

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

MOHAMED KHIDER UNIVERSITY – BISKRA

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH



A Contrastive Rhetoric Study of Algerian English as a Foreign Language Learners'

Use of Conjunctions in Writing Argumentative Paragraphs

The Case of Second Year Students at Biskra University

Dissertation submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages in partial
fulfilment for the requirements for a **Master Degree in Sciences of Language**

SUBMITTED BY:

Abdeldjalil **Messaoudi**

SUPERVISED BY:

Ms. Kenza **MERGHMI**

Board of Examiners

Dr. Tarek **ASSASSI** (Chairperson) (University of Biskra)

Dr. Ahmed Chaouki **HOADJLI** (Examiner) (University of Biskra)

Ms. Kenza **MERGHMI** (Supervisor) (University of Biskra)

Academic Year

2021/2022

Dedication

For one to conduct research may not be easy, but for one to decide to whom they dedicate their work to can be even harder. Here I am in a similar situation pondering, struggling to find words that convey my feelings best.

First and foremost, I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, for they have taken care of me for longer than I can remember.

I dedicate it to my friends, friends that the word itself does not do them justice.

I dedicate it to those who made my time here a time to never be forgotten.

I dedicate it to those I hold dear, to those I cherish endlessly.

Wherever you may be, far or near, I wish you good health and peace of mind.

Acknowledgements

First of all, great thanks to my teacher and supervisor Ms. Merghmi Kenza. Her support, guidance, and patience helped me reach this stage of my journey as a researcher. Wanting to be one of her supervisees is something I do not regret.

I thank the participants and teachers who were willing enough to spare me some of their time as well as would like I extend my gratitude to Dr. Ahmed Chaouki Houajli and other teacher that put time and effort into organising valuable conferences throughout the year. The board of examiners are also to be thanked for their crucial role in the process of finishing this significant step in our academic career.

I am grateful to my friends who encouraged me and motivated me to finish this work, and I greatly appreciate Anfel Silabdi's help, one of my dearest friends. Helped me when I needed help the most. Finally, and absolutely not least, I deeply appreciate Lily Schreve's support throughout this journey. Without her, this would not have been possible.

Abstract

An issue that is often mentioned in the EFL setting is the tendency of learners to write in English in a manner that is claimed to be a reflection of their native language. In an attempt to investigate the nature of this claim, we decided to examine it through the perspective of the rhetorical transfer hypothesis. This study was further narrowed down to the examination of conjunctions use in both English and Arabic compositions of second year students at the Department of English at the University of Biskra. A total of 12 participants served as a sample for this study. Each participant was asked to write an argumentative paragraph in both languages. This is a corpus-based study that falls under the mixed-method umbrella. The collected samples were analysed on a basis of frequencies as well as from a qualitative perspective. The results of the analysis showed dominance of coordinative conjunctions. Also, in regards to the functions of conjunctions used, the additive function was dominant. The qualitative analysis of the samples identified reoccurring patterns such as the frequent use of lengthy sentences and the participant's tendency to create parallel structure through coordination. These findings support the rhetorical transfer hypothesis. As a consequence, it is recommended that both teachers and students become aware of the concept and take it into consideration in the teaching/learning process. Awareness of the rhetorical tendencies of each language and their differences would help students avoid transfer and produce writings that are deemed natural in the target language.

Keywords: conjunctions, rhetorical transfer, rhetorical patterns, EFL writing

List of Abbreviations

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

TESL: Teaching English as a Second Language

EAP: English for Academic Purposes

ESP: English for Specific Purposes

CR: Contrastive Analysis

SVO: Subject-verb-object

SOV: Subject-object-verb

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

CPL: Conjunction-per-Line

AR: Arabic

EN: English

List of Tables

Table 01. Frequency of Conjunctions use in Both Sub-corpora	49
Table 02. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions used in the English Compositions	50
Table 03. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions used in the English Compositions	51
Table 04. Frequency of the Functions of Conjunctions Used in the English Compositions ..	52
Table 05. Frequency of the Functions of Conjunctions Used in the Arabic Compositions	53
Table 06. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 01	54
Table 07. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 01	55
Table 08. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 02	57
Table 09. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 02	57
Table 10. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 03	59
Table 11. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 03	59
Table 12. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 04	60
Table 13. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 04	61
Table 14. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 05	63
Table 15. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 05	63
Table 16. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 06	65
Table 17. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 06	66
Table 18. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 07	67
Table 19. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 07	68

Table 20. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 08	69
Table 21. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 08	70
Table 22. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 09	71
Table 23. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 09	72
Table 24. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 10	73
Table 25. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 10	74
Table 26. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 11	76
Table 27. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 11	76
Table 28. Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 12	78
Table 29. Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 12	78

Contents

Dedication	1
Acknowledgements	2
Abstract.....	3
List of Abbreviations	4
List of Tables	5
Contents	7
General Introduction	11
1. Statement of the Problem	11
2. Aim and Objectives	12
3. Research Questions.....	12
4. Literature Review	13
5. Methodology.....	15
6. Significance of the Study.....	16
7. Delimitations of the Study.....	16
8. Operational Definitions	16
9. Structure of the Dissertation.....	17
 Chapter One: Language Interference in L2 Writing 	
Introduction.....	19
1.1 Language Transfer and Interference	19
1.1.1 Language Interference.....	19
1.1.2 Positive and Negative Transfer	20

1.2 Second Language (L2) Writing	21
1.2.1 Definition	21
1.2.2 Purposes of L2 Writing	22
1.2.3 L2 Writing Variation.....	23
1.2.3.1 Cross-linguistic/cultural Variation	23
1.2.3.2 Cross-disciplinary Variation of L2 Writing.....	24
1.3 Sources of Language Interference in L2 Writing	25
1.3.1 Linguistic Sources of Interference in L2 Writing	25
1.3.1.1 Morphology: Morphological Interference	25
1.3.1.2 Syntax: Structural Interference	26
1.3.1.3 Semantics: Semantic Interference	27
1.3.2 Language Interference from a Cultural Perspective.....	28
1.4 Contrastive Analysis and Language Transfer	29
Conclusion	31

Chapter Two: English and Arabic Conjunctions

Introduction.....	34
2.1 Definition of Conjunctions	34
2.2 Types and Functions of Conjunctions.....	35
2.2.1 Types of Conjunctions	35
2.2.2 Functions of Conjunctions	37
2.2.2.1 The Additive Function.....	37
2.2.2.2 The Adversative Function	37

2.2.2.3 Causal Function	38
2.2.2.4 Temporal Function	38
2.3 Multifunctionality of Conjunctions.....	39
2.4 Punctuation and Conjunctions	40
2.5 English and Arabic Rhetoric Tendencies in Relation to Conjunctions Use	41
2.6 Conjunctions as a Language Interference Indicator.....	42
Conclusion	44

Chapter Three: Field Work and Data Analysis

Introduction.....	47
3.1 Methodology	47
3.1.1 Participants	47
3.1.2 Data Collection.....	47
3.1.3 Data Analysis Procedure	48
3.2 Corpus Analysis	49
3.2.1 Frequency of Overall Use of Conjunctions.....	49
3.2.2 Frequency of Types Used.....	50
3.2.3 Frequency of Conjunctions According to Functions.....	52
3.3 Case-by-Case Analysis	53
3.4 Discussion	80
Conclusion	81
General Conclusion.....	82
Limitations of the Study	82

Recommendations	83
References	85
ملخص الدراسة	91

General Introduction

The difficulty of learning a language is often measured by how different it is from a person's native language. It is believed that the more there is difference there is the more difficult it becomes. On a similar note, the theory of native language interference claims that a person's native language can affect the learning experience either positively (positive transfer) or negatively (negative transfer) (Odlin, 1989; Hashim, 1994). For example, if the writing system of the target language is different from that of the learner's, then the learner is expected to face difficulty in regards to writing. If the writing system is similar, then the learner is expected to have an easier time writing in the target language.

In the case of writing, interference is usually present in the form of frequent errors in certain linguistic elements such as punctuation, grammar, and syntax to name a few. Following the same reasoning, the contrastive rhetoric hypothesis claims that each language has writing tendencies that reflect its linguistic culture. In other words, not only the pure linguistic features that may cause interference but also the cultural aspect of it (Kaplan, 1966). Such interference is usually shown in the writing style itself. For example, the Arabic language favours coordinating conjunctions while the English language favours subordinating conjunctions (Kaplan, 1967; Oshima & Houge, 2006). Therefore, for EFL learners to produce compositions that follow the English rhetoric style, awareness of such differences is important.

1. Statement of the Problem

At the University of Mohamed Khider Biskra, students of the English department face issues regarding their writing skill. Generally speaking, when they start their writing course, they often lack the basics of academic writing. Some of the problems that they face are formulating correct sentences, punctuation, grammar and many other issues that can be

attributed to either poor background knowledge of the language or interference from their native language. The course of academic writing/written expression aims to eliminate these issues and improve their writing skill to meet academic standards. In order to explore the possibility of rhetorical transfer being a factor that affects their writing, this paper focuses on how EFL learners at the University of Mohamed Khider Biskra use conjunctions. It investigates whether their Arabic writing style is transferred to their English compositions. If the presence of rhetorical transfer is confirmed, the results of this study may help teachers and learners avoid interference resulting from rhetoric transfer.

2. Aim and Objectives

The aim of this study is to investigate whether rhetoric transfer is present in the writing of second year EFL learners at the English department of the University of Mohamed Khider Biskra. In order to achieve this aim, a set of objectives are set. First, we identify what are the most common types of conjunctions used by Algerian EFL learners in both Arabic and English language writings. Second, we identify what are the most dominant functions of conjunctions used by these learners in both languages. Third, we try to relate the findings and the writing patterns of the learners to the rhetorical tendencies of both Arabic and English.

3. Research Questions

This study aims to answer the following questions:

- 1- What are the most common types of conjunctions used by Algerian EFL learners in both Arabic and English compositions?
- 2- What are the most dominant functions of conjunctions used by EFL learners in both Arabic and English compositions?
- 3- Is there a relation between the rhetorical tendencies of both languages and the learners' writing patterns?

4. Literature Review

“Language Transfer in the Written English of Finnish Students” (2010) is a dissertation written by Lea Meriläinen. In her study, a total of 500 writing samples of Finnish students taken from Finnish national Matriculation Examination in 1990, 2000 and 2005. The study did focus on lexical and syntactic patterns transfer and whether there is any improvement or changes through the selected period. Findings show that the lexical inventory of the students did improve while syntactic structure mastery showed no improvements. These findings indicate that native language interference is more persistent in the case of syntax if L1 and L2 are fundamentally different.

In September 7, 2015, Abu Rass published a study titled “Challenges Face Arab Students in Writing Well-Developed Paragraphs in English” in which she explored how native language interference may affect learners’ writing skill. In this study, writing samples of 205 first year college EFL Palestinian students (mostly females between 19 to 21 years old) were collected in a weekly basis for 14 years. The writing samples were analysed on a paragraph and sentence level using contrastive and error analysis. The study concludes that after employing different kinds of teaching methods, students continue to struggle with providing supporting sentences, getting rid of the Arabic writing style, and that they need more practice regarding conjunctions and transition words.

In a study conducted by Mohamed-Sayidina in her paper titled “Transfer of L1 Cohesive Devices and Transition Words into L2 Academic Texts: The Case of Arab Students” (2010), a clear connection between the Arabic writing style and the English writings of Arabic EFL students was confirmed. This study did focus on the use of conjunctions and transition words in relation to rhetoric compositions to determine whether interference from the native language is reflected. The sample used consisted of 50 English compositions written by students taking the course of Academic English at the American

University of Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates. The researcher noticed that these students opted mostly for additive transitions which is considered a characteristic of the Arabic writing style.

In a paper titled “A Contrastive Rhetorical Analysis of Factual Texts in English and Arabic” (2012), Almehmadi from the University of Um Al-Qura, Saudi Arabia made a comparison of factual texts from both English and Arabic sources in an attempt to confirm the concept of contrastive rhetoric. Through textual analysis of 176 lines from Arabic newspapers and 178 lines from English ones, it was found that both sources show a frequent use of coordinating conjunctions. These findings do show that English and Arabic rhetoric have similarities when it comes to factual texts.

“An Investigation of Interlingual Interference in the use of ‘and’ as a Syntactic Coordinating Structure by Jordanian EFL Learners” (2011) by Al-Khresheh from the University of Malaya in Malaysia did uncover that Jordanian EFL students display a high frequency of errors when it comes to the use of the selected coordinator. In order to reach this conclusion, a total of 120 students provided written samples through a writing test. The researcher suggests that this high frequency of errors may be attributed to native language interference.

“Clausal Connection in the Writing of Arabic-Speaking EFL Learners: Verifying Contrastive Rhetoric Hypotheses” (2019) authored by Drid from Kasdi Merbah University, Algeria: In this study, essays were collected from a set of 52 EFL Master students and then examined to determine whether rhetorical patterns do transfer in the case of Algerian students. The study concluded that rhetoric transfer is not the only culprit for misuse of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. The researcher suggests that core of the problem lies in the teaching approaches being used to develop the students’ writing practices.

In a study in 2014, Hamadouche made a connection between L1 writing rhetorical patterns and L2 writing in the Algerian EFL setting. To reach this conclusion, he examined the compositions of 60 Algerian second year EFL students from the Department of Letters and English at the University of Constantine. The students were asked to write an English composition (L2) then an Arabic one (L1) of the same topic. Through contrastive analysis, the researcher found that the students displayed rhetorical patterns of L1 on their L2 composition despite writing the English one first. These findings indicate towards the possibility that they automatically rely on their L1 rhetoric tendencies to write in L2.

Taking these studies into consideration, our research tries to analyse the writing tendencies of EFL learners in the Algerian context. Precisely, we examine the use of conjunctions in argumentative paragraphs of second year students at the English department of Biskra University with the main aim being investigating whether rhetorical transfer is present or not. Such a sample was selected in order to examine the phenomenon in an early stage in contrast with Drid's research that tackled the issue on later stage (2019).

5. Methodology

This is a corpus-based analysis that falls under the mixed-method umbrella as it resorts to both numerical and qualitative data in its attempt to answer the questions asked.

The target population of this study is Algerian EFL students enrolled at the English department of University of Biskra. In order to draw speculations about the status of rhetoric transfer in this population, 12 second year students were selected as a sample. The reasoning behind this selected sample is that it would be more likely to spot traces in their writing as they are still in the middle of developing their academic writing skills (Hamadouche, 2014).

6. Significance of the Study

Considering that the idea of language interference is thought to be one of the reasons that cause EFL learners to write in an unnatural style, the findings of this study may shed light on the plausibility of this claim. The findings of this study would be of relevance to both teachers and students alike as it would help improve the approach in which writing is taught or learnt in regards to writing tendencies.

7. Delimitations of the Study

Due to time constraints, this study is limited only to the use of conjunctions in the context of second year EFL learners at the English Department of Biskra University. In addition to the qualitative examination of writing patterns, the analysis is focused mostly on intra sentential use of conjunctions. Transitional words and other aspects of writing are referred to in the analysis; however, they are not the focus. Moreover, the sample size is kept to a total of 12 participants to allow detailed examination of the samples within the allotted time.

8. Operational Definitions

Conjunctions: refer to the words and expressions used to connect elements of writing. They connect words, clauses, or sentences. They help achieve cohesion in writing.

Rhetorical Patterns: refer to writing preferences that are attributed to the style and culture of a language.

Rhetorical Transfer: it refers to the instances in which learners transfer the rhetorical patterns of their native language to the language which they are learning. This is often reflected on their writing style.

EFL Writing: refers to any form of writing within the EFL classroom or any writing performed by EFL learners.

9. Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation was split into three chapters and their content is as follows:

The first chapter aims to clarify the concepts of language transfer, interference, and sources of interference in L2 writing. In addition, the concept second language writing is further explained in the sense of definition, purpose and variation. Finally, the contribution of contrastive analysis to this field of study is referred to.

The second chapter focuses on the understanding of conjunctions and their categorisation on the basis of type and function. The tendencies of both English and Arabic were also explored in the context of rhetorical transfer studies.

The third chapter's purpose is to present the methodology of this study in addition to the analysis and the interpretation of findings.

Chapter One: Language Interference in L2 Writing

Introduction

1.1 Language Transfer and Interference

1.1.1 Language Interference

1.1.2 Positive and Negative Transfer

1.2 Second Language (L2) Writing

1.2.1 Definition

1.2.2 Purposes of L2 Writing

1.2.3 L2 Writing Variation

1.2.3.1 Cross-linguistic/cultural Variation

1.2.3.2 Discipline Variation of L2 Writing

1.3 Sources of Language Interference in L2 Writing

1.3.1 Linguistic Sources of Interference in L2 Writing

1.3.1.1 Morphology: Morphological Interference

1.3.1.2 Syntax: Structural Interference

1.3.1.3 Semantics: Semantic Interference

1.3.2 Language Interference from a Cultural Perspective

1.4 Contrastive Analysis and Language Transfer

Conclusion

Introduction

Facing challenges in the process of learning is not uncommon, but the fact that challenges are a natural occurrence is what makes the need to understand and find an explanation to why it happens an important step to find solutions. An example of such challenges, learners may face difficulties in the attempt to write in a language other than their already acquired language/s. In other words, second or foreign language writing is a context in which the learner or the teacher can be challenged. As a result, the need to understand what second language (L2) writing is and its intricacies becomes important to find effective solutions. Understanding the source of the problem enables the researcher to better tackle the issue. Thus, in this chapter, we will explore definitions, concepts, and issues relevant to second language writing such as the purpose of L2 writing, its variations, and the concept of language transfer and interference as a possible source of L2 writing challenges.

1.1 Language Transfer and Interference

Both terms are often discussed together. Thus, we see that it is appropriate to discuss the meaning of both for a better understanding of the phenomenon being studied.

1.1.1 Language Interference

The concept of language interference appears in the field of second and foreign language acquisition. It refers to the phenomenon in which one's native language interferes with the acquisition or the learning of the target language due to the difference between the two. Other terms that often substitute the term interference are crosslinguistic influence or language transfer. While these three terms are related, the latter two usually encompass both the negative and the positive effects of this phenomenon and are broader in their scope (Allard et al., 2011).

1.1.2 Positive and Negative Transfer

Despite the fact that the term transfer is used frequently to describe this phenomenon, there is no definite description that all scholars agree on. (Odlin, 1989). In the context of linguistics, the term of language transfer refers to any kind of influence resulting from the interaction of a person's already established language/s and the language he or she attempts to learn or acquire. The term in itself does not dictate the direction in which such influence occurs or whether such influence is helpful or not to the learning process. This means that one's native language may influence L2 learning/acquisition while that the possibility of L2 influencing L1 is not null (Allard et al., 2011). In other words, it is a neutral term that requires definition in a case-by-case basis in relation to the context in which it is being used.

In 1989, in a book titled *Language Transfer*, Odlin defined language transfer as "...the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired" (p.27). Scholars often divide it into two sides, positive and negative transfer. (Odlin, 1989; Hashim, 1994), and to simplify our definition, we will restrict the direction of transfer to L1 influencing L2. In Odlin's definition, he narrowed the source of influence to the differences and the similarities between the languages. These opposites represent the sources of negative and positive transfer respectively.

As mentioned before, the presence of negative transfer is attributed to the differences between the languages in question. For example, if the syntactic structure of L2 is different than that of L1, like English and Arabic, the probability of the learner displaying errors in the formation of sentences is higher (Al-Khresheh, 2011). This means that, in this case, fundamental differences interfere in the process of language production. Thus, its effects are negative.

On the other hand, positive transfer is attributed to the similarities between the languages. This means that the similarities facilitate the process of learning/acquisition of the aspects concerned. An example of such influence is when the languages have similar vocabulary such as English and Spanish. In 2010, a study was conducted to test young Spanish-English Bilingual children's ability to recognise similar words in reading. The children tested were at the level of kindergarten and first grade. The results showed that children which were exposed to Spanish more than English were able to recognise more words in English (Pérez et al.). This was attributed to the concept of cognates which refers to words that have similar orthography. Having similar vocabulary reduces the time needed to acquire words and therefore less time may be needed to reach the production phase like speaking and writing. Thus, its effects are positive.

1.2 Second Language (L2) Writing

1.2.1 Definition

“Second language writing is a uniquely characterizable specialty area that has ties to but does not completely overlap with the fields of first language writing instruction, second language acquisition, or second language pedagogy” (Kroll, 2003, p.11).

In a historical overview, Matsuda (2003) traces back the rise of this field to the period after the end of the second world war in which the higher education in the United States saw an increase in the number of international students. At the beginning, second language writing was not seen as a point of focus as students were expected to be able to write through transferring their speaking skill to writing, but this view changed as the number of international students increased further and issues started to arise in settings where English composition was required. As a response, in settings where such skill was required, they started giving courses on English composition. The issue was discussed annually by both

composition and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers to find solutions to the issues in question. Eventually, the task was given to ESL teachers which makes it considered, in a sense, a subfield of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL). As a result, the task of teaching second language writing gave birth to various approaches to the acquisition of the writing skill such as the focus on language structures, text functions, creative expression, writing process, content, genres and context (Matsuda, 2003; Hyland, 2003).

1.2.2 Purposes of L2 Writing

Considering that writing is present in various settings such as nonformal, occupational, or academic, the purpose of L2 writing depends on the needs of the user. To elaborate, the informal setting encompasses uses such as dairies, texting and social media (Matsuda & Nouri, 2019), while occupational writing covers functions such as reports and business emails, and finally, academic writing is present in the form of essays, research papers, and dissertations to name a few examples (Leki et al., 2008). While all these are topics of research, the focus of this study is on academic L2 writing.

The need to learn academic L2 writing (dominantly English) rises from the global linguistic circumstances of academia. As a result of globalisation, English stands currently as a Lingua Franca in the academic setting (Mauranen et al, 2010). Such importance is reflected on the popularity of the term English for Academic Purposes (EAP) that originated from the field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (Hyland & Shaw, 2016). In the current state of academia, members of the academic communities are forced to acquire EAP considering that publications are dominantly English. In many instances, scholars are required to publish in international journals as means for survival (Braine, 2005).

Another context in which the English language is widely used is in higher education as seen in the case of Europe (Truchot, 1994). According to Truchot, this spread is attributed to

the dominance of English as the language of scientific and academic publication in addition to the desire of the European universities to accommodate international students. The use of Academic English in this context eliminates the issue of language barriers and facilitates participation in higher education programs.

The importance of learning English is reflected on the number of people that speak it as a second language. In 2022, English sits as the most spoken L2 in the world with approximately one billion speakers out of the total of 1,45 billion English speakers (Ethnologue, 2022).

1.2.3 L2 Writing Variation

Considering that L2 writing occurs on various contexts, it is inevitable that varieties of L2 writing emerge. Such variation could be seen from cross-linguistic, cross-cultural or cross-disciplinary perspectives.

1.2.3.1 Cross-linguistic/cultural Variation

Through numerous attempts to study the phenomenon of language transfer, many scholars (Odlin, 1989; Connor, 1996; Hyland, 2003) noticed that, in some cases, there are distinct differences in the writings of different languages. Such difference is seen in how some language may have writing genres that other languages do not and vice versa. To support this claim, Kachru (1995) did put forward the example of how there is no equivalent of the Indian writing of horoscopes in English or how there is no equivalent of written invitations in the Indian language. In some cases, even if a genre did exist in the compared languages, the content and how the writing process is approached may be different as demonstrated in the comparison between the argumentative genre of English and Indian. In the Indian argumentative genre, writers convey various stances and perspectives, while on the other hand, in the English version, writers eliminate other stances and focus on only one

(Kachru, 1995). This kind of difference and variation is often attributed to the cultural differences of the speaker of each language.

1.2.3.2 Cross-disciplinary Variation of L2 Writing

Another way in which second language writing displays variation is in relation to disciplines. This is an aspect of variation that is tackled on the field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) considering that this field aims to teach language based on the different disciplines of the learners (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). This is reflected in subfields of ESP such as English for Business and Economics, English for Science and Technology, and English for Social Sciences. Considering that the content of these fields is different based on discipline, variation in language use is present. Such variation is present in the form of word choice, structural patterns, and tenses among others. (Taylor, 1995; Jalilifar et al., 2017)

In 1995, Taylor examined the use of tenses in a corpus of 18 research articles. The research articles belonged to the disciplines of English, philosophy, and history. Despite the disciplines being under the same umbrella of humanities, differences were still found. The findings of this study indicated cross-disciplinary variation in use of tenses and consistent tense choice within each discipline. In the field of history, there was a tendency towards the use of the past tense more than other tenses while philosophy showed the tendency to use the present tense and modals more often. On the other hand, higher variation in the use of the simple past and present tenses was noticed in the field of English. This reinforces the notion of cross-disciplinary variation in writing.

In another study, the use of nominalisation in texts of hard and soft sciences was compared (Jalilifar et al., 2017). In order to compare, a set of eight academic textbooks from the fields of Physics and Applied Linguistics were examined. Upon examination, it was noticed that physics writing leaned towards using “a more complex, lexically dense style of writing and package more information into compound nominal phrases by deploying a

pattern where nominals are followed by strings of prepositional phrases in comparison to writers in Applied Linguistics” (Jalilifar et al., 2017, p.01) in addition to more frequent use of classifiers. On the other hand, Applied Linguistics writings employed less modifiers to give their nominals a sense generality.

1.3 Sources of Language Interference in L2 Writing

After numerous studies on language interference, the phenomenon was attributed to many elements that may cause it. Such causes were either of linguistic or cultural nature.

1.3.1 Linguistic Sources of Interference in L2 Writing

When approaching the concept of transfer from a linguistic perspective, the analysis focuses on the fundamentals of the languages themselves. This entails grammar, morphology, syntax, and other elements and all the rules that make each language what it is. In other words, it focuses on the linguistic components on a micro level.

1.3.1.1 Morphology: Morphological Interference

When writing is concerned, before learners are able to build sentences, they are required to have an understanding of word formation rules of the target language. Naturally, this is because not all languages have the same rules. The phenomenon of morphological difference is often the topic of research in the field of morphological typology (Song, 2010). This field of study categorises languages based on their word formation tendencies such as inflection or derivation. The existence of these rules serves as possible source of complications and may interfere with the learning process, but it may also play a role of facilitation in cases of positive transfer.

Keeping in mind that language interference has been linked to differences in language rules, speculating that L1 morphology may interfere with the learner's ability to form words in L2 is not baseless. Following the same reasoning, in 2013, a study tackled the issue of L1 morphological interference on L2 of adult Arab EFL learners in Malaysia (Muftah & Rafik-Galea). In this study, a sample of 240 adult Arab speakers leaning English was tested on the use of the third person singular present tense agreement morpheme (-s). Two methods were used for testing. The first being a multiple-choice test, and the second was through a writing test. The results displayed that these learners find mastering the use of the morpheme challenging as a result of L1 interference. The researchers attributed this challenge to the fact that, in contrast with English, Arabic verbs do not have a specific morphological indicator for the present tense.

1.3.1.2 Syntax: Structural Interference

In the written context, syntax is one of the fundamental aspects of language that learners encounter on the early stages of acquisition of the writing skill. The analysis of syntax focuses on the rules that govern sentences or clauses and the patterns in which they are built. Comparative studies demonstrate that not all languages have the same syntactic structures (Hawkins, 2017). For example, comparisons with a syntactic focus reveal that some languages like English use a sequence of subject-verb-object (SVO) to build basic sentences while languages like Japanese and Korean use a sequence of subject-object-verb (SOV) (Tomlin, 2013). These differences and similarities serve as base for research on language transfer in L2 writing.

A common claim regarding interference in syntax is that the more different the structure of the compared languages are, the more likely that interference is present (Ellis, 1994). Such interference may appear either in structural errors or traces of L1 structures in

sentence building tendencies of the L2 learner. When a learner attempts to acquire an L2 structure that is distinctly different from L1 structures, in the case of failure, the learner either consciously or subconsciously tries to compensate by relying on prior L1 knowledge to guess possible sentence sequences (Odlin, 1989). This serves as a possible explanation for this phenomenon.

On the other hand, some scholars found that interference is present in situations where L1 and L2 have more similarities than differences (Albert & Obler, 1978). It is assumed that the more similar the languages are, the more there is chance for mutual interference to happen (Bhela, 1999). A possible explanation to this type of occurrence is that the learner has a tendency to rely on L1 knowledge based on the assumption that L1 and L2 are equal in terms of structure. Considering that there is reliance on L1 structures, the L2 writing of the learner may reflect L1 patterns. (Bhela, 1999).

Taking both views into consideration, interference does not necessarily occur due to differences alone, but also, it may occur due to similarities as well. This leads back to notion, mentioned at beginning of the chapter, that transfer occurs due to interaction of the languages themselves.

1.3.1.3 Semantics: Semantic Interference

The third component that plays a crucial role when it comes to language production is semantics. Semantics is concerned with the meaning of words or the combination of the words in a sentence as whole (Partee, 1999). This means that for a person to write semantically accepted sentences, they need to have an understanding of semantics of the language in question. Similar to the previous elements, this element adds a possible source for L1 interference.

A hypothesis that attempts to explain how semantic transfer may occur, whether it is negative or positive, puts emphasis on the awareness of the learner (Kellerman, 1977). Specifically, it is speculated that the learner's awareness of how semantically compatible is the target language with the L1 of the learner is what determines the occurrence of transfer and its nature. This means that the learner may rely on L1 semantic knowledge if they consider it close to the language being learnt. A study that portrays the transfer of semantic knowledge is Kellerman's experiment with Dutch EFL learners in 1977. The learners were given a list composed of idioms in English and some Dutch idioms which were literally translated into English. The participants were asked to determine which idioms were correct or acceptable without knowing which idiom were Dutch and which were English. Regardless of proficiency level in L2, the participants showed signs that their perception of compatibility of L1 and L2 played a role in their judgement of the acceptability of the idioms written. These findings may indicate that the closer L1 is to L2 semantically, the more likely that positive transfer occurs, and that the more distance there is, the more likely negative transfer to occur.

1.3.2 Language Interference from a Cultural Perspective

A different perspective that scholars took towards language transfer is culture. Instead of focusing on the intricacies of language rules, they decided to look at the culture behind the languages since language and culture are considered interconnected. The way in which scholars examined this aspect of language was through the examination of how writers from different cultural backgrounds tackled writing. A main focus of this approach was the concept of rhetoric. In other words, they analysed and examined the way in which ideas are organised and presented in writing. Consequently, the theory of contrastive rhetoric gained attention. Scholars like Kaplan (1966) compared and contrasted writing patterns and how they are

connected to the culture of the writer. This type of analysis did compare and contrast L2 writing of non-natives and attempted to find traces of L1 rhetoric patterns.

At the beginning, it was thought that difference in culture would cause interference. It was thought that difference in culture would eventually mean difference in how the individual fundamentally thinks. The reasoning behind it is that if a person's way of thinking is incompatible with the language they are trying to write in, that would result in written products that are considered suboptimal. In Kaplan's initial attempt (1966) to shed light on this phenomenon, he compared the patterns in which learners from different backgrounds such as Arab, Asian, French, Spanish, and Russian wrote. The conclusion he came to was that the patterns in which they wrote mirrored the way these learners think and speculated that this may interfere with achieving mastery of the writing skill.

Though, this hypothesis did not remain unchanged. The belief that rhetorical patterns could be a source of interference due to difference in thinking was replaced by idea that these patterns are no more than writing tendencies learnt from the environment of learner. This means that a learner's cultural background does not necessarily interfere with their writing but rather it gives their writing a different style. While different cultures may wield different rhetorical patterns, that does not mean that the learner is unable to utilise rhetorical patterns of the target language as Kaplan considered it as matter of cultural preference (Kaplan, 1987, as cited in Hyland, 2003).

1.4 Contrastive Analysis and Language Transfer

The phenomenon of language transfer or language interference is tackled using various approaches. One of the commonly used approaches is Contrastive Analysis. In 1980, Carl James defines contrastive analysis as a discipline within the umbrella of applied linguistics

that is not concerned only with pure linguistics, but it also takes into consideration a psychological approach to language as it concerns itself with the notion of L2 learning. According to him, Contrastive analysis is based on the assumption that languages are comparable, but the main goal of it is to produce contrasts rather than comparisons. Which means that the researcher is not concerned with language universals that Chomsky focused on, but rather to focus on the differences between languages and the implications these differences pose on the process of L2 learning.

According to James (1980), the process of Contrastive Analysis (CR) has two phases. First is the descriptive phase in which the researcher has to describe an aspect of the languages in question. This kind of description is of linguistic nature; therefore, it tackles linguistic elements such as morphology, lexis, syntax, and grammar, but that does not exclude the cultural aspect of language. The second phase is the phase of contrasting. In this phase, the researcher extracts the differences from the descriptions generated from the first phase. After these two phases, the researcher attempts to speculate how the findings affect the process of L2 learning.

In 1957, Robert Lado published a book titled “Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers”. In his book, he did talk about the necessity of comparing languages and provided six approaches to how to compare languages. The approaches he listed are how to compare sound systems, grammatical structures, vocabulary systems, writing systems, and how to compare cultures. One of the points that he mentioned when explaining the importance of comparing languages is that learners have a tendency to transfer elements of their native language to the language they are learning. These elements entail “forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture” (Lado, 1957, p.02). Another point that Lado mentioned is the fact that linguistic

research indicates that differences between languages resulted in “distortions” in the linguistic performance of bilinguals (1957). This is a claim that aligns with the principles of contrastive analysis in the sense that it links differences between languages to the phenomenon of interference which in this case was referred to as distortions. His book, as result, was considered as “highly influential manual on contrastive analysis” (Odlin, 1989, p.15).

During the period of the 1950s and 1960s, contrastive analysis was mostly focused on grammar and pronunciation (Odlin, 1989). An example of this trend is Kufner’s book on the grammatical structures of English and German (1962). His book was part of a collection titled *Contrastive Structure Series* and focused on the analysis of structural differences between the two languages with an emphasis on the problems of German syntax. On the other hand, an example of papers written on the topic of pronunciation is Leed’s paper on the differences between Russian and English intonation contours (1965). His paper was focused on the differences and how they may cause misunderstandings between English learners of Russian and native speakers. This trend remained as is until Robert B. Kaplan triggered an interest in the cultural aspect of contrastive analysis through his paper titled “Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-cultural Education”. This paper was marked as the beginning of what is now called Contrastive Rhetoric (Odlin, 1989; Hyland, 2003).

Conclusion

Second language (L2) writing is a topic that piqued the interest of numerous researchers through the decades ever since it became a point a focus after the globalisation of English began (Matsuda, 2012). Different approaches to this field came to light in addition to further classification be it in a linguistic or a cultural perspective. Researchers explored its variation through different languages, cultures, and disciplines while trying to uncover the source of

difficulty of acquiring this skill (Kaplan, 1966; Albert & Obler, 1978; Tomlin, 1986; Odlin, 1989). Eventually, the emergence of the approach of contrastive analysis played a significant role in uncovering some of the underlying mechanisms that contribute to the challenges in teaching and learning L2 writing (Lado, 1957; James, 1980). A concept that sits at the centre of this research is language transfer and interference which we consider as the base of our research. In the next chapter, in addition to other elements of relevance, we will be discussing what conjunctions are, how they are categorised, and how they relate to rhetorical transfer.

Chapter Two: English and Arabic Conjunctions

Introduction

2.1 Definition of Conjunctions

2.2 Types and Functions of Conjunctions

2.2.1 Types of Conjunctions

2.2.2 Functions of Conjunctions

2.2.2.1 The Additive Function

2.2.2.2 The Adversative Function

2.2.2.3 Causal Function

2.2.2.4 Temporal Function

2.3 Multifunctionality of Conjunctions

2.4 Punctuation and Conjunctions

2.5 English and Arabic Rhetoric Tendencies in Relation to Conjunctions Use

2.6 Conjunctions as a Language Interference Indicator

Conclusion

Introduction

In the process of writing, a person is bound to use a variety of linguistic items that serve different roles. The way this process is undertaken differs from language to another (Kaplan, 1966; Hyland, 2003). Thus, the building blocks of writing, and the manner in which they are handled are likely to differ as well. Among such items, conjunctions play the role of connecting words, clauses, or sentences (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Their purpose may sound simple, but it is nuanced. Due to the importance of conjunctions, understanding what they are and how their use differs across languages may help in the task of testing the contrastive rhetoric hypothesis. Thus, in this chapter, we will discuss what conjunctions are, their types and functions, crosslinguistic differences, and how scholars approached the phenomenon under investigation in relevance to both English and Arabic.

2.1 Definition of Conjunctions

Upon checking a dictionary, one finds that the word conjunction stems from the verb “to conjoin” which means to join things together, or in other words, to connect two separate things to form one unit (Merriam, 2022; Oxford, 2022). In linguistics, conjunctions refer to linguistic items that serve the purpose of connecting words, phrases, clauses, or sentences. They serve to clarify the semantic relations between the connected items and reinforce the sense of cohesion in speech and writing (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Conjunctions may indicate to the reader or the listener what relation the connected items have whether it is of additive, adversative, causal, or temporal nature among many other types or subtypes of relations such as the conditional. Conjunctions may also serve as an indicator to the status or nature of the items connected. They indicate whether the items connected are equal or not like in the case of coordination or subordination which translates to whether these items hold

meaning by themselves or whether they require the connection made to maintain their meaning (Haspelmath, 2007).

2.2 Types and Functions of Conjunctions

When it comes to the classification of conjunctions, different approaches can be taken. Usually, they are classified based on structural notions or based on their semantic qualities. However, this does not mean that these are the only ways to classify conjunctions as there is no restrictions on how to classify them (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In other words, scholars have the flexibility to use different criteria for categorisation to better suit their needs. In our work, we decided to rely on the mentioned approaches. For clarity, we will refer to structural categorisation as types of conjunction, while we will refer to semantic categorisation as functions of conjunctions.

2.2.1 Types of Conjunctions

Rather than categorisation according to the semantic notions, they can be categorised based on their structural function within the sentence. Such categorisation is concerned with the how, what type, and the status of words, clauses, or sentences that are connected (Haspelmath, 2007). An example of this is the distinction between dependent and independent clauses. Based on this type of classification, conjunctions can be classified into three (3) main categories: coordinating, subordinating, and correlative conjunctions.

Coordinating conjunctions refer to conjunctions that link between elements that are equal or similar in nature (Haspelmath, 2007). For example, this type of conjunctions can be used link two nouns, two adverbs, two independent clauses, or two sentences. Something that is noted in this category of conjunctions is that the elements linked retain their fundamental meaning even if separated. Meaning that there is no form of dependency between them hence

why clauses linked using them are referred to as independent clauses. In the English language, conjunctions that fall under this category are *for, and, nor, but, or, yet, and so* (Lunsford, 2015). The equivalent of these conjunctions in Arabic would be the nine connectors *waw, fa, thum'ma, hatta, bel, lakin, aw, la, and am'ma* (Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994).

Subordinating conjunctions, on the other hand, are used to link clauses. The difference between them and coordinating conjunctions is that they indicate subordination, or in other words, dependency of a clause to an independent one. In this case, the clauses connected are not equal in status. Such connection makes it so that the dependent clause's meaning is not complete without the meaning of the independent one. Thus, that clause cannot stand by itself. In the English language, conjunctions within this category include *because, till, if, when, while, as, whether*, among many others (Lunsford, 2015). On the other hand, in Arabic, the conjunctions *bisababi, bifathli, haythu an'na, wa, in, baynama, and law* also belong to this category (Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994).

Finally, correlative conjunctions act the same way as coordinating conjunctions in the sense that they connect elements that are equal in status, but the difference is in how this connection is accomplished. Correlative conjunctions come in the form of pairs that are distanced within the sentence instead of the usual pattern of subordination and coordination where the conjunction comes in the form of a singular word or a cluster. To name a few examples, conjunctions that fit this description are *both...and, not only...but also, either...or, and neither...nor* among many others (Lunsford, 2015). In Arabic, *lam...fahasb...bal...kathalek, sawa'a kana...am/aw, la...wa la, im'ma...wa im'ma* (Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994).

2.2.2 Functions of Conjunctions

When it comes to the functions of conjunctions, there is no definite way to categorise them. Categorisation of functions depends on the perspective or which aspect of conjunctions is focused on (Hasan & Halliday, 1976). One of the many categorisations that exist is Hasan and Halliday's simplified approach in their book on cohesion in English in which the functions were classified into four distinct types: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. In addition to these categories, subcategories exist within each category to further detail these functions.

2.2.2.1 The Additive Function

This category's main function is as its name suggests. This category contains conjunctions that serve the purpose of addition. What is considered as addition can be further clarified through subcategories such as simple additive (and, and also), additive negative (nor, nor... and), and alternative (or, or else) (Hasan & Halliday, 1976). Arabic conjunctions that belong to this category include *wa*, *fa*, *la...wa la*, and *im'ma...wa im'ma* to name a few (Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994).

2.2.2.2 The Adversative Function

Adversative conjunctions play the role of connecting ideas that are contrary to what is expected (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). This means that the element that is connected to the initial idea flows against the expectations of either the reader or the writer. Adversative conjunctions can be used to display purely adversative relations, contrastive relations, corrective relations, or dismissive relations. Key conjunctions that accomplish this type of connection are *yet*, *but*, *however*, *though*, *rather*, *anyhow*, *whichever*, and *instead* while in Arabic, *lakin*, *bal*, *in'nama*, *il'la an'na wa*, and *fa* sit within the same category (Hasan & Halliday, 1976; Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994).

2.2.2.3 Causal Function

Causal conjunctions refer to conjunctions that convey notions such as cause and effect, reason, purpose, or conditional relations. This type of conjunctions tells the reader, for example, how an idea, element, occurrence, or event is responsible for the state of another. Conjunctions that fit this description include: *because, since, as, and for* to indicate cause or reason; *so* and *that* for result or consequence; *that, so that, and lest* to indicate purpose; *if* and *unless* to indicate condition (Hasan & Halliday, 1976). The Arabic *haythu, haythu an'na, bihaythu, bisababi, bifathli, li, kay, hat'ta, ith, in, and law* fall under this category (Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994).

2.2.2.4 Temporal Function

On the other hand, temporal conjunctions' use is to convey time relations between the connected ideas. They help to organise ideas based on when they happen or expected to happen. For example, temporal relations can be of sequential, simultaneous, or durative nature. Common English conjunctions that fulfil this function include *before, after, till, since, when, and while* while *kabla, ba'ada, lam yakad...hat'ta, and wa* among many others are Arabic conjunctions that fulfil the category's function (Hasan & Halliday, 1976; Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994).

	External/internal	Internal (unless otherwise specified)		
Additive	Additive, simple: <i>and, and also</i> Negative <i>nor, and . . . not</i> Alternative <i>or, or else</i>	Complex, emphatic: Additive <i>furthermore, in addition, besides</i> Alternative <i>alternatively</i> Complex, de-emphatic: After-thought <i>incidentally, by the way</i>	Apposition: Expository <i>that is, I mean, in other words</i> Exemplificatory <i>for instance, thus</i>	Comparison: Similar <i>likewise, similarly, in the same way</i> Disimilar <i>on the other hand, by contrast</i>
Adversative	Adversative 'proper': Simple <i>yet, though, only</i> Containing 'and' <i>but</i> Emphatic <i>however, nevertheless, despite this</i>	Contrastive: Avowal <i>in fact, actually, as a matter of fact</i> Contrastive (external): Simple <i>but, and</i> Emphatic <i>however, on the other hand, at the same time</i>	Correction: Of meaning <i>instead, rather, on the contrary</i> Of wording <i>at least, rather, I mean</i>	Dismissal: Closed <i>in any case, in either case, whichever way it is</i> Open-ended <i>in any case, anyhow, at any rate, however it is</i>

	External/internal	Internal (unless otherwise specified)		
Causal	Causal, general: Simple <i>so, then, hence, therefore</i> Emphatic <i>consequently, because of this</i> Causal, specific: Reason <i>for this reason, on account of this</i> Result <i>as a result, in consequence</i> Purpose <i>for this purpose, with this in mind</i>	Reversed causal: Simple <i>for, because</i> Causal, specific: Reason <i>it follows, on this basis</i> Result <i>arising out of this</i> Purpose <i>to this end</i>	Conditional (also external): Simple <i>then</i> Emphatic <i>in that case, in such an event, that being so</i> Generalized <i>under the circumstances</i> Reversed polarity <i>otherwise, under other circumstances</i>	Respective: Direct <i>in this respect, in this regard, with reference to this</i> Reversed polarity <i>otherwise, in other respects, aside from this</i>
Temporal	Temporal, simple (external only): Sequential <i>then, next, after that</i> Simultaneous <i>just then, at the same time</i> Preceding <i>previously, before that</i> Conclusive: Simple <i>finally, at last</i> Correlative forms: Sequential <i>first . . . then</i> Conclusive <i>at first . . . in the end</i>	Complex (external only): Immediate <i>at once, thereupon</i> Interrupted <i>soon, after a time</i> Repetitive <i>next time, on another occasion</i> Specific <i>next day, an hour later</i> Durative <i>meanwhile</i> Terminal <i>until then</i> Punctiliar <i>at this moment</i>	Internal temporal: Sequential <i>then, next, secondly</i> Conclusive <i>finally, in conclusion</i> Correlative forms: Sequential <i>first . . . next</i> Conclusive <i>. . . finally</i>	'Here and now': Past <i>up to now, hitherto</i> Present <i>at this point, here</i> Future <i>from now on, henceforward</i> Summary: Summarizing <i>to sum up, in short, briefly</i> Resumptive <i>to resume, to return to the point</i>

Summary Table of Conjunctive Relations (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p.242)

2.3 Multifunctionality of Conjunctions

When observing which conjunctions fall under which semantic category, we notice that some conjunctions are capable of conveying multiple meanings depending on the context in

which they were used. A good example of this phenomenon is present in the Arabic language. The Arabic conjunction *wa* can be used to convey both additive and adversative meanings. Also, the conjunction *fa* is capable of conveying temporal functions such as “immediate succession of actions” while also being able to convey adversative, causal, and conditional notions among others (Al-Warraki & Hassanein, 1994). The concept of multifunctionality of conjunctions is often tackled in translation studies (Emara, 2014; Baker, 2018; Mohammed, 2021). For example, in 2014, a study was conducted to examine the difficulties that translators may face regarding the translation of the conjunction *aw* to English (Emara, 2014). As means of examination, four separate translations of the Quran were used as a sample and noted how the conjunction was used. The findings support the concept of multifunctionality as they found that the conjunction is capable of conveying meanings of “alternative, uncertainty, deliberate ambiguity, division, absolute addition, exception, continuance of an action to a specified time, and nexus question” (Emara, 2014, p.154). This means that the conjunction *aw* is not restricted to its literal translation *or* which conveys alternative addition.

2.4 Punctuation and Conjunctions

Within the context of English writing mechanics, punctuation is given importance as it plays a role in the segmentation of text, indication of clausal/sentence boundaries, listing items, and in some cases, it plays a conjunctive role like the semicolon (Lunsford, 2015). What makes punctuation relevant to our study is that punctuation is highly linked to conjunctions. An example of this would be the presence of the comma before coordinating conjunctions in formal and academic English writing. Such pairing is obligatory as it is considered a rule. A noticeable distinction between English and Arabic is that English uses a highly developed punctuation system in contrast with Arabic. As Arabic introduced

punctuation to its repertoire relatively late, its use of punctuation is less developed (Holes, 1984 as cited in Baker, 2018; alQinai, 2015; Baker, 2018). While Arabic does not use punctuation in the same way as English does, it compensates through the frequent use of conjunctions. As result, it is possible to find sentences that are paragraph long (alQinai, 2015; Baker 2018).

2.5 English and Arabic Rhetoric Tendencies in Relation to Conjunctions Use

In the same manner that languages are different, the use of conjunctions differs from language to another. A key study of relevance is Kaplan's rhetorical analysis of various languages and how learners of differing linguistic backgrounds wrote in English as a second/foreign language (1966). Among other languages, he did examine Arabic writing tendencies, and one of his findings is that Arabic writers frequently use parallel structures. One of the methods of achieving such parallelism is the use of coordinating conjunctions. Considering that another feature of Arabic writing is the frequent use of conjunctions, it is possible that coordinating conjunctions have the potential of dominating the overall written product. In contrast with Arabic, English opts to use subordination as a sign of mature writing. Thus, the expectation is that writers of both languages are more likely to follow the tendencies of their respective language.

In 2012, a study was conducted by Almeahadi to test the rhetorical contrastive hypothesis through the analysis of factual texts written in English and Arabic. As means of investigation, two corpora of factual texts consisting of 176 and 178 lines from Arabic and English were used as a sample. The samples were extracted from newspaper articles that talked about forest fires as a topic. One of the rhetorical features that the analysis focused on was the frequency of use of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions in each language. The findings showed that Arabic, as mentioned before, had frequent use of coordinating

conjunctions in combination with lengthy sentences. On the other hand, the English sample also displayed frequent use of coordinating conjunction in contrast with subordination. Such a result goes against the assumption that English favours subordination. The relevance of this study is that it suggests that rhetorical preferences of languages are not always employed and that it could be dependent on the type of text that is being written.

2.6 Conjunctions as a Language Interference Indicator

What makes conjunctions relevant to the task of examining language transfer or interference is that the manner in which they are used in second language writing can reflect L1 tendencies (Kaplan, 1966; Hamadouche, 2014; Drid, 2019). An example which hints the possibility of using conjunctions as a language transfer indicator is the field of Native Language Identification. This field of study relies on the language transfer theory and uses automated analysis of texts based on stylistic, syntactic, and lexical features and function words being one of the elements included in such analysis (Malmasi & Dras, 2018). Considering that conjunctions are function words, they are taken into consideration when conducting native language identification tasks, but they are not the focus as they are grouped with other words that fulfil different linguistic functions. However, the importance of focusing on conjunctions is more apparent in the results of contrastive analysis studies as this approach allows the researcher to examine linguistic features in a detailed manner. A possible advantage of this approach is that it is more manual than automatic as it relies on the researcher's ability to recognise patterns in human language use.

As mentioned in the first chapter, the concept of contrastive analysis was solidified by Lado in 1957. Numerous studies made use of it to investigate the phenomenon of language transfer. Among all these studies, Robert Kaplan's work which initiated the trend of contrastive rhetoric is of high significance to our study (1966). That is because his reference

to how Arabic uses conjunctions to accomplish parallelism encouraged a number of scholars to test his theory on the mentioned point. As a result, contrastive rhetoric studies with a focus on Arabic conjunctions and whether the language's tendencies transfer to second language writing started to appear (Hamadouche, 2014; Drid, 2019).

In 1985, on the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Derrick-Mescua & Gmuca examined how Arabic, Spanish, and Malay EFL learners construct their sentences and their compositions when writing in English. Through the analysis of these students' papers and essays, the researchers found that Arabic and Spanish students tend to write lengthy sentences that consist of a series of independent clauses. These clauses were often linked with either commas, coordinating conjunctions, or both. Something to note is that these findings reflect what these students considered as proper cohesion. In contrast with Arabic and Spanish learners, Malay students opted to use shorter and separate sentences as means of cohesion. These findings align with the hypothesis of rhetorical transfer.

In 2014, the Algerian scholar Hamadouche conducted a rhetorical contrastive study on the use of connectives in the case of Algerian second year university EFL students from the University of Constantine. In this sense, connectives refer to the use of conjunctions whether within a sentence or between sentences. Following the same reasoning of previous studies, among other features, he tested the hypothesis of whether these students would overuse coordinating conjunctions instead of opting to use subordination when writing in English. For this purpose, he analysed a corpus of 120 essays which half of them was written in English while the other half was written in Arabic. The essays in question tackled a general topic as the writing prompt was to write about how they spend their leisure time. The findings align with the previously mentioned rhetorical tendencies of Arabic when using conjunctions. In other words, there was dominance of coordination. In addition to that, he noticed that some students overused the coordinator *and*. For example, in some cases, students combined *and*

with other conjunctions where it is inappropriate (e.g., and because, and but). Also, in some instances, they would start their sentences with the coordinator. Such features are frequently encountered in Arabic writing.

On the other hand, in 2019, Drid conducted a similar study but focused on the genre of argumentative essays. She examined the essays of master level Algerian EFL learners at Kasdi Merbah University. Fifty-two participants majoring in English were asked to write two argumentative essays which in total generated a corpus of 104 essays. The findings of her research did not hint towards rhetorical transfer in the same manner that Hamadouche's research did (2014). She found that the participants did not overuse coordination. Though, she mentions that "subordination is found to be excessive, missing or ill-structured", "coordinating conjunctions' use is distorted or not accompanied with a balanced clause structure", and that sentences "are relatively so packed with phrasal components that content is difficult to track and comprehend" which she classifies as rhetorical issues (Drid, 2019, p.32). She speculates that these results are influenced by the fact that the sample is of students that are relatively advanced level (university master level); whereas, rhetorical transfer is more likely to occur in the writings of students at a lower proficiency level. Such a statement can be supported by Hamadouche's findings considering that he used second year university students as a sample for the reason that rhetorical transfer is more noticeable at early stages (2014).

Conclusion

The collection of knowledge accumulated through numerous studies done by scholars of various linguistic backgrounds in differing contexts demonstrates how nuanced conjunctions are (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Haspelmath, 2007). In the current state of English and Arabic, the importance of conjunctions is undeniable. Though, scholars are yet to reach a

clear answer to how, why, and whether language transfer occurs in second language writing. Some scholars find clear differences and transfer between the two (Derrick-Mescua & Gmuca, 1985; Hamadouche, 2014), while others find results that indicate otherwise (Almehmadi, 2012; Drid, 2019). Hence, further research is required in attempt to understand the nature of this phenomenon. The following chapter will tackle the practical part of this study. That includes the methodology, the analysis of collected data, discussion of findings and the attempt to answer the raised questions.

Chapter Three: Field Work and Data Analysis

Introduction

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Participants

3.1.2 Data Collection

3.1.3 Data Analysis Procedure

3.2 Corpus Analysis

3.2.1 Frequency of Overall Use of Conjunctions

3.2.2 Frequency of Types Used

3.2.3 Frequency of Conjunctions According to Functions

3.3 Case-by-Case Analysis

3.4 Discussion

Conclusion

General Conclusion

Limitations of the Study

Recommendations

References

Résumé

Introduction

After the exploration of the concepts of language transfer, writing variation, and the categorisation of conjunction among other important notions related to this study, this chapter tackles the practical part of it. Thus, this chapter will deal with data analysis, interpretation, and discussion of the findings.

3.1 Methodology

This a corpus-based study that follows a mixed-method approach with a case study design. The essential elements of the methodology of our study are as follows:

3.1.1 Participants

As means of exploring the possibility of the presence of rhetorical transfer, second year students from the department of English at University of Biskra were selected as the main population for our study. The selection of this population is due to the reason that language transfer is more likely to be noticed at the early stages of language learning (Hamadouche, 2014). Students at this stage are also expected to be familiar with the production of paragraphs; therefore, the collected samples would allow us to examine their writing tendencies in a format that is more likely to reflect their reasoning. A total of 12 participants were picked in a random manner from various groups in an attempt to avoid selection bias. Their English proficiency or academic grades were not taken into consideration to keep the sample as random as possible.

3.1.2 Data Collection

When it comes to the collection of samples, the participants were asked to write two paragraphs. The samples were collected during the second half of their second semester.

They were asked to write a paragraph in English then followed by another one in Arabic. That is to avoid direct translation from their L1 (Arabic). In regards to the content of the samples, the topic which they wrote about was argumentative in nature considering that the writing prompt they received reads as follows: “Are you with or against distance learning? Write a paragraph of a minimum of 10 lines to clarify your stance”. Even though a minimum number of lines was specified, it serves only as means to encourage the participants to write paragraphs of practical length for analysis. If a paragraph was too short, it would be relatively difficult to observe patterns of writing. The outcome of data collections was two sub-corpora consisting of twelve (12) paragraphs each. The English corpus was a sum of 152 lines while the Arabic corpus was a sum of 139.5 lines.

3.1.3 Data Analysis Procedure

In regards to data analysis, two perspectives were taken into consideration. Initial analysis was on the basis of frequencies and ratios then followed by analysis from a qualitative perspective.

This first phase of data analysis was the identification of conjunctions within sentences. After the identification, they were categorised based on types (coordination, subordination, and correlation) and functions (additive, causal, adversative, and temporal) then translated into rates and frequencies. The results of codification were seen from the perspective of the overall corpus then from a case-by-case perspective for further detailed examination.

The second phase has a qualitative approach as it focused on the writing patterns of each participant. The samples written were analysed in order to compare and contrast how the participants wrote and whether there were any signs of rhetorical transfer in regards to the use

of conjunctions within sentences. In addition to that, other aspects of writing were taken into consideration such as sentence length, the use of transitional words, and punctuation.

3.2 Corpus Analysis

The corpus analysis approaches the sum of samples as a whole and examines them from a mostly quantitative perspective.

3.2.1 Frequency of Overall Use of Conjunctions

Table 01

Frequency of Conjunctions use in Both Sub-corpora

Case Number	Conjunctions Sum (EN)	Lines (EN)	CPL (EN)	Conjunctions Sum (AR)	Lines (AR)	CPL (AR)	CPL Difference (%)
1	15	17	0.88	14	9	1.56	55.2%
2	4	13	0.31	9	12	0.75	83.6%
3	6	13	0.46	13	13	1.00	73.7%
4	9	14	0.64	11	14	0.79	20.0%
5	7	13	0.54	12	13	0.92	52.6%
6	3	9	0.33	17	14	1.21	113.8%
7	6	10	0.60	6	10	0.60	0.0%
8	4	14	0.29	6	13	0.46	47.1%
9	6	9	0.67	6	9	0.67	0.0%
10	15	14	1.07	14	10	1.40	26.6%
11	5	11	0.45	7	9.5	0.74	47.4%
12	9	15	0.60	15	13	1.15	63.2%
Total	89	152	-	130	139.5	-	-
Average	-	-	0.59	-	-	0.93	48.6%

The frequency of conjunctions used was noticeably different between the languages. In Arabic, a total of 130 conjunctions was used in the span of 139.5 lines giving us an average of 0.93 conjunctions-per-line (CPL). On the other hand, the English corpus had a total of 89 conjunctions used in the span of 152 lines giving us an average of 0.59 conjunctions per line. This difference translates to an approximate increase of 48.6% in conjunctions use in the Arabic corpus despite the fact that the English one contains more lines. This aligns with the rhetorical preferences of both languages. (Baker, 2018)

3.2.2 Frequency of Types Used

When analysing the samples in regards to the type of conjunctions used, it is noticeable that the participants opted to use coordinating conjunctions more often than subordination or correlation. This tendency seems to be consistent for compositions of both languages as the percentage of use of coordination was 69.23% for Arabic and 67.42% for English of the overall conjunctions used. The second most used type of conjunctions is subordination. This is also consistent between the two sub-corpora with a percentage of 29.23% and 31.46% respectively. In comparison to both types, correlative conjunctions were rarely used as correlation appeared only twice in Arabic (1.54%) while it appeared only once in the English corpus (1.12%).

Table 02

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions used in the English Compositions

Case (EN)	Coordination	Subordination	Correlation	Conjunctions per case
1	6	8	1	15
2	4	0	0	4
3	6	0	0	6
4	5	4	0	9
5	5	2	0	7

6	2	1	0	3
7	3	3	0	6
8	3	1	0	4
9	4	2	0	6
10	12	3	0	15
11	4	1	0	5
12	6	3	0	9
Total	60	28	1	89
Percentage	67.42%	31.46%	1.12%	100.00%

Table 03

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions used in the Arabic Compositions

Case (AR)	Coordination	Subordination	Correlation	Conjunctions per case
1	9	5	0	14
2	8	1	0	9
3	8	5	0	13
4	8	3	0	11
5	9	2	1	12
6	13	3	1	17
7	3	3	0	6
8	5	1	0	6
9	5	1	0	6
10	9	5	0	14
11	5	2	0	7
12	8	7	0	15
Total	90	38	2	130
Percentage	69.23%	29.23%	1.54%	100.00%

3.2.3 Frequency of Conjunctions According to Functions

The sum of the conjunctions found in the two sets of writing were also analysed based on the semantic functions they fulfilled within the texts. The results show that both sub-corpora follow a similar pattern. In the Arabic corpus, the additive function dominates (63.08%) then followed by causal conjunctions (27.69%). The adversative and temporal functions were rarely used in comparison as they sit at 6.15% and 3.08% respectively. As for the English corpus, even though it followed the same pattern, noticeable difference was found. The additive function saw a decrease of 5.77% (57.30%) while the causal function saw an increase of 7.14% (34.83%). The frequency of use of adversative and temporal functions remained around the same level as in Arabic at a percentage of 5.62% and 2.25% respectively.

Table 04

Frequency of the Functions of Conjunctions Used in the English Compositions

Case (EN)	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal
1	8	6	0	1
2	2	1	1	0
3	5	1	0	0
4	3	6	0	0
5	4	2	1	0
6	1	2	0	0
7	3	2	1	0
8	3	1	0	0
9	4	2	0	0
10	10	5	0	0
11	2	1	1	1
12	6	2	1	0
Total	51	31	5	2
Percentage	57.30%	34.83%	5.62%	2.25%

Table 05*Frequency of the Functions of Conjunctions Used in the Arabic Compositions*

Case (AR)	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal
1	9	3	1	1
2	6	2	1	0
3	8	4	0	1
4	7	4	0	0
5	8	2	2	0
6	11	5	0	1
7	3	2	1	0
8	5	1	0	0
9	5	1	0	0
10	9	4	1	0
11	4	1	1	1
12	7	7	1	0
Total	82	36	8	4
Percentage	63.08%	27.69%	6.15%	3.08%

3.3 Case-by-Case Analysis

When it comes to a case-by-case analysis, we notice different patterns in the participants' tendencies.

Case 01

In the first case, the English paragraph consists of 17 lines while the Arabic one consists only of 9 lines, yet in regards to the frequency of conjunctions used, we find that the participant had a higher conjunction-per-line (CPL) rate when writing in Arabic. In the Arabic sample, the participant had a rate of 1.56 conjunctions per line; however, when writing in English, they had a rate of 0.88 conjunctions per line. This translates to a

difference of 55.2%. We notice that when they were writing in English, transitional words were used in locations where conjunctions could have been used if it was written in Arabic, but even if they were replaced by conjunctions, the conjunction-per-line rate would remain lower than that of the Arabic composition.

In regards to the type of conjunctions used, we noticed that subordination (53.33%) is slightly more frequent than coordination (40%) while correlation remains low (6.67%) in the English sample. On the other hand, coordination was significantly dominant in the Arabic composition (64.29%). Subordination was second in frequency at a percentage of 35.71% while correlation was not used at all.

Table 06

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 01

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	6 (40%)	8 (53.33%)	1 (6.67%)
Arabic	9 (64.29%)	5 (35.71%)	0

Although the subordination was slightly higher than coordination in the English sample, the way coordination was used was similar to that of Arabic. The participant used coordination to create parallel structures both at a word and clause levels.

Examples:

- “Secondly, not everyone is comfortable with showing themselves or their homes/rooms...”
- “...some of them don’t even have them or they have really loud and noisy families.”
- كما أن أغلبية الطلبة ليسو مرتاحين باظهار منزلهم او غرفهم لان ليس لهم غرف ملائمة النظرة العامة ”
المجتمعية او أن عائلاتهم مزعجة.

Another thing that we notice is that in some cases where a subordinative conjunction would have been suitable, a coordinative one was used instead.

Example:

- “Third, students in a normal setting are already lazy and they rely on the teacher to get all the info...” (*because* would have been more suitable instead of *and*)

When it comes to the functions of the conjunctions employed, difference in frequency is present. The English composition has a frequency of 53.33% for addition, 40% for causal conjunctions, and 6.67% for temporal conjunctions while adversative conjunctions were not present. On the other hand, the Arabic composition was dominantly additive (64.29%). The causal function was also present but at a relatively lower rate (21.43%) while the adversative and temporal functions both had a rate of 7.14%. The higher rate of additive functions was also the result of the participant’s attempt to achieve parallelism as shown in the examples shown above.

Table 7

Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 01

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	8 (53.33%)	6 (40%)	0	1 (6.67%)	15
Arabic	9 (64.29%)	3 (21.43%)	1 (7.14%)	1 (7.14%)	14

When it comes to rhetorical tendencies, we notice that the participant writes long sentences through connecting the clauses using a balanced variation of coordination and subordination. Short sentences were not used, and sentence length was similar to that when they wrote in Arabic which may indicate a transfer of patterns.

Another element that was noticed is the use of the expression “and if”. This expression was present both in the Arabic and English compositions. This type of expression is often attributed to Arabic’s tendency to overuse the additive *wa*. (Hamadouche, 2014)

Example:

- “First, in our country not everyone has the electronics needed for learning be it phones, computers or tablets, and if available the network connection is really bad.”

- "...او الهاتف الذكي او اللوح الالكتروني، و إن توفرت، فإن الانترنت بلدنا..."

Case 02

For this case, both paragraphs had similar lines count (13 for English and 12 for Arabic); however, noticeable difference is found when it comes to the conjunctions-per-line (CPL) rate. The participant had a rate of 0.31 CPL when writing in English while they had a rate of 0.75 CPL when writing in Arabic. This gives us a difference of 83.6%. The relatively low use of conjunctions in the English sample can be attributed to the fact that the student used transitional words in combination with short sentences which is a characteristic of English writing (Bake, 2018). This pattern is relevant due to the fact that the participant used mainly long sentences when writing in Arabic as sentences were connected through conjunctions and commas instead of using full stops.

When it comes to the types of conjunctions used, both compositions opted to use coordination instead of subordination. This preference is shown through the fact that the English sample used only coordination (100%) while in the Arabic one only one instance of subordination was found (11.11%). Dominance of coordination could be due to rhetorical transfer.

Similar to the previous participant, this participant also opts to use coordination as means of creating parallels structures even in situations where a subordination would have been suitable as seen in the following example:

- “It’s easy for students to cheat on online exams and they easily pass their courses” instead of “Students easily pass their courses because it’s easy for them to cheat on online exams.”

Table 8

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 02

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	4 (100%)	0	0
Arabic	8 (88.89%)	2 (16.67%)	2 (16.67%)

On the other hand, the semantic functions present in the English composition show relative balance. The additive function appeared twice while the adversative and causal functions each appeared once; however, the Arabic composition showed dominance of the additive function. 66.67% of the conjunctions used were additive in nature, then followed by the causal and adversative functions at 22.22% and 11.11% respectively.

Table 9

Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 02

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0	4
Arabic	6 (66.67%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	0	9

Although the participant used short sentences when writing in English, an instance of lengthy sentences can be found at the end of their composition as seen in the following example:

- “Many people might say that students have the chance to study in their own time and boost the level of self motivation, but I believe that the disadvantages are much more stronger than the benefits.”

The use of coordination to connect the parts of this sentence is also considered to be a characteristic of Arabic writing.

Case 03

The third case had equal lines count for both compositions (13), but similarly to the previous two cases, a clear difference in the conjunctions-per-line rate was found. The English composition had a rate of 0.46 CPL while the Arabic one had a rate of 1 CPL. This translates to a decrease of 73.7% when writing in English. This could be attributed to the use of short sentences with no connectors in addition to the occasional use of transitional words.

When it comes to the type of conjunctions used, the English composition used only coordination (100%) in contrast with the Arabic one where coordination was dominant (61.54%) yet subordination (38.46%) was also present. This goes against the rhetorical tendencies of the languages to some extent considering that English favours subordination while Arabic favours coordination which means that transfer from Arabic to English is present.

Table 10*Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 03*

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	6 (100%)	0	0
Arabic	8 (61.54%)	5 (38.46%)	0

In regards to the functions of the conjunctions, we find that both compositions followed a similar pattern. Both compositions were dominantly additive (EN:83.33%, AR:61.54%). Causal conjunctions had relatively higher occurrence rate in the Arabic sample (30.77%) while it was minimal in the English one (16.67%). As for the other functions, only one instance is found as the temporal function appeared once in the Arabic sample (7.69%). This pattern may indicate rhetorical transfer towards English.

In the English composition, most instances of coordination were used to create parallels at the level of words instead of clauses. This can be seen in the following examples:

- "...there is no time wasted waiting for a bus or train, also there is no money wasted on buying food or tickets for the bus."
- "...Distance learning is a very comfortable and flexible kind of learning where you save money and time."

Table 11*Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 03*

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	5 (83.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0	0	6
Arabic	8 (61.54%)	4 (30.77%)	0	1 (7.69%)	13

Even though the participant used short sentences, instances of long sentences still appear. These lengthy sentences seem to be accompanied with improper use of punctuation.

Example:

- “Shy people for example it may seems hard to them, to socialize make friends, ask question, so using distance learning will provide them with a comfortable environment where they can be creative and learning new ideas to the field.”

Case 04

Similar to the previous participant, the compositions of this participant have an equal lines count (14 lines); however, a key difference is that the CPL rate of both compositions is relatively close in comparison. The Arabic composition had a CPL rate of 0.79 while the English composition had a CPL rate of 0.64. This translates to a relatively low difference of 20% in regards to the frequency of conjunctions use.

Although the English and Arabic compositions of this participant had similar lines count and frequency of conjunctions, differences start to appear when analysing them on the basis of type of conjunctions used. This can be seen in how the Arabic composition was dominantly coordinative (72.73%) with a few instances of subordination (27.27%) while the English composition had a relatively balanced use of coordination (55.56%) and subordination (44.44%).

Table 12

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 04

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	5 (55.56%)	4 (44.44%)	0
Arabic	8 (72.73%)	3 (27.2%)	0

The functions of the conjunctions used by this participant seem to follow a similar pattern of difference. Such difference is reflected on the fact that the Arabic composition was mostly additive in nature (63.64%) while the rest consisted of causal conjunctions (36.36%). On the other hand, the English composition used mostly causal conjunctions (66.67%) in addition to some additive conjunctions (33.33%). This behaviour aligns with the rhetoric expectations of both languages.

Considering that the conjunctions used in the English composition were mostly causal in nature, the construction of parallels was still present through the use of additive coordinative conjunctions as seen in the following examples:

- "...so that resulted to us not understanding any thing at all, and failing classes as well"
- "I hope we don't have to deal with online school or distance anymore..."

Although the causal conjunctions were executed in an improper manner, they were still used for their intended purpose of providing arguments.

Example:

- "I'm 100% against distance learning because it's not convinient at all. It's only because online school was only introduced to our educational system during a short period, and because it's a new thing"

Table 13

Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 04

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	3 (33.33%)	6 (66.67%)	0	0	9
Arabic	7 (63.64%)	4 (36.36%)	0	0	11

A reoccurring pattern is the presence of lengthy sentences as seen in the following example:

- “It’s only because online school was only introduced to our educational system during a short period, and because it’s a new thing, moreover, we were forced to adapt to it quickly, so the professors didn’t know how to manage it, so that resulted to us not understanding any thing to it at all, and failing classes as well”

We notice in this example that the participant opted to write a lengthy sentence through the use of coordination in addition to two subordinators. Also, it was possible for the participant to split the sentence at the transitional word “moreover”, yet they opted to put a comma instead of a full stop.

Another element that could be of relevance is the use the combination “and because”. This combination is similar to the combination found in Case 1 which means that it can be attributed to Arabic writing tendencies. Though, in contrast with the first case, this instance appeared only in the English composition which makes it more likely that it is an indicator of rhetorical transfer.

Case 05

The fifth case also had equal lines count. Both compositions consisted of 13 lines, but difference is found in regards to conjunctions count. The Arabic composition had a CPL rate of 0.92 while the English composition had a CPL rate of 0.54. This translates to a difference of 52.6% in frequency. This difference is partially due to the use of transitional words; however, even if they are replaced with conjunctions, the CPL rate would remain lower than that of Arabic. This aligns with the rhetorical expectations of the languages.

On the other hand, both compositions follow a similar pattern when it comes to the type of conjunctions used. They were both dominantly coordinative (EN: 71.43%, AR:

75.00%). Subordination was second in rank (EN: 28.57%, AR: 16.67%) while correlation was present once in the Arabic composition (8.33%). This is possibly due to rhetorical influence from Arabic.

Table 14

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 05

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	5 (71.43%)	2 (28.57%)	0
Arabic	9 (75%)	2 (16.67%)	1 (8.33)

The assumption of the presence of rhetorical transfer in this sample is also reinforced through the frequency of functions of conjunctions used. Both compositions were mostly additive in nature (EN: 57.14%, AR: 66.67%). With exception of the lack of temporal conjunctions, both causal (EN: 28.57%, AR:16.67%) and adversative (EN:14.29%, AR:16.67%) conjunctions were relatively balanced in frequency.

Table 15

Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 05

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	4	2	1	0	7
Arabic	8	2	2	0	12

From the instances in which the participant used coordination, we find that this participant also uses them to create parallels in the English composition as well as in the Arabic one. This can be seen in the following examples:

- "...if I have trouble with assignments, or questions about any lecture I will face problem..."

- "...not all the Student have a reliable source of electricity or don't have reliable internet..."

- "...ليس كل الطلاب يحوزونهم حاسوب او على اتصال دائم شبكة الإنترنت..."

Lengthy sentences are also present in this participant's writing. When taking punctuation into account, their English composition consists of only 2 sentences considering that only two full stops were present.

Example:

- "There are unfortunately some disadvantages of distance learning, for instance for many people not having a classroom it is difficult to Them to stay motivated in The other hand if I have trouble with assignments, or questions about any lecture I will face problem to How can I understand it even I contact my instructor bay email but The clear image stille not enough clear."

Something that also could be of relevance is the fact the second sentence begins with the coordinator "and". This is considered to be a characteristic of Arabic writing.

Example:

- "... and The most important Thing That not all The students have a reliable source of electricity or don't have reliable internet it can be difficult to always get to a friend's house, a café, a library or somewhere else where internet access is readily available."

Case 06

The count of lines of this case is unequal as the English composition consists of only 9 lines while the Arabic one consists of 14 lines. Another notable difference is the CPL rate between the two. The Arabic sample had a CPL rate of 1.21 (17 conjunctions used within 14 lines) while the English one had only a CPL rate of 0.33 (3 conjunctions used within 9 lines). This translates to a difference of 113.8%. Although, the hand writing of the participant is less

dense than when they are writing in Arabic which may also cause a decrease in the CPL rate to some degree.

Due to the low count of conjunctions in the English composition, although it is slightly leaning towards coordination, it is relatively balanced in terms of conjunction types (coordination: 2, Subordination: 1) aside from the lack of correlation. On the other hand, the Arabic composition was dominantly coordinative (76.47%) while subordination and correlation were minimal in comparison (17.65% and 5.88% respectively). It is possible to say that the Arabic composition conforms to the rhetorical tendency of excessive coordination while the English composition appears to differ.

Table 16

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 06

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	2 (66.67%)	1 (33.33%)	0
Arabic	13 (76.47%)	3 (17.65%)	1 (5.88%)

When it comes to the functions of conjunctions, we notice that the English composition also differs slightly as the count of causal conjunctions was slightly higher than the additive (causal:2, additive:1); whereas, the Arabic composition was mostly additive (76.47%). The causal function was also present (29.41%) in addition to an instance of temporal conjunctions (5.88%). Due to the low count of conjunctions in the English composition, we are unable to infer whether interference is present.

Table 17*Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 06*

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	1 (33.33%)	2 (66.67%)	0	0	3
Arabic	11 (64.71%)	5 (29.41%)	0	1 (5.88%)	17

An instance of parallel structures was present in the English composition while the Arabic one had frequent instance of it. This can be seen in the following examples:

- “...we noteced the meeting in Google meet frequently paused during online lecture, made by professors in this department, and I notice many student have not brought their lectures from moodle during official session”

- "...مما يعيقنا على فهم الدروس او حتى طرح بعض الأسئلة على الأساتذة..."

- "...مازال الطلبة يشكون من طريقة الولوج و عدد كبير منا لا يحضر الدرس للقسم..."

Something to note about this participant is the fact that their English composition consisted of only one continuous sentence. Its parts were connected through the use commas and conjunctions.

Example:

- “Distance learning is hard to achieve in Algerian universities simply because the net is not working well, that’s why we noteced the meeting in Google meet frequently paused during online lecture, made by professors in this department, and I notice many student have not brought their lectures from moodle during official session, in addition to that bad marks were ..., so distance learning needs more effort to achieve best way of learning”

Case 07

The seventh case consisted of 10 lines for each composition. Something that we notice about this case is that the participant used an equal number of conjunctions (6 conjunctions each) for both compositions. As a result, both had a CPL rate of 0.6. This means that in regards to frequency of conjunctions, there is no difference to be noted.

In the same manner that the lines count and conjunctions frequency were equal for both English and Arabic, we notice that the type of conjunctions used was also identical between the two. Both compositions used 50% coordination and 50% subordination while no instance of correlation was found.

Table 18*Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 07*

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0
Arabic	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0

When it comes to the functions of the conjunctions used, we also notice an identical pattern. The additive function was highest in rate (50.00%) then followed by the causal function (33.33%) in addition to an instance of the adversative function (16.67%). This pattern leans toward the rhetorical tendencies of Arabic to some degree.

In the English composition of this participant, we notice that both proper and improper punctuation is present; however, no improper use of punctuation-conjunction pairings was found. Moreover, only an instance of parallel constructions was found.

Example:

- “..., he may have a big family his siblings sharing his room and stuff or parents asking him to go buy something for the house.”

Also, an unusual pattern in the Arabic composition was found. When writing a list of items, the participant opted to use commas instead of repeating the conjunction before each item. This pattern reflects English writing conventions instead of following Arabic rules.

Example:

"بسبب الأشياء في ملكهم كالهاتف لوحة إلكترونية، حاسوب، الإنترنت او جهاز ألعاب..." -

Table 19

Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 07

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	3 (50%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0	6
Arabic	3 (50%)	2 (33.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0	6

The identity of patterns in this participant's writing is possibly due to translation; however, the translation was from English to Arabic. This assumption is due to the fact that the way the participant wrote in Arabic reflected English writing conventions. They used transitional words and employed punctuation in the same manner in which it is employed in English writing. In addition to that, the structure of their sentences mirrored that of English.

This could be an indicator that English writing conventions influenced how this student wrote in both languages. In other words, this may indicate that rhetorical transfer was that of English influencing their Arabic instead of the other way around.

Though, signs of Arabic writing style were still present in form of lengthy sentences. Their use of conjunctions and the comma to construct a long sentence can be observed in the following example:

- "Second, the situation the student may not be at ease in his house to study due to many facts, he may have a big family his siblings sharing his room and stuff or parents asking him to go buy something for the house."

Case 08

The compositions the eighth participant wrote have relatively similar length (EN:14, AR:13); however, the number of conjunctions used differs to some extent (EN:4, AR:6). The Arabic composition had a CPL rate of 0.46 while the English one had a CPL rate of 0.29. This translates to a difference of 47.1%, but it is important to keep in mind the overall low count of conjunctions. This is mostly due to the relatively frequent use of transitional words and short sentences.

When it comes to the type of conjunctions used, we find that both compositions follow a similar pattern. The participant opted to use coordinative conjunctions (AR:83.33%, EN: 75.00%) more often than the other types. Minimal use of subordination can also be found as there was only one instance in each language (AR:16.67%, EN:25.00%) while correlation was not present. This pattern leans toward the tendencies of Arabic writing.

Table 20*Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 08*

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0
Arabic	5 (83.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0

Rates of functions used also followed the same pattern as conjunction types. Both compositions were dominantly additive in nature (AR:83.33%, EN:75.00%) while adding only one instance of the causal function in each language (AR:16.67%, EN:25.00%). This pattern also follows Arabic writing tendencies.

Table 21*Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 08*

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0	0	4
Arabic	5 (83.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0	0	6

The use of parallel structures was present in the English composition of this participant. This can be seen in the following examples:

- “Furthermore, online learning take the student away from pressure and time shortage.”
- “Moreover, e learning save both time and money.”

Something that is worth taking note of when it comes to this case is the fact that the hints of rhetorical transfer were not only those of Arabic affecting English writing. Hints of rhetorical transfer from English to Arabic were also present considering that the participant used short sentences in addition to the frequent use of transitional words. The way in which they were used mirrors English writing mechanics to some extent. Thus, the number of conjunctions used in Arabic was lowered.

Examples:

- "...، أولاً، "... علاوة على ذلك، "... من ناحية اخرى، "... في نفس الوقت، "... للتأخير"
- “awalan,...”, “wa ilawatan ala thalik, ...”, “min nahiyatin okhra,...”, “wa fii nafsi alwakt, ...”, and “littalkhis,...” which translates to “ First, ...”, “In addition to that, ...”, “On the other hand, ...”, “At the same time,...”, and “To sum up,...”.

Case 09

The ninth case has relatively equal lines count for both Arabic and English (both 9 lines). Similar to the seventh case, this case has an equal conjunctions count. Both compositions had total of 6 conjunctions each which translates to a CPL rate 0.67; therefore, there is no difference to be noted in regards to frequency of conjunctions.

Although the CPL rate was the same for both compositions, we notice a slight difference in regards to the type of conjunctions used. In both compositions, the participant was more inclined towards the use of coordination; however, the rate of coordination in the Arabic sample (83.33%) was slightly higher than that of English (66.67%). This difference is due to fact that subordination was slightly higher in the English sample (33.33%) in comparison to Arabic (16.67%). Even though there is slight difference between the two, both of them lean towards Arabic writing tendencies (favouring coordination).

Table 22

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 09

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	4 (66.67)	2 (33.33%)	0
Arabic	5 (83.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0

This pattern is also followed in regards to the functions used. Both compositions were mostly additive in nature; however, the Arabic composition was relatively more additive (83.33%) in comparison to the English one (66.67%). This difference is due to the fact that the English composition employed the causal function (33.33%) more than the Arabic one did (16.67%). A higher rate of additive conjunctions is also considered to be an Arabic writing tendency.

Table 23*Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 09*

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	4 (66.67%)	2 (33.33%)	0	0	6
Arabic	5 (83.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0	0	6

Similar to previous participants, we notice that this participant used lengthy sentences. This is partially due to improper use of punctuation in combination with the use of conjunctions instead of splitting them into shorter sentences.

Example:

- “because of epidemic in our time most of the teachers and professors choose to work with distance learning, and in my opinion it is not effective way to work with, it in Algeria. because of the lack of possibilities and technology in the majority of students and this will be an obstacle for our students add to that the net in our country is slow-motion.”

As far as parallel structures are concerned, the instances found were at words level such as “...most of the teachers and professors choose to work...” and “...the lack of possibilities and technology...”.

Case 10

In this case of this participant, the line count of their compositions differs. The Arabic one had a lone count of 10 lines while the English one had 15 lines. As for the frequency of conjunctions, the CPL rate of Arabic was higher in comparison to the English one even though it had a lower line count. Arabic had a CPL rate of 1.4 while English had a CPL rate of 1.07 which translates to a difference of 26.6%. Although the difference in frequency is on

the lower side in comparison to the previous cases, the CPL rate of both is on the higher end of the spectrum.

When it comes to the type of conjunctions used, we notice difference in patterns. Although coordination had a higher rate in both languages, English (80%) had a higher rate than Arabic (64.29%). Considering that neither used correlation, the use of subordination was higher in the Arabic composition (35.71%) instead of the English one (20%). These rates could still be an indicator of rhetorical transfer from Arabic since they both lean towards coordinative conjunctions.

Table 24

Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 10

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0
Arabic	9 (64.29%)	5 (35.71%)	0

After analysing both compositions on the basis of the functions used, the rates we found also point toward the possibility of rhetorical transfer. The participant employed the additive function more than the other functions in both languages at a similar rate. In Arabic, the additive function had a rate of 64.29% while English had a rate of 66.67%. The second most used was the causal function at rate of 28.57% for Arabic and 33.33% for English. In addition to these, there was one occurrence of the adversative function in the Arabic text (7.14%).

Table 25*Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 10*

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	10	5	0	0	15
Arabic	9	4	1	0	14

In addition to the excessive use of coordination, it is noticeable that the participant wrote lengthy sentences similar to the previous participants. This further enforces the possibility of Arabic influence on how they write in English.

Example:

- "... Second, not all students have the ability or the possibilities for distance learning, and many of them got small houses, so imagine studying in a room full of people talking at the same time. You can hear nothing! Finally, most teachers and students are not strict about the timing, and also it takes time to join all the student to the room, also most students struggle to deal with distance learning, so if they can't hear the teacher for example you'll find them freaking out and they start to send a lot of messages, or they keep their mics on and don't know how to turn them off."

Within these lengthy sentences, the presence of parallel structures is noticeable; however, what makes this sample different is joining two different parallel clauses into one parallel structure. This can be seen in the following example:

- "you'll find them freaking out **and** they start to send a lot of messages, **or** they keep their mics on **and** don't know how to turn them off"

The presence of parallel structures was also on a smaller scale as seen in the following:

- "Due to Covid-19 all schools or universities switched to distance learning..."

- “Second, not all students have the ability or the possibilities for distance learning...”

Another example of relevance is the presence of the combination “and if” due to the same reason mentioned in case 1 and 4. Similar to case 4, the Arabic equivalent of “and if” was not present in the Arabic sample which make it more likely to be the result of transfer.

Example:

- “First, we all know that internet in crap in Algeria and if you got a good internet connection the electivity cuts-off specially in summer.”

The Arabic composition also showed elements similar to English writing conventions such the way in which transitional words are used. This is portrayed through the following instances:

- "...اولا،" "...ثانيا،" "...ثالثا و اخيرا،" "...في الخاتمة"

- “awwalan, ...”, “thaniyan, ...”, “thalithan wa akhiran, ...”, “fi alkhathima, ...” which to translates to “First, ...”, “Second, ...”, “Third and last, ...”, “In conclusion, ...”

Case 11

The English composition of the eleventh case consisted of 11 lines while the Arabic one consisted of 9.5 lines; though, the Arabic composition had a higher conjunctions frequency rate than that of the English one. The Arabic composition had a CPL rate of 0.74 while the English one had a CPL rate of 0.45. This translates to a difference of 47.4%. Such difference conforms to the norms.

Table 26*Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 11*

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0
Arabic	5 (71.43%)	2 (28.57%)	0

On the other hand, the type of conjunctions used indicates possible rhetorical transfer from Arabic. This is due to the fact that both compositions were dominantly coordinative in nature (AR:71.43%, EN: 80%). Subordination was also present in a relatively close percentage (AR: 28.57%, EN: 20%) while correlation was not used in both.

Table 27*Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 11*

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	5
Arabic	4 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	1 (14.29%)	7

When it comes to the functions of the conjunctions used, there is noticeable difference. While the Arabic composition was dominantly additive (57.14%), we find that English composition had a more spread pattern. That could be partially due to the lower count of conjunction in it. There were two instances of the additive function (40%) while only an instance of each of the other three functions (20% each). The Arabic composition also had an instance of each of the other three functions (14.29%).

This participant used relatively short sentences, but the presence of lengthy sentences can still be found. This style of writing was also employed in their Arabic composition. The use of transitional words and punctuation in a manner that reflects English patterns was also

present similar to the previous participant. This set of conditions point towards the likeliness that they transferred English writing tendencies to Arabic through translation; however, the presence of lengthy sentences is more of an indicator of transfer from Arabic to English.

Example:

- “Second, most of students don’t know how using models to have their lessons, so they forced to get it by money, but I that their is benefits to Distance learning.”

Parallel structures were also present as seen in the following:

- “Distance learning is one of the means that don’t help education in an effective and good way.”
- “...you find them start using communication sites and forgetting their lessons.”

Case 12

The twelfth participant produced compositions of different length. The Arabic composition consisted of 13 lines while the English one consisted of 15 lines. Although the Arabic one was shorter, it had a higher CPL rate than that of English. The CPL rate of Arabic sits at 1.15 while English had a CPL rate of 0.6. This translates to a difference of 63.2%. This pattern conforms to the expectation that English uses less conjunctions in comparison to Arabic.

When it comes to the type of conjunctions used, we notice difference in patterns. The Arabic composition was relatively balanced between coordination (53.33%) and subordination (46.67%). On the other hand, the English composition was dominantly coordinative (66.67%) while subordination followed (33.33%). In both languages, correlation was not used. The fact that coordination was dominant in the English composition could be an indicator of rhetorical transfer (excessive coordination).

Table 28*Frequency of Types of Conjunctions – Case 12*

Language	Coordination	subordination	correlation
English	6 (66.67%)	3 (33.33%)	0
Arabic	8 (53.33%)	7 (46.67%)	0

In regards to the functions used, we notice a pattern similar to that of the types used. In the Arabic composition, the conjunctions were split in a balanced manner between both the causal (46.67%) and the additive (46.67%) function in addition to an instance of the adversative (6.67%). In contrast, the English composition favoured the additive function (66.67%). Both the causal (22.22%) and adversative (11.11%) functions were also present but in lower percentage. Although the pattern of the Arabic sample seems odd in comparison to the previous cases, the English sample displays signs of rhetorical transfer (domination of additive conjunctions).

Table 29*Frequency of Functions of Conjunctions – Case 12*

Language	Additive	Causal	Adversative	Temporal	Total
English	5 (66.67%)	2 (22.22%)	1 (11.11%)	0	9
Arabic	7 (46.67%)	7 (46.67%)	1 (6.67%)	0	15

Similar to the previous cases, lengthy sentences are present in the English sample as well as in the Arabic one. Such sentences are achieved mostly through excessive coordination.

Example:

- “Lastly, it is worth mentioning that distant learning enables students to cheat their way out of their exams and tests a lot more than when they are in class being watched up close by their teachers, and this hinders their learning effectiveness and makes them put little to no effort in their studies.”

Notes

Through case-by-case analysis of the texts collected, a sum of notes in regards to possible rhetorical transfer was generated. These notes can be summarised as follows:

- The reoccurrence of lengthy sentences in the English compositions can be observed across the various participants. With exception of the 8th case, this feature was present in all of the cases.
- The frequent appearance of parallel structures in the English compositions indicates towards the possibility of transfer from Arabic.
- Signs of transfer from English to Arabic were found within the 7th, 8th, and the 11th case. These signs consist of the use of English writing patterns and conventions such as the use of transitional words at the beginning of sentences, sentence structure, and the manner in which punctuation is used.
- Combinations of conjunctions like “and because” and “and if” are present in the 1st, 4th, and 10th case. These combinations are thought to be a possible sign of rhetorical transfer considering that they are common in Arabic (Hamadouche, 2014).
- An instance of participant starting a sentence with conjunction *and* was found in the 5th case. This is a characteristic of Arabic writing (Hamadouche, 2014).

3.4 Discussion

The purpose of this study is to explore the possibility of the presence of rhetorical transfer in the writing of EFL learner at Biskra University. In order to achieve that, it examines the way conjunctions are used by the selected sample. It tries to identify which type and which function of conjunctions are more dominant as well as the identification of writing patterns related to them.

This study tries to answer three main questions. First, what are the most common types of conjunctions used by Algerian EFL learners in both Arabic and English compositions? Second, what are the most dominant functions of conjunctions used by EFL learners in both Arabic and English compositions? Finally, is there a relation between the rhetorical tendencies of both languages and the learners' writing patterns? By answering these questions, the researcher should be able to assess whether rhetorical transfer is present or absent.

The results extracted through data analysis seem to be of significance in regards to answering the questions of this research.

When it comes to the types of the conjunctions used, the participants were dominantly coordinative. This can be seen as an indicator that supports the hypothesis of rhetorical transfer. Such behaviour was also seen in their Arabic compositions; therefore, it was not limited to one language. We speculate that this is mostly due to their attempts to create parallel constructions in their writing as well as a reflection of Arabic's tendency to write long sentences. Both patterns were frequently present across the samples. Such tendencies seem to be in accordance with previous studies conducted on the matter such as the studies of Hamadouche (2014) and Kaplan (1966).

On the other hand, the functions of conjunctions that the participants opted to use were mostly additive. This behaviour was present in both languages. Even though the use of

transitional words that are additive in nature would have been sufficient as means of adding arguments, additive conjunctions were dominant even on a within-sentence level. This is considered to be of significance considering that the writing prompt was argumentative in nature. The reason behind the low number of causal conjunctions used can be attributed to the same reason of coordinative dominance. Students opted to use additive conjunctions instead of causal conjunctions to achieve parallelism through the use of addition even in cases where the causal function would have been more appropriate. This also corresponds to the findings of previous studies (Hamadouche, 2014).

In addition to that, the occasional improper placement of conjunctions as well as incorrect punctuation-conjunction pairings could possibly be due to rhetorical transfer. Also, despite the small sample, instances of conjunction combinations such as “and because” or the starting a sentence with coordinative *and* were present. This means that likelihood of rhetorical transfer is plausible. (Hamadouche, 2014)

Although signs of rhetorical transfer from English to Arabic were few, they may indicate that the Arabic writing skill of some participants is not at an advanced level. This could be due to the reason that writing in dialectal Arabic is more common than writing in standard Arabic in the daily lives of the population selected for this study.

Conclusion

Through analysis, interpretation, and discussion of findings, this chapter portrays the core of this study. It serves as means to fulfil the objectives of this study and its aim as it attempts to answer the questions raised in regards to the phenomenon under study.

General Conclusion

At the Department of English at the University of Biskra, an issue that is often mentioned is that students' writings reflected their native language; however, the mentions of such phenomenon were often claimed to be due to literal translation or left ambiguous. As a way to further explore the nature of this phenomenon, we decided to examine it through the lens of contrastive rhetoric with a focus on intra sentential conjunctions use in the argumentative paragraphs of second year students. The findings showed signs that support the presence of rhetorical transfer. When writing in English, the participants used mostly coordinative conjunctions. Additionally, in regards to functions, their writing was dominantly additive in nature. This supports the assumption that rhetorical transfer does indeed occur as both of these characteristics are considered to be features of Arabic writing. Moreover, rhetorical writing patterns such as frequent use of lengthy sentences and generation of parallel constructions were found. Both these characteristics also reflect Arabic writing tendencies. Due to the reason that the findings indicate a high possibility of transfer, it is recommended that the learners are taught about the differences between the rhetorical tendencies of both languages to increase their awareness. This would possibly help decrease the frequency and degree in which this phenomenon occurs. The findings of this research may be applicable not only to writing courses but also to the course of translation (Emara, 2014; Baker, 2018; Mohammed, 2021).

Limitations of the Study

In the duration of conducting our study, various barriers were met. For example, when it comes to the recruitment of participants, we faced difficulty in securing the probability of them returning samples. This is mostly due to the fact that their attendance was not consistent during the period in which the data was collected. Another issue that we faced is the inability

to plan two separate dates for the collection of samples for each language due to time constraints. Thus, we were forced to have the participants write both compositions in one sitting. This is also due to the inability to secure the participant's commitment. Moreover, there was the intention of interviewing written expression teachers in order to confirm the results of the analysis; however, that was not possible to due to insufficient time remaining after the analysis was done.

In regards to data analysis, a number of factors contribute to possible inaccuracy of findings. For example, we found that the participants had a considerably low mastery of the writing skill which affected the quality of the compositions they wrote. This contributed to an increase of difficulty in regards to codification and pattern recognition. This also limited the type of samples to paragraphs as they did not learn how to write essays yet which in turn limits the length of their compositions.

Recommendations

In regards to future research, conducting this study on a larger sample size would be preferable. That is to ensure that the findings are more reliable. In addition to that, we recommend the examination of the topic of conjunctions use in the context of EFL learners at the English Department of University of Biskra to be through different writing genres (argumentative, descriptive, expository, narrative. Etc). Interviewing both teachers and student writers about the topic could reveal further insights on the phenomenon. Comparing the students of different levels is also recommended in order to see how persistent language transfer is case of its presence. Another topic that could be of interest is the examination of punctuation-conjunction pairings considering the presence of improper use in the sample we examined. Also, an area of interest would be exploring the possibility of rhetorical transfer from target language (English) to the L1 (Arabic) of EFL learners in Algerian context.

Finally, considering that dialectal Arabic is more commonly used than standard Arabic in the daily life these learners, we recommend exploring the possibility of it being an influence on their writing tendencies.

References

- Albert, M. L., & Obler, L. K. (1978). *Perspectives In Neurolinguistics : The Bilingual Brain : Neuropsychological and Neurolinguistic Aspects of Bilingualism* (1st ed.). Academic Press.
- Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2011). An Investigation of Interlingual Interference in the use of ‘and’ as a Syntactic Coordinating Structure by Jordanian EFL Learners. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(3), 426–433.
- Allard, D., Bourdeau, J., & Mizoguchi, R. (2011). Addressing Cultural and Native Language Interference in Second Language Acquisition. *CALICO Journal*, 28(3), 677–698.
<https://doi.org/10.11139/cj.28.3.677-698>
- Almehmadi, M. M. (2012). A Contrastive Rhetorical Analysis of Factual Texts in English and Arabic. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 3, 68–76.
- alQinai, J. B. S. (2015). Mediating Punctuation in English Arabic Translation. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, 5(1), 5–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.v5i1.5>
- Al-Warraki, N. N., & Hassanein, A. T. (1994). *The Connectors in Modern Standard Arabic (Arabic Edition)* (1st ed.). The American University in Cairo Press.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Bhela, B. (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal*, 1(1), 22–31.
- Braine, G. (2005). The Challenge of Academic Publishing: A Hong Kong Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(4), 707. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588528>

- Conjoin. (n.d.-a). In *Merriam-Webster*. Retrieved June 21, 2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/conjoin>
- Conjoin. (n.d.-b). In *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Retrieved June 21, 2022, from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/conjoin>
- Connor, U., & Kaplan, R. B. (1987). *Writing Across Languages*. Addison-Wesley.
- Connor, U. M. (1996). *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second Language Writing (Cambridge Applied Linguistics)* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Derrick-Mescua, M., & Gmuca, J. L. (1985, March). *Concepts of Unity and Sentence Structure in Arabic, Spanish, and Malay*. College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis.
- Drid, T. (2019). Clausal Connection in the Writing of Arabic-Speaking EFL Learners: Verifying Contrastive Rhetoric Hypotheses. *Praxis International Journal of Social Science and Literature*, 2(5).
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition (Oxford Applied Linguistics)*. Oxford University Press.
- Emara, S. A. E. G. (2014). The Functions of “or” and “aw”: Implications for Translation. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(5), 154. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i5.5961>
- English. (2022). Ethnologue. <https://www.ethnologue.com/language/eng>
- Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English (English Language Series; No. 9)*. Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Hamadouche, M. (2014). A Contrastive Rhetoric of Algerian Students' Use of Connectivity. *Revue Sciences Humaines*, 42(A), 95–104.
<http://revue.umc.edu.dz/index.php/h/article/view/2020/2158>
- Hashim, N. (1994). Some Implications of the Role of the Mother Tongue in Second Language Acquisition. *LINGUISTICA COMMUNICATIO*, VI(1–2), 97–106.

- Haspelmath, M. (2007). Coordination. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Volume 2, Complex Constructions (Language Typology & Syntactic Description)* (2nd ed., pp. 1–51). Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, J. A. (2017). *A Comparative Typology of English and German*. Taylor & Francis.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes (Cambridge Language Teaching Library)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Shaw, P. (2016). *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*. Routledge.
- Jalilifar, A., White, P., & Malekizadeh, N. (2017). Exploring nominalization in scientific textbooks: A cross-disciplinary study of hard and soft sciences. *International Journal of English Studies*, 17(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2017/2/272781>
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. Longman.
- Kachru, Y. (1995). Contrastive rhetoric in World Englishes. *English Today*, 11(1), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s026607840000804x>
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). CULTURAL THOUGHT PATTERNS IN INTER-CULTURAL EDUCATION. *Language Learning*, 16(1–2), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x>
- Kaplan, R. B. (1967). Contrastive Rhetoric and the Teaching of Composition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1(4), 10. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3585808>
- Kellerman, E. (1977). Towards a characterisation of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 2(1), 58–145. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43135159>
- Kroll, B. (2003). *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing (Cambridge Applied Linguistics)* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- Kufner, H. L. (1962). *The Grammatical Structures of English and German*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. University of Michigan Press ELT.
- Leed, R. L. (1965). A Contrastive Analysis of Russian and English Intonation Contours. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 9(1), 62. <https://doi.org/10.2307/304390>
- Leki, I., Cumming, A. H., & Silva, T. (2008). *A Synthesis of Research on Second Language Writing in English*. Routledge.
- Lunsford, A. A. (2015). *The St. Martin's Handbook* (Eighth ed.). Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Malmasi, S., & Dras, M. (2018). Native Language Identification With Classifier Stacking and Ensembles. *Computational Linguistics*, 44(3), 403–446.
https://doi.org/10.1162/coli_a_00323
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing (Cambridge Applied Linguistics)* (1st ed., pp. 15–34). Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, P., & Nouri, M. (2019). Informal Writing and Language Learning. In M. Dressman & R. W. Sadler (Eds.), *The Handbook of Informal Language Learning* (pp. 75–84). Wiley.
- Mauranen, A., Hynninen, N., & Ranta, E. (2010). English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(3), 183–190.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.10.001>
- Meriläinen, L. (2010). *Language transfer in the written English of Finnish students* (dissertation). University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu.

https://erepo.uef.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/9868/urn_isbn_978-952-61-0230-6.pdf

Mohamed-Sayidina, A. (2010). Transfer of L1 cohesive devices and transition words into L2 academic texts: The case of Arab students. *RELC Journal*, 41(3), 253–266.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210380569>

Mohammed, I. A. (2021). Translation of Arabic Conjunction into English the Case Study of Wa, Fa and Thumma. *SUST Journal of Linguistic and Literary Studies*, 22(2), 74–82.

Muftah, M., & Rafic-Galea, S. (2013). Error Analysis of Present Simple Tense in the Interlanguage of Adult Arab English Language Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 146–154. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n2p146>

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning (Cambridge Applied Linguistics)* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing Academic English, Fourth Edition (The Longman Academic Writing Series, Level 4)* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Partee, B. H. (1999). Semantics. In R. A. Wilson & F. C. Keil (Eds.), *The MIT Encyclopedia of Cognitive Sciences* (pp. 739–742). The MIT Press.

Pérez, A. M., Peña, E. D., & Bedore, L. M. (2010). Cognates Facilitate Word Recognition in Young Spanish-English Bilinguals' Test Performance. *Early Childhood Services*, 4(1), 55–67.

Rass, R. A. (2015). Challenges Face Arab Students in Writing Well-Developed Paragraphs in English. *English Language Teaching*, 8(10). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n10p49>

Song, J. J. (2010). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford University Press.

Swales, J. M., & Holes, C. (Eds.). (1984). Textual Approximation in the Teaching of Academic Writing to Arab Students: A Contrastive Approach. In *English for specific*

purposes in the Arab world (0 ed., pp. 228–242). Language Studies Unit, University of Aston in Birmingham.

Taylor, V. L. (1995). *Tense Usage in Academic Writing: A Cross-Disciplinary Study* (Master's Thesis). University of Victoria.

Tomlin, R. S. (2013). *Basic Word Order (RLE Linguistics B: Grammar): Functional Principles* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Truchot, C. (1994). The spread of English in Europe. *Journal of European Studies*, 24(2), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004724419402400204>

ملخص الدراسة

من المشاكل التي غالباً ما يتم ذكرها في اقسام تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية هي مشكلة ميل التلاميذ للكتابة بطريقة يزعم أنها تعكس لغتهم الأم. في محاولة للتحقيق في طبيعة هذا الادعاء، قررنا فحصه من خلال منظور فرضية النقل البلاغي. تم حصر نطاق هذه الدراسة إلى دراسة أدوات الربط المستخدمة في كل من اللغتين الإنجليزية والعربية من طرف طلاب السنة الثانية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة بسكرة. كان ما مجموعه 12 مشاركاً بمثابة عينة لهذه الدراسة. وطلب إلى من شارك أن يكتب فقرة جدلية باللغتين. تم تحليل العينات التي تم جمعها على أساس الترددات وكذلك من منظور نوعي. أظهرت نتائج التحليل هيمنة أدوات الربط التنسيقية. كذلك، فيما يتعلق بوظائف أدوات الربط المستخدمة، كانت وظيفة الإضافة هي المهيمنة. حدد التحليل النوعي للعينات أنماطاً متكررة مثل الاستخدام المتكرر للجمل الطويلة وميل المشاركين إلى إنشاء تركيبات ذات طابع متوازي من خلال توظيف أدوات الربط ذات الطابع التنسيقي. تدعم هذه النتائج فرضية النقل البلاغي. ونتيجة لذلك، يوصى بأن يدرك كل من المدرسين والطلاب هذا المفهوم وأن يأخذ في الاعتبار في إطار التدريس و التعلم. من شأن الوعي بالمبولات و الإختلافات البلاغية لكل لغة أن يساعد الطلاب على تجنب النقل البلاغي و الكتابة بطريقة تليق باللغة المستهدفة.