



UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE CÓRDOBA
FACULTAD DE LENGUAS



MAESTRÍA EN INGLÉS
Orientación en Lingüística Aplicada

**Towards Enhancing EFL Academic Literacy:
The Effect of Genre-Based Instruction on
Summary-Response Writing**

Trabajo de tesis presentado por
Natalia V. Dalla Costa

Directora
Dra. Ana María Morra

Córdoba, Marzo 2012

Reading furnishes the mind with materials of knowledge; it is thinking that makes what we read ours. We are of the ruminating kind, and it is not enough to cram ourselves with a great load of collections; unless we chew them over again, they will not give us strength and nourishment.

John Locke

To my family – Edis María, Jorge, Silvana and Nicolás – for understanding what this project meant to me and, especially, to Andrés for his selfless love and patience.

To Martha Zaya de Valy, who has been one of my sources of inspiration ever since I decided to take up English rather than ballet classes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the School of Languages and SECyT, National University of Córdoba, for their institutional and financial support, and my Language IV students whose needs have prompted me to carry out this research.

I am particularly indebted to Ana María Morra, my supervisor, for her invaluable contribution, insightful comments and encouragement. She offered feedback as well as much needed moral support as she responded to successive drafts of the manuscript.

I am also grateful to my colleagues Yamina Gava, Fabián Negrelli and Marcela González de Gatti, who generously committed their time and effort to this study and worked hard as raters, instructors, and advisors.

I need to express my appreciation to Silvia Joekes, to whom I owe a large debt for sharing her expertise in statistics and providing her assistance in this field.

While all those mentioned have contributed to this project, none is, of course, responsible for its weaknesses and I am accountable for any remaining errors.

Abstract

This study investigates the effect of genre-based instruction on the process of teaching summary-response writing to EFL university students at an advanced level of language proficiency. A quasi-experimental research design (one-group pre- and post-test) was followed and quantitative and qualitative methods to collect and analyse the data were employed. The participants were one instructor, two raters and an intact group of 46 EFL students attending the fourth year of five-year Teacher Training, Licentiate and Translation Studies Programmes in an Argentinian university. The subjects were administered a pre-test requesting them to write a summary-response before instruction. After a ten-week period of instruction following the genre-based approach, a post-test was administered. Two independent raters scored students' summary-responses using an analytic scoring scale designed for this study. The quantitative data collected from the tests were analysed using two statistical tests, namely, Cohen's Simple Unweighted Coefficient and Wilcoxon Rank Sums (matched pairs). Results indicated that the difference in means between pre- and post-test scores was statistically significant. The information gathered was triangulated with the analysis of summary-response writing strategies carried out by the researcher, the data provided by pre- and post-study questionnaires and self-assessment checklists administered to the students, and interviews held with the instructor. The results provided by these measures support the hypothesis that genre-based instruction is an effective pedagogical tool to teach summary-response writing to EFL university students at an advanced level of language proficiency.

Table of Contents

List of Figures and Tables	ix
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	x
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Research Problem	1
1.2 Rationale	7
1.3 Content of the Chapters	9
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Theoretical Framework	10
2.1.1 Definition of Literacy.....	10
2.1.2 An Integrated-Skills Approach to EFL Reading and Writing.....	17
2.1.2.1 Reading-Writing Relations.....	19
2.1.3 EFL Literacy Instruction.....	23
2.1.3.1 Models of Reading.....	24
2.1.3.2 Approaches to Writing.....	30
2.1.4 Genre-Based Literacy Instruction.....	35
2.1.5 Summary-Response Writing.....	43
2.2 Literature Review	49
2.3 Objectives of the Present Study	57
2.3.1 General Objective.....	58
2.3.2 Specific Objectives.....	58
2.4 Research Question and Hypotheses	58
3. METHODOLOGY	59
3.1 Context of the Study	59
3.2 Participants	60
3.2.1 Subjects.....	61
3.2.2 Instructor.....	62
3.2.3 Raters.....	62
3.3 Materials and Methods	62
3.3.1 Genre-Based Classroom Materials.....	63

3.3.2	Instructor's Pack.....	63
3.3.3	Raters' Pack.....	63
3.3.4	Data Collection Instruments.....	64
3.3.4.1	Testing Instruments: Summary-Response Writing Tasks.....	65
3.3.4.2	Written Questionnaires.....	66
3.3.4.3	Self-Assessment Checklists.....	68
3.3.4.4	Teacher Interview Protocols.....	68
3.4	Piloting.....	69
3.4.1	Genre-Based Classroom Materials.....	69
3.4.2	Instructor's and Raters' Packs.....	69
3.4.3	Data Collection Instruments.....	69
3.5	Data Collection Procedures.....	70
3.5.1	Instructor's Training.....	72
3.5.2	Administration of Pre-Study Questionnaire.....	72
3.5.3	Pre-Test and Self-Assessment Checklist.....	72
3.5.4	Treatment.....	73
3.5.5	Administration of Post-Study Questionnaire.....	75
3.5.6	Post-Test and Self-Assessment Checklist.....	75
3.5.7	Interviews with the Instructor.....	75
3.5.8	Raters' Training.....	76
3.6	Data Analysis Procedures.....	76
3.6.1	Analysis of the Ratings of Students' Performance in Summary-Response Writing Tasks.....	77
3.6.1.1	Script Selection and Codification.....	77
3.6.1.2	Script Scoring.....	77
3.6.1.3	Statistical Analysis.....	78
3.6.2	Researcher's Analysis of Summary-Response Writing Strategies.....	78
3.6.2.1	Analysis of Summary Writing Strategies.....	79
3.6.2.2	Analysis of Critical Response Strategies.....	82
3.6.3	Analysis of Questionnaires and Self-Assessment Checklists.....	83
3.6.4	Analysis of Interviews with the Instructor.....	83

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	85
4.1 Results of Quantitative Data	85
4.1.1 Results of the Ratings of Students' Performance in Summary-Response Writing Tasks.....	85
4.1.1.1 Reliability.....	85
4.1.1.2 Wilcoxon Rank Sums Test.....	89
4.1.1.3 Validity.....	91
4.2 Results of Quantitative and Qualitative Data	92
4.2.1 Results of the Researcher's Analysis of Summary-Response Writing Strategies.....	93
4.2.1.1 Summary Writing Strategies.....	94
4.2.1.2 Critical Response Strategies.....	110
4.2.2 Results of Questionnaires.....	126
4.2.2.1 Demographic Information about the Subjects.....	126
4.2.2.2 Information about the Subjects' Abilities.....	126
4.2.2.3 Information about the Subjects' Attitudes.....	131
4.2.3 Results of Self-Assessment Checklists.....	143
4.2.4 Results of Interviews with the Instructor.....	145
4.2.4.1 Experiential Factors.....	145
4.2.4.2 Pedagogical Factors.....	145
4.2.4.3 Contextual Factors.....	147
5. CONCLUSION	150
5.1 Summary of Research Findings	150
5.2 Pedagogical Implications	151
5.3 Limitations of the Study	157
5.4 Directions for Further Research	159
5.5 Final Considerations	160
BIBLIOGRAPHY	163
APPENDICES	178
Appendix A. Genre-Based Classroom Materials	178
Appendix B. Instructor's Pack	187

Appendix C. Raters' Pack	190
C.1 Protocol.....	190
C.2 Scoring Scale.....	191
C.3 Scoring Sheet.....	195
Appendix D. Testing Instruments	196
D.1 Pre-Test.....	196
D.2 Post-Test.....	198
Appendix E. Questionnaires	200
E.1 Pre-Study Questionnaire.....	200
E.2 Post-Study Questionnaire.....	203
Appendix F. Self-Assessment Checklist	206
Appendix G. Teacher Interview Protocols	207
G.1 Pre-Study Interview.....	207
G.2 Post-Study Interview.....	207
Appendix H. Written Consent Form	208
Appendix I. Estimated p-value	209
Appendix J. Cumulative Proportions of Post-Test Score Gains	210
J.1 Quantity of Students according to Pre- and Post-Test Scores.....	210
J.2 Percentage of Students according to Post-Test Scores for each Pre-Test Score.....	210

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 4.1 Cumulative Proportions of Post-Test Score Gains.....	90
Figure 4.2 Pre-Test Summarisation Strategies.....	94
Figure 4.3 Post-Test Summarisation Strategies.....	100
Figure 4.4 Pre-Test Response Strategies.....	110
Figure 4.5 Post-Test Response Strategies.....	116

Tables

Table 3.1 Stages of the Present Study.....	71
Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics for Pre-Test Scores.....	87
Table 4.2 Agreement between the Raters on Pre-Test Scores.....	87
Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics for Post-Test Scores.....	88

Table 4.4 Agreement between the Raters on Post-Test Scores.....	88
Table 4.5 Mean Difference between Pre- and Post-Test Scores.....	89
Table 4.6 Students' Abilities to Summarise and Respond Critically to a Text.....	128
Table 4.7 Difficulty of Summary-Response Writing Tasks.....	131
Table 4.8 Importance of Summary-Response Writing.....	135
Table 4.9 Quantity of Activities.....	142
Table 4.10 Quality of Activities.....	142
Table 4.11 Differences in Self-Assessment Checklists between Pre- and Post-Test....	144

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

CBI Content-Based Instruction
EAP English for Academic Purposes
EFL English as a Foreign Language
EGP English for General Purposes
ELT English Language Teaching
EOP English for Occupational Purposes
ESL English as a Second Language
ESP English for Specific Purposes
L2 Second Language
NNSs Non-Native Speakers
SFL Systemic Functional Linguistics
UNC National University of Córdoba