

Writing in Higher Education: A Study of Faculty Expectations

by Nahla Nola Bacha
Humanities Division at the Lebanese American
University, Lebanon.

I. Introduction

The transition from high school to institutions of higher learning in the medium of English requires not only adaptation to a different academic culture of learning for non-native speakers of English, but also the acquisition of a certain level of academic writing skills to perform successfully in their course work (Jordan, 1997). The different disciplines in higher education institutions often require emphasis in certain areas of the writing skills over others considered important for that particular course work (Fulwiler & Young, 1990; Bader, 1992; Ieki & Carson, 1994; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). However, research has indicated that faculty in EFL/ESL programs at these institutions are unaware or prioritize the various aspects of the writing skills differently, and thus do not have comparable language expectations of their students to those of the faculty in the disciplines (Reid, 1989). In such a situation, it would seem that although the English Program is attempting to help students acquire the necessary writing skills to manage well in their university-course work, these programs need to address the issue and revisit the teaching/learning of the writing proficiency skills more in light of what is expected in the various disciplines (Barra, 1993).

II. Aim of Study

This paper reports a study of a survey of faculty language expectations of their students in writing at the Lebanese American University in the Schools of Engineering and Architecture, Pharmacy, Business, and Arts & Sciences. Specifically, the study compares faculty expectations of student writing proficiency necessary to follow undergraduate degree majors in the four main schools: Arts & Sciences, Business, Engineering and Architecture and Pharmacy.

III. Significance of the Study

No institution of higher learning can deny the importance of writing to the academic success of the learner. In order for EFL/ESL programs to better help initiate students into the writing skills required by the disciplines, it is significant that the English faculty be aware of discipline faculty expectations. Thus, the importance of the study is in obtaining information for furthering English Program Development at the Lebanese American University to better serve the students in the acquisition of the 'appropriate' writing proficiency skills that meet the expectations of those related to the disciplines.

To the researcher's knowledge, this is the first rigorous study in this area at LAU and in Lebanon and thus its importance in obtaining data which could help in program development. Related research has indicated that faculty in the disciplines expect their students to focus more on the content in their writing in aspects of coherence, organization and argumentation and do not consider the mechanical aspects of grammar or punctuation as important as in EFL/ESL Programs (e.g. Horowitz, 1986a,b; Santos, 1988; Caulk, 1994; Harklau, 1994; Connor, 1996; Leki & Carson, 1997; Sharkey & Layzer, 2000). Other studies have concentrated on English for Specific Purposes, specifically English for academic purposes in identifying which of the language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) are most important for students for their academic work. General findings indicate that listening and reading are of priority for faculty but that writing is the most difficult (e.g. Johns, 1981; Zughol & Husain, 1985; Basturkmen, 1998), and that students need to learn how to write specific genres

such as reports and research papers according to acceptable academic conventions and standards (Swales & Mustapha, 1984; Brooks, 1990; Swales, 1990; Yazigi, 1991; Basturkmen, 1998).

These studies indicate that English Programs can no longer be viewed as separate service entities from the rest of the university curriculum as was the case in the past. Thus, the importance of the present study is in its attempt to find what acceptable writing is in the various disciplines at the university for better EFL/ESL curriculum development.

IV. Review of Literature

There is an understanding among teachers that there is something called 'good' writing which their students must aspire to (see Anson, 1988; Reid, 1989). Textbooks often provide 'good' models that are used in the classroom (e.g Tibbets, A & Tibbetts, C, 1991). The term 'good' as applied to written discourse, however, is broad and does not consider the styles nor standards acceptable in the different discourse communities. Recent scholarship views the style and quality of writing as dependent upon the task, purpose, and audience relative to course objectives, teaching methods and evaluative criteria used (Bernhardt, 1986; Duane, 1989; Sitler, 1993; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Furthermore, 'good' in the past decade has been viewed more in accordance to what degree the expectations of the academic disciplines have been met. Writing across the curriculum research emphasizes that for a writer to be "successful", a knowledge of the genre in the disciplines is a prerequisite (Swales & Mustafa, 1984; Swales, 1990; Gattbonton, 1999; Chan, 2001). In the present study the term "good" writing refers to the foregoing; that is, writing in any academic genre that conforms to the conventions of the academic community. Specifically, whether the genre is an essay written in EFL/ESL Programs, a summary, report or research paper written for course work in the disciplines, the standards of formal academic English must be met since the readership is of that community (Swales, 1990). For example,

a "good" essay typically has an introductory paragraph which usually includes definitions of key words, a short background or context of the topic of the essay and a thesis statement indicating the main ideas that are to be developed in the body of the essay. Next, the essay contains body paragraphs that develop the main ideas with relevant logical specific evidence. Finally, the essay has a concluding paragraph in which the thesis statement is restated, closing remarks and final comments. The essay should show competent use of vocabulary related to the subject and clear sentences with various types of simple, compound and complex. Another example which students need to write at university is the research paper. Also, to produce a "good" research paper, certain conventions must be followed. Basically, the research paper provides information or the author's point of view supported by logical proof and evidence in clear language. Although these examples in themselves also seem general, the reader is referred to Freshman EFL writing textbooks (e.g. Leki, 1995) and research manuals for format and style and to their own experiences in either English or discipline courses for 'academic standards'. Obviously, it is no easy task for students to acquire the skills and standard required.

In this context, Charney and Carlson (1995) carried out a study to see whether providing models of what the faculty deemed "good" writing would help in students acquiring the acceptable proficiency level in writing research texts. Their sample was 95 undergraduates (mainly sophomores and juniors) who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course at the university. They divided the students into two experimental groups and one control group. The findings indicated that students performed significantly better in both content and organization when models were given before writing and that giving students models of good, moderate and poor quality was just as helpful as providing three good models. The authors conclude that ... "the opportunity to compare good, moderate, and poor models might help students identify the effective aspects of the models and avoid the mistakes" (p.112). However, the expectations of faculty in the disciplines may change much faster than models can keep up with, and often a model may not reflect the needs of the disciplines.

Obtaining feedback as to students' writing proficiency and involving faculty in the disciplines in the English Program Curriculum

is a 'new' intervention in the field, an intervention that is not without its pros and cons. How far should English teachers be involved in teaching the content of the disciplines along with the writing skills is at present an unresolved controversy in writing across the curriculum research (Johns, 1981; 1988, 1990; Smith, 1988; Spack, 1988a, 1988b; Bush, 1992; Sitler, 1993; Schaub, 2000). However, in the present study, it is argued that faculty in the disciplines need to be regularly consulted as even these faculty may have different opinions as to the 'models' of appropriate writing chosen by the English faculty.

A study done at the University of Canberra, Australia in 1992 (Denise Bush cited in *English for Academic Purposes*, 1996) surveyed the academic writing expectations of 500 faculty on nine major features considered of importance for their students, specifically those from overseas in six disciplines: education, communication, management, information science and engineering, applied science and environmental design. Findings indicated that of the nine major features of writing of content, argument, communicative ability, organization, use of literature, grammar, style, vocabulary and punctuation, content features (ideas, argument, organization and communicative ability) were of more importance than form features (style, punctuation, spelling, grammar and vocabulary). Literature features (use of readings) fell in the middle between content and form; those dealing with analyzing and synthesizing ideas being of higher priority than those focusing on correct citing of references and overall format of the text. A similar study was done at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia in 1996 and the information made available for students in their text (*English for Academic Purposes*, 1996) of what the discipline expectations are according to the nine writing features on a three proficiency level scale of low, medium and high. Implications from both these studies for the teaching/learning of writing in EFL/ESL programs at the respective universities indicated a need for more emphasis on synthesis and argumentative writing with less preoccupation on mechanical skills of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Research findings into the writing proficiency of L1 Arabic non-native students of English have indicated weaknesses in sentence construction specifically in coherence and concision. That is, these

students find problems in the use of transitions and cohesive devices in connecting sentences at the discourse level as well as in developing ideas that are not redundant (Bacha & Hanania, 1980; Swales & Mustapha, 1984; Zughoul & Hussain 1985; Connor, 1996). Although contrastive rhetoric studies show that often times it is the negative transfer from L1 that may contribute to the difficulties these students have in writing in English, there is research to suggest that it is actually the lack of appropriate methods that is the overriding factor (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Bacha, 2000). Recently a few needs analysis attempts in EFL/ESL programs in the universities in Kuwait, Jordan, Lebanon have suggested the importance of focusing on the English curriculum more in terms of the student discipline related writing needs (Abdulhamdia, 1984; Swales & Mustafa, 1984; Zughol, 1985; Bader, 1992; Shaaban & Ghaith, 1997; Basturkmen, 1998; Bacha, 2000, Schaub, 2000). This is of course true in many other EFL/ESL programs around the world.

V. Method

In the Spring and Fall 2000 semesters, a survey (see appendix) adapted on a study carried out at the University of Macquairie (1996) was distributed to all faculty at the Lebanese American University at the three campuses in Beirut, Byblos and Sidon in the four schools: Engineering and Architecture, Business, Arts & Sciences, and Pharmacy. Faculty were asked to rate their expectations on a scale of 1 to 3 with 3 indicating high importance in their students' course work. Most of the faculty's linguistic background were L1 Arabic non-native speakers with L2 English and many with L3 French. They are holders of American and/or European university degrees and had had experience in teaching in their field. The students had similar linguistic backgrounds and were following their university studies in the medium of English. The data received from a total of 74 faculty (out of a total of 145 full-time faculty) questionnaires were analyzed using two statistical tests. The Mann-Whitney Statistical Test was used to compare the mean ranks (or central locations) of two sets of independent data and the Kruskal-Wallis to compare more than two sets of independent data, both not normally distributed. Probability (p) levels of $p = < 0.05$ were accepted as significant (SPSS 1997).

VI. Results and Discussion

Findings in general indicate that various majors require different writing skills and an indication that writing may not be the main medium used for assignment or assessment purposes in some of the more scientifically oriented disciplines. However, the result does show that it is the 'top' skills of content, argumentation, use of readings etc. rather than the 'bottom' skills of grammar and mechanics that are of priority (see Tables 1-9). A comparison also made between the English and discipline faculty expectations shows that the latter are more tolerant when accuracy is concerned. These findings, in general, confirm those of the Macquarie University study (English for Academic Purposes 1, 1996)

Specific findings are given below according to the nine writing categories based on the statistical results of comparisons of mean faculty expectations among all the majors including English, between the English and majors, between the Arts and Sciences, and among the majors excluding English. The order in which the findings are reported is a top down one reflecting in general the priority in EFL/ESL teaching/learning methodology which assumes that communicativeness, content, use of readings, argumentation are focused on first in the learning situation and then editing for grammar and mechanics are attended to later. The number of surveys received and analyzed according to major is reported only in Table 1. The total number of 74 faculty surveys are also divided as follows for comparative statistical purposes: English (N=29) versus Majors (N=45); Arts (N=49) versus Sciences (N=25). The Arts subjects included English, Education and Social Sciences [with the social sciences including sociology, psychology, political science] and Humanities including history, fine arts, graphic design, music, radio/T.V./film, journalism. The Science subjects included Business, Engineering and Architecture, Pharmacy, and Natural Science [with the natural science including chemistry, physics, computer science, mathematics]. The findings focus on the discipline in general; for example business, pharmacy, natural science and so on and not on the specific majors within the discipline such as chemistry, physics etc. The headings in bold type in each of

the tables are abbreviated forms of the detailed descriptors in the survey (see appendix).

1. Communicative Ability

Table 1 indicates that all majors consider communicative ability in making writing clear and interesting for the reader of relative importance, with the pharmacy and humanities faculty more so (means of 3 and 2.92 respectively). Perhaps this is due to the nature of the subject matter in these two majors wherein details are not so easy to get across to the reader and where writing is crucial in the learning process. The other majors may depend more upon numbers, maps, charts etc. rather than prose format to convey ideas. However, there were no significant differences when all the majors including and excluding English were compared with one another, or when English expectations were compared with those in the majors.

Table 1 Communicative Ability

	N	Understandable	Interesting
English	29	2.39	2.48
Business	8	2.38	2.13
Engin.& Arch.	4	2.50	2.50
Pharmacy	3	3.00	3.00
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	8	2.50	2.50
Natural Science	10	2.50	2.10
Humanities	12	2.92	2.92

2. Content

Table 2 indicates that perhaps writing is not the main medium used in assignments and assessment as the Engineering and Architecture faculty have a low expectation level on all variables. In fact, differences were statistically significant when majors including English were compared. More specifically, when the English faculty expectations were compared with those in the majors, supporting ideas with evidence and fulfilling the requirements as set out in the assignment were higher expectations for the English faculty. This is expected since the three Freshman composition courses and the Sophomore Rhetoric Writing course in the EFL

Program at the university, that all students are required to take, stress specificity of support and completion of essay and research assignments. Furthermore, faculty expectations were significantly higher in the Arts (that is, education, social sciences and humanities subjects) over those in the Sciences when ability to think for oneself, relevance, support and fulfillment of the assignment were considered. This result is surprising since these expectations have been viewed of equal importance by all faculty during informal interviews and discussions. The author suggests that more research needs to be done in this area at the university to confirm the results.

Table 2 Content

	Concepts	Thought	Relevance	Support	Complete
English	2.48	2.65	2.84	2.74	2.81
Business	2.38	1.88	2.75	2.13	2.13
Engin. & Arch.	1.00	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.75
Pharmacy	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Ed. & Soc.Sc.	2.75	2.63	2.75	2.63	2.38
Natural Science	2.50	2.10	2.70	2.40	2.40
Humanities	2.53	2.74	2.88	2.79	2.84

3. Argument

Table 3 indicates that all majors consider the sub-skills in argumentation equally important. There was no statistical significant differences when the majors including English were compared. However, faculty expectations in the majors were significantly higher when compared to those in English showing the importance of getting ideas across in a more concise manner typical for the sciences. It is the pure sciences such as those in the natural science category that had the highest significant expectations when concision, or avoidance of irrelevant material, was concerned. There were no significant differences when faculty expectations on all variables in the majors excluding English were compared.

Table 3 **Argument**

	Logic Coherence		Concision		Precision
English	2.65	2.81	1.71	2.55	
Business	2.25	2.38	2.00	2.00	
Engin.& Arch.	2.25	2.50	2.25	2.25	
Pharmacy	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	2.38	2.63	2.38	2.50	
Natural Science	2.70	2.60	2.50	2.60	
Humanities	2.72	2.81	1.72	2.65	

4. Use of Readings

Table 4 indicates an overall medium importance for use of readings in both English and discipline courses. Faculty expectations were significantly higher concerning students ability to analyze what other writers say when all the majors including English were compared. This finding confirms that of previous studies in which analysis was of high priority in the disciplines. All the sub-skills of reading were equally important for both English and discipline related faculty; there being no significant differences. However, faculty expectations were significantly higher concerning students ability to show that they can grasp main points of other writers when the Arts were compared to the Science faculty expectations. This is expected as the focus on main ideas in writing is an important factor in the arts, the sciences focusing more on numbers, equations, formulae and the like. No significant differences were found when expectations were compared among the majors excluding English. An important confirmatory finding is that all faculty in all the majors find plagiarism offensive and of concern. This reinforces the Macquarie University study (*English for Academic Purposes 1, 1996*).

Table 4 **Use of Readings**

	Extensive	Quoting Main Ideas			Analysis	Citing	Plagiarism
				Synthesis			
English	2.06	2.23	2.52	2.16	2.32	2.26	2.71
Business	2.13	2.00	2.13	2.38	2.75	1.88	2.50
Engin.& Arch.	2.00	2.25	1.75	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50
Pharmacy	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	2.25	2.25	2.63	2.63	2.38	2.50	2.63
Natural Science	1.90	2.10	2.20	2.00	2.00	2.30	2.40
Humanities	2.21	2.35	2.60	2.33	2.51	2.40	2.77

5. Organization

Table 5 indicates that on the whole except for Engineering and Architecture, organization is of importance in writing. When all majors including English were compared, faculty expectations were significantly higher for English faculty in that students should know how to paragraph correctly. This same result was obtained when the expectations of the English and majors were compared and when the majors were compared with one another with the Humanities faculty having the highest expectations. Again, it is the arts and English courses that stress correct paragraphing. When the Arts and Sciences faculty expectations were compared, again it was the Humanities faculty who had higher expectations concerning the appropriate dividing of assignments into sections and correct paragraphing reinforcing the type of prose genres being used.

Table 5 **Organization**

	Introduction	Conclusion	Division	Paragraphing	Citation
English	2.74	2.65	2.61	2.77	2.23
Business	2.50	2.50	2.38	2.25	2.13
Engin.& Arch.	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.75	2.50
Pharmacy	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	2.25	2.25	2.38	2.25	2.38
Natural Science	2.20	2.20	2.10	2.30	2.10
Humanities	2.74	2.65	2.70	2.79	2.30

6. Style

Table 6 indicates that in general style is of less importance for the sciences than the arts. When all the majors including English were compared, faculty expectations were higher for those in the Education and Social Science in that writing show some sophistication and that sentences should not be too short in the Humanities. Similar results were obtained when the Arts and Sciences faculty expectations were compared and when those of the majors were compared with one another. When the English and major faculty expectations were compared, faculty expectations were significantly higher in Education and social Science in that writing should show some sophistication. It is apparent that sophisticated writing is not as important a feature in science courses.

Table 6 Style

	Formal	Imper.	Sophist.	Objective	Short S.	Long S.	Approp.	Repetitive
English	2.35	2.06	2.23	2.29	2.16	2.16	2.61	1.97
Business	2.00	1.88	1.63	2.38	1.63	2.25	2.50	2.25
Engin.& Arch.	1.50	1.50	1.25	2.00	1.75	2.00	2.50	2.00
Pharmacy	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	2.00	2.13	2.38	2.25	1.75	1.88	2.63	2.50
Natural Science	2.30	2.30	1.30	2.40	1.50	2.20	2.50	1.70
Humanities	2.37	2.19	2.23	2.37	2.23	2.28	2.70	2.14

7. Vocabulary

Table 7 indicates that vocabulary is of importance. There were no significant differences between all majors including and excluding English. However, English and the arts faculty expectations were significantly higher when compared with the majors and the Sciences respectively concerning the need for vocabulary to be accurate. The use of specialized and appropriate vocabulary for the related field was not as important. Perhaps faculty do not expect students to have a wide vocabulary repertoire but to acquire one throughout their university studies. However, from informal interviews with the English faculty, it is believed that more emphasis should be placed on helping students broaden their active use of vocabulary in their writing.

Table 7 Vocabulary

	Specialized	Appropriate	Accurate
English	2.00	2.42	2.48
Business	2.13	2.38	2.13
Engin.& Arch.	2.25	2.00	2.00
Pharmacy	3.00	3.00	3.00
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	2.50	2.38	2.50
Natural Science	2.30	2.00	2.30
Humanities	2.19	2.51	2.60

8. Grammar

Table 8 indicates that in general faculty expectations concerning grammar is not as high as those in the other sub-writing skills

discussed above, specifically in business studies. When all the majors were compared including English, faculty expectations were significantly higher concerning the need for students to use complex grammatical structure and to have the correct grammar as incorrectness distracts the reader from the argument and content in Education and Social Sciences and Humanities. The same results were obtained when faculty expectations were compared between the Arts and Sciences and among the majors excluding English. No significant differences were obtained between faculty expectations when English was compared with the majors although higher means are indicated in the former. It seems that faculty in general expect grammatical accuracy but not necessarily complex structures nor significantly believe that poor grammar is distracting. This also confirms research in the field that grammar is more of a 'lower' order concern in teaching/learning recently.

Table 8 Grammar

	Accurate	Complex	Meaning
English	2.03	2.29	2.35
Business	1.88	1.38	1.75
Engin.& Arch.	2.50	2.00	2.25
Pharmacy	3.00	2.00	3.00
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	2.63	2.25	2.75
Natural Science	2.40	1.60	2.00
Humanities	2.00	2.33	2.51

9. Mechanics

Table 9 indicates that punctuation is important but significantly more so for the English courses. This is expected since it is in the English courses that students practise their punctuation skills as part of language learning. The same results were obtained when faculty expectations were compared between the Arts and Science faculties as well as among the majors. However, the Arts (specifically the Humanities) indicated significantly higher expectations. The high means in the pharmacy are questionable due to the low number of surveys received.

Table 9 Mechanics

	Corr. Punct.	App. Punct.	Corr. Spell.	Corr. Capit.
English	2.55	2.29	2.39	2.48
Business	1.75	1.88	2.38	2.13
Engin.& Arch.	2.25	2.25	2.50	2.25
Pharmacy	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Ed.& Soc.Sc.	2.25	2.13	2.63	2.63
Natural Science	2.20	2.00	2.50	2.30
Humanities	2.65	2.44	2.56	2.63

No faculty member added any extra comments on the survey probably because the survey covered most points. Results indicate that although faculty expectations on certain sub-writing skills and sub-sub-writing skills are similar, there are differences. Basically, the sciences stress more objective straight forward communication, while the arts stress sophistication and extensive readings as support. This further suggests that in a class that has students following the different majors, teachers must be aware of the different needs and attempt to cope with them. Assuming that all the students in any one EFL/ESL class have similar writing needs is too simplistic. Whether the teaching/learning of the writing skill needs to be considered more in terms of ESP with possible individual clinical writing techniques or some other approach is not to be determined in the space of such an article as the present one. The issue that the author is arguing is that students need different writing skills which EFL/ESL programs must investigate and account for in the teaching/learning situation in order for these programs to be successful.

This is a first exploratory study. Further follow up studies need to be carried out with more representation from the different majors especially from the Pharmacy and Engineering and Architecture. The low number of surveys in these majors could have biased the results. However, the findings do suggest the need to access the faculty in the disciplines in planning the curriculum for the teaching/learning of English in EFL/ESL programs.

VII. Implications and Conclusion

The implications of the results of the present study for revisiting

the EFL program objectives for English courses are far reaching. If the expectations of the discipline-related faculty are identified, then the on-going English Program revision is of more significance and relevant to the students' needs and success in their course work. To what degree of proficiency in the different aspects of the writing skill do the faculty in the disciplines want their students to attain needs to be examined. Taking this for granted by any English Program faculty in continued efforts to better the teaching/learning of the writing skill is to leave out a very important part of the students' learning process in a university discourse community, a part that can no longer be overlooked.

This is a revised version of the paper submitted to the Second International Conference on Contrastive Rhetoric on Linguistics, Culture and Teaching, Sub-Theme: Teaching Pedagogy: Writing/ Language Acquisition at the American University in Cairo, March 23-25, 2001.

This work was supported in part by The Lebanese American University.

References

- Abduhamdia, Zakaria (1984), "English Departments at Arab Universities; Toward a Planning-Based Model". *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 8:1, pp. 21-34.
- Anson, Chris M. (1988), "Toward a Multidimensional Model of Writing in the Academic Disciplines". In Jolliffe, D.A. (ed.) (1988), *Advances in Writing Research Vol.2: Writing in Academic Disciplines*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Bacha, N.S., and Hanania, E.A.S. (1980), "Difficulty in Learning and Effectiveness of Teaching Transitional Words: A Study on Arabic-Speaking University Students". *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, pp. 151-254.

- Bacha, Nahla Nola (2000), "Academic Writing in a Multilingual Context: A Study of Learner Difficulties", *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, Beirut: Librarie du Liban Publishers, Vol.2, No.2, pp. 239-268.
- Bader, Yousef (1992), "Curricula and Teaching Strategies in University English Departments: A Need for Change". *IRAL*. 30:3, 233-240.
- Barra, Alipio (1993), "Writing Reflection and Research May Increase Teacher Understanding". *English Teaching Forum*, July, 31:3, pp.14-17.
- Basturkmen, Helen (1998), "Refining Procedures: A Needs Analysis Project at Kuwait University", *English Teaching Forum*. Oct.-Dec., Vol.36, No.4.
- Bernhardt, Stephen A. (1986), "Applying a Functional Model of Language in the Writing Classroom". In Couture, Barbara (ed.)(1986), *Functional Approaches to Writing: Research Perspectives*. London: Frances Pinter Publishers, pp. 186-198.
- Brookes, Arthur (1990), "The Writing Process". In Brookes, Arthur and Grundy, Peter (1990), *Writing for Study Purposes: A Teacher's Guide to Developing Individual Writing Skills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 14-29.
- Bush, Denis (1992). *Academic Writing: Faculty Expectations and Overseas Student Performance*. Canberra, University of Canberra.
- Caulk, Nat (1994), "Comparing Teacher and Student Responses to Written Work". *TESOL Quarterly*, 28:1, pp. 181-187.
- Chan, Victoria (2001). "Determining Students' Language Needs in a Tertiary Setting". *English Teaching Forum*, Vol.39:3, pp. 16-27.
- Charney, David H. and Carlson, Richard A. (1995), "Learning to Write in a Genre: What Student Writers Take from Model Texts". *Research*

in the Teaching of English, Feb., pp. 88-125.

Connor, Ulla (1996), *Contrastive Rhetoric Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second-Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duane H. (ed.) (1989), *Richness in Writing*. London: Longman Group Limited.

English for Academic Purposes I (1996), Unpublished English 101 Course Text Macquarie: Macquarie University, School of English, Linguistics and Media, Sydney

Grabe, William and Kaplan, Robert B. (1996), *Theory and Practice of Writing*. London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Fulwiler, Toby and Young, Art (1990), *Programs That Work: Models and Methods for Writing across the Curriculum*. Portsmouth: Boynton Cook Publisher.

Gatbonton, Elizabeth. (1999). "Investigating Experienced ESL Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge", *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol.83:1, pp. 35-50.

Harklau, L. (1994). "ESL Versus Mainstream Classes: Contrasting L2 Learning Environments". *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28, pp. 241-272.

Horowitz, Daniel M. (1986a), "Essay Examination Prompts and the Teaching of Academic Writing". *English for Specific Purposes*, 5:2, pp. 107-120. _____ (1986b) "What Professors Actually Require: Academic Tasks for the ESL Classroom". *TESOL Quarterly*, 20:3, pp.445-462.

Johns, Ann M (1981) "Necessary English: A Faculty Survey". *TESOL Quarterly*, 15:1, pp. 51-57. _____ (1988), "Another Reader Reacts...". *TESOL Quarterly*, 22:4, pp. 705-707. _____ (1990), "L1 Composition Theories: Implications for Developing Theories of L2 Composition".

In Kroll, Barbara (ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 24-36.

Jordan, R.R. (1997), *English for Academic Purposes*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, Ilona & Carson, Joan (1994), "Students Perceptions of EAP Writing Instruction and Writing Needs across the Disciplines". *TESOL Quarterly*, 28:1, pp.81-101. _____ (1995) *Academic Writing: Exploring Processes and Strategies*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

_____ (1997). " 'Completely Different Worlds': EAP and the Writing Experiences of ESL Students in University Courses". *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol.31:1, pp.39-69

Reid, Joy M. (1989), "English as a Second Language Composition in Higher Education: The Expectations of the Academic Audience". In Johnson, Donna M. and Roen,

Santos, T. (1988). "Professors' Reactions to the Academic Writing of Non-Native-Speaking Students. *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 22, pp.69-90.

Schaub, Mark. (2000). "English in the Arab Republic of Egypt", *World Englishes*. Vol.19:2, pp.225-238.

Sharkey, Judy & Layzer, Carolyn (2000). "Whose Definition of Success? Identifying Factors That Affect English Language Learners' Access to Academic Success and Resources", *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 34:2, pp. 352-368.

Shaaban, Kassim & Ghaith, Ghazi. (1997). "An Integrated Approach to Foreign Language Learning in Lebanon. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. Vol.10:3, pp. 200-207.

Smith, Louise Z. (1988), "Opinion Why English Departments Should 'House' Writing across the Curriculum". *College English*, 50:4, pp. 390-395.

Sitler, Helen Collins (1993), "What College Writing Instructors Expect and Why You Should Join the Resistance". *English Journal*, 82:6, pp. 21-25.

Spack, Ruth (1988a), "Initiating ESL Students into the Academic Discourse Community: How Far Should We Go?" *TESOL Quarterly*, 22:1, pp. 29-51.

_____ (1988b), "The Author Responds to Johns...". *TESOL Quarterly*, 22:4, pp. 707-708.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Base 7.5 for Windows' User's Guide. (1997) Michigan, Chicago.: SPSS Inc.

Swales, John (1990), *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, John M. and Mustafa, H. (eds.) (1984), *English for Specific Purposes in the Arab World.* Birmingham, UK.: Language Studies Unit, University of Aston.

Tibbetts, A.M. and Tibbetts, Charlene (1991), *Strategies of Rhetoric with Handbook.* New York: Harper-Collins Publishers Incorporated.

Yazigi, Rula J. (1991), *Social and Psychological Factors in Learning English as a Foreign Language in Lebanon.* Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leicester, England.

Zughoul, Muhammad R. and Husain, Riad F. (1985), "English for Higher Education in the Arab World - A Case Study of Needs Analysis at Yarmouk University". *The ESP Journal*, 4, pp. 133-152.

Appendix

Survey on Faculty Expectations of Students' Writing

(adapted from survey EAP 100, 1996)

Check the school in which you teach

1. Business _____ 2. Engineering & Architecture ____ 3. Pharmacy _____
4. Arts & Sciences _____
- a. Education & Social Sciences ____
- b. Natural Sciences _____
- c. Humanities _____
- d. English _____

Indicate the expectations concerning the level of writing required for your course(s) by circling the appropriate number for each of the specific skills below according to 1 = high, 2 = medium, and 3 = low expectation. Please indicate NA if the item is not applicable. The information is part of a university wide research into students' academic English. Your responses will be treated with confidentiality. Thank you.

(Note: The items in bold type after each descriptor represent the basic skill. These are for ease of reference included in the tables 1-9).

- | | | |
|-----------|--|-------|
| A. | Communicative Ability | |
| 1. | Writing must be easy to understand (understandable) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Writer should interest reader in his/her main ideas (interesting) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |
| B. | Content | |
| 1. | Writing should show understanding of main concepts of subject (concepts) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Writer should show ability to think for him/herself (thought) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Ideas should be relevant to topic (relevance) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Evidence/examples should be given to support writer's ideas (support) | 1 2 3 |
| 5. | Writing should fulfill requirements as set out in assignment topic (complete) | 1 2 3 |
| 6. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |
| C. | Argument | |
| 1. | Line of argument should be clear to reader (logic) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Writer should show connections between one idea and next (coherence) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | There should be no padding or unnecessary material (concision) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Argument should not go off on tangents (precision) | 1 2 3 |
| 5. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |

D. Use of Readings

- | | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | Students should show they have read widely (extensive) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Students should show they can quote accurately (quoting) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Students should show they can grasp main points of other writers (main ideas) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Students should show they can synthesize views of different writers (synthesis) | 1 2 3 |
| 5. | Students should be able to analyze what other writers say (analysis) | 1 2 3 |
| 6. | References must be cited accurately (citing) | |

1 2 3

- | | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 7. | Students should not plagiarize other writers' work (plagiarism) | 1 2 3 |
| 8. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |

E. Organization

- | | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 1. | An assignment should have an introduction (introduction) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | An assignment should have a conclusion (conclusion) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Assignments should be divided into appropriate sections (division) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Paragraphs should be used correctly (paragraphing) | 1 2 3 |
| 5. | References must be cited in a consistent style (citation) | 1 2 3 |
| 6. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |

F. Style

- | | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 1. | Writing should be formal (formal) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Writing should be impersonal (impersonal) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Writing should show some sophistication (sophisticated) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Writing should be objective (objective) | 1 2 3 |
| 5. | There should not be too many short sentences (short sentences) | 1 2 3 |
| 6. | Sentences should not be too long (long sentences) | 1 2 3 |
| 7. | Writing should be appropriate to subject area (appropriate) | 1 2 3 |
| 8. | Writing should not repeat words or phrases (repetitive) | 1 2 3 |
| 9. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |

G. Vocabulary

- | | | |
|----|--|-------|
| 1. | Writers should show mastery of specialized vocab. of field (specialized) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Vocabulary usage should be appropriate for particular assignment (appropriate) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Vocabulary usage should be accurate (accurate) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |

H. Grammar

- | | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | Writing should be grammatically accurate (accurate) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Writer should be able to use complex grammatical structures (complex) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Poor grammar distracts reader from argument and content (meaning) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |

I. Mechanics

- | | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | Punctuation should be correct (corr. punct.) | 1 2 3 |
| 2. | Students should be able to use all forms of punctuation appropriately (app. punct.) | 1 2 3 |
| 3. | Students should be able to spell correctly (corr. spell.) | 1 2 3 |
| 4. | Students should be able to capitalize correctly (corr. capit.) | 1 2 3 |
| 5. | Others (please specify) | 1 2 3 |

Please mention any additional language expectations you have for your course(s)
