies, where the three respondents agreed that the first used strategy is reading and they agreed on the importance of the use of a computer in writing a composition and then reading the instructions of writing a composition.

And then begin the sequence of using strategies by designing a roadmap for writing through beginning a short introduction followed by examples that support the idea of the topic and then conclude with writing a draft and a revision.

Table 3: Reveals the strategies used by (Yasser, Khalid, Omar) who are less exposed to the internet**.**

Code	Strategy
Code 9	Writing an introduction starting with general ideas and then I narrow my ideas
Code10	Giving examples to support ideas

We can see Table 3 that the three respondents used 4 strategies which is an introduction that begins with general ideas and ends with specific ideas in addition to the use of examples that support the ideas that exist in the introduction, and the use of the conclusion is followed by a revision of grammar and misspelling.

CONCLUSION

The objective of this question is to explore the writing strategies used by the students who were transferring the least rhetorical features from Arabic to English and by those who transferred most of the rhetorical features.

The three students who were transferring the least rhetorical features used the strategy "Reading before Writing". They did this in order to select proper words and to avoid being influenced by Arabic, especially regarding the differences between the two languages in their respective writing styles and in order to avoid transferring the rhetorical feature *word repetition*. This strategy helped the students to use fitting terms instead of repeating the same words or similar sentences which is often seen as a stylistic error in English.

Adopting this strategy provides the student with new ideas about the positive and negative aspects of the subject which the respondant tends to write on. It also helps to avoid using the rhetorical feature *digression* that is considered to be the second rhetorical feature of *repetition*. Furthermore, relying on this strategy helps to avoid the rhetorical features *parallelism* and *pattern repetition*.

Adopting the second strategy "Reading the Main Points of the Text" helps the student to understand the topic and to instantly jump into writing. This makes the students' writing cohesive and relevant to the subject and reduces the usage of rhetorical features such as *digression of subordinate clauses* as these features are linked with the students' misunderstanding of the subject that he intends to write about. Also, the understanding of the main points by limiting the number of words helps to avoid the rhetorical feature *coordination* which sometimes occurs when writing for a long time. This helps to meet the deadline while writing and to avoid repeating the words which one is prepared to use. It also adds to the usage of synonyms that are related to the subject and helps to avoid the usage of the rhetorical feature *parallelism.*

The three student's mentioned above focus on structuring the topic to minimize errors by splitting the text into main headlines and by choosing an introduction as a main idea into the text which helped to avoid the rhetorical features of transferring *digression, parallelism* and *redundancy* in their writing compostions. Furthermore, the students adopted the strategy of writing a short introduction in order to get to know the importance of the subject and to reduce the errors in their writing. They did so by writing a short, general and fitting introduction which was sensitive towards the Arabic language, especially regarding the differences between the two languages in writing style and in order to avoid the possibility of transferring the rhetorical features of *pattern repetition*, *root repetition* and *redundancy*.

Also, the use of the strategy gives "supporting thoughts by using examples" which helps to reduce the amount of rhetorical transfer of *subordinate clauses*. These clauses are considered to be a form of repetition and require

focus on a strategy of his writing a conclusion. The three students used these clauses to integrate ideas and were evident in their compositions. These were not affected by Arabic. This aids in avoiding the rhetorical feature *digression*, makes the topic more cohesive, and prevents the usage of connectors which is preferred in Arabic.

Surely, the organization of thoughts, finding errors, and reductionism are tied to the use draft composition strategy and proof-reading specific to reducing rhetorical redundancies of digression, parallelism and word repetition.

The students with the highest transfer of rhetorical features from Arabic to English in their compositions used different writing strategies than the students with the least amount of transfer.

Certainly, the strategy of writing an introduction without having written about the topic led to a high degree of rhetorical transfer; *root repetition* and *word repetition*. A student's writing was weakened by repetitive vocabulary and excessive usage of words of the same root. Students who focused on a long introduction and the repetition of complete sentences resulted in *redundancy*, *digression*, and *parallelism*. Another strategy used by the students with a high degree of rhetorical transfer is the important use of supporting examples, the repetition of these examples, absence of suitable expressions, and the reliance on the rhetorical feature *word repetition*, too. It can be summarize that the students repetitively used supporting sentences and considered them to be examples to support their ideas.

Not reading the directions for the essay, such as the number of words required, affected the style of the writing from the standpoint of high word count. This led to students over usage of connectors and excessive repetition of the rhetorical features *coordination* and *parallelism*.

The three students used of a conclusion strategy incorrectly reliant on the rhetorical features redundancy, digression and parallelism. Herein, they considered these strategies to coalesce the introduction into a single paragraph.

REFERENCES

Abbad A (1988). An Analysis of Communicative Competence Features in English Language texts in Yemen Arab Republic. PhD Dissertation, University of Illinoisat Urbana-Champaign.

Hisham D (2008). Needs Analysis of Arab graduate students in the area of EAP: Acase study of the ICT program at UUM. Unpublished minor thesis.Sintok:University Utara Malaysia Press. Ibrahim, & S. Aydelott (Eds.), Contrastive rhetoric: Issues, insights and pedagogy (pp.1-23). Cairo, Egypt: American University in Cairo Press.

Rababah G (2003). "Communication Problems facing Arab learners of English: A personal perspective." TEFL Web Journal 2(1), 15-30.

Al-Makhzoumi K (1986). "Teaching reading comprehensive to secondary students in Jordan" Dirasat, vol.12,no.6.

Ostler S (1987). English in parallels: A comparison of English and Arabic prose. In Connor, U and Kaplan, R, (eds). Writing across Languages: Analysis of L2 text (pp. 169-185). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.

Kaplan R (1972). The Anatomy of Rhetoric: Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Rhetoric.

Philadelphia: The Centre for Curriculum Development Eggington, William. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implications for effective communication. In Connor, U. and Kaplan, R. (eds). Writing across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text (PP. 153-168). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.

Inani A (1998). Common Errors in Essays Written in English by Arabic speakers. Cairo: al maktab al-maSriilitawziiC al-maDbuuCaat.

Al-Jarrah M (2001). The transfer of Arabic rhetorical patterns into Jordanian students' writing in English.Mu'tah Lil-Buhūth wad-Dirāsāt: Humanities and Social Sciences Series, 16(8), 223-246.

Al-Jubori A (1984). The role of repetition in Arabic argumentative discourse. In Swales, J. and Mustafa, H. (eds). English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World. Birmingham, UK: The Language Studies Unit, University of Aston

Koch B (1983). Presentation as proof: The language of Arabic rhetoric. Anthropological Linguistics, 25, 47-60.

Bitchener J and H Basturkmen (2006). "Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section." Journal of English for Academic Purposes: 1-15.

Hinkel E (2004). "Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar. ." Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Matsumoto K (1995). "Research paper writing strategies of professional Japanese EFL writers."TESL Can. J.: 13 (11), 17-27.

Schoonen R et al., (2003) . First language and second language writing: The role of linguistic knowledge, speed of processing, and metacognitive knowledge. *Language Learning, 53* (1), 165-202.

Scollon S (1999). "Not to waste words or students: Confucian and Socratic discourse in the tertiary classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), ." Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning(pp. 13-27). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hirose K (2003). "Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students." Journal of Second Language Writing **12**: 181-209.

Woodall BR (2002). Language-switching: Using the first language while writing in a second language. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11* (1), 7-18.

Wu S (1995). "Transfer in Chinese students' academic English writing " Unpublished doctoral thesis, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona, USA.

Connor U (1996). Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross –culture aspect of second – language writing. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe M and C Grabe (2001). "Integrating Technology for Meaningful Learning " Houghton Muffin Company. USA.

Fletcher D & Atkison C (1972)."Evaluation of the Stanford CAI Program in Initial reading"J. Educ. Psychol.

Arroyo C (1992). "What is the Effect of Extensive Use of Computer on the Reading Achievement Scores of Seventh grade Students?" Available at: http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests

Chan C (1993). "As the Computer Turned on: A case Study of Computer – Mediated Educational Experience in an ESL Classroom".Dissertation Abstracts International. 53. 277.

De Ridder I (2000). "Are We Conditioned to Follow links? Highlights in CALL materials and their Impact on the Reading Process". Computer Assisted Language Learning.

Berge Z & Collins M (1995). "Computer – Mediated communication and the Online Classroom in the Distance Learning". Hampton press.

Sivin-Kachala.& Bialo E (2000). Research Report on the Effectiveness of Technology in Schools. (7th ed.) Washington.DC: Software and InformationIndustry Association.

Bebell RO & Tucker-Seeley (2005). "E-mail for English Teaching. Alexandria"Virginia: TWSOL publications.

Abu Naba'h A, Hussain J, Al-Omari A, & Shdeifat S (2009). The effect of computer-assistedlanguage learning in teaching English grammar on

the achievement of secondary students in Jordan .The International Arab Journal of Information Technology, Vol .6, No .4, 431-439.

Strauss A & Corbin J (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen D (1998). "*Toward a knowledge context: report on the first annual UC Berkeley forum on knowledge and the firm*", *California Management Review*, Vol. 41 No. 3,pp. 22-39. [CrossRef] [Infotrieve]

Catherine M & Gretchen BR (2006). Designing Qualitative Research fourth edition.

Hyland K (2003). Second language writing. Cambridge: Cambridge UniversityPress.doi:10.1017/CBO9780511667251,http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251.

Schmidt R (2001). Attention. In: Cognition and Second Language Instruction edited by Robinson P (New York: Cambridge University Press) 3-32

Liu CK (1997). Locations of L1-L2 Translation that Occur in English Writing.The Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of English Teaching (1997).

Cheng CK (1998). The Use of Think-aloud Protocols in Investigation of Second Language Reading. Paper presented at the 1998-9 Seminar, English Department, Chinese Culture University.

Ericsson KA & Simon HA (1994). Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data. Cambridge,MA: MIT Press.

Someren V (1994). The Think Aloud Method: A Practical Guide to Modeling Cognitive Processes. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Bitchener J and H Basturkmen (2006). "Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section." Journal of English for Academic Purposes: 1-15. Press) 3-32