

EFL Education Journal

- Budi Setyono** **The Use of Process and product Assessment in Teaching EFL Writing Applying Genre-Based Approach**
- Sugeng Ariyanto** **An Applied Linguistic Analysis of EFL Teacher Trainees' Communicative Language Ability in Academic Writing**
- Wiwiek Istianah** **Developing Students' Participation through Learning Community Technique in the Reading Class of Non-English Department Students**
- Fitri Wijayanti** **Poem as Creative Writing Form: a source of pedagogical language input**
- Avilanofa Bagus Budi** **EFL Poetry Writing on e-Classroom for Creating Expressive Pedagogy**
- Mohammad Zaeni** **Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Ability through the Combination of Pair Work and STAD**
- Siti Sundari** **The Analysis of the Grammatical Errors Made by the English Students in Writing a Descriptive Text at FKIP, The University of Jember**

THE ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, THE FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF JEMBER

Volume 1

Number 1

March 2014

Hal. 1- 78

**ISSN:
2338- 4190**

A publication on EFL Education Journal

EFL Education Journal is published 3 times a year in the months of March, July, November ; it presents articles on EFL education and research

Editorial Committee

Chief Editor:

Drs Sugeng Ariyanto, M.A

Associate editors;

Dra. Zakiyah Tasnim, M.A.

Dra. Siti Sundari, M.A

Dra. Wiwiek Istianah, M.Kes, M.Ed

Dra. Wiwiek Eko Bindarti, M.Pd

Drs, Bambang Suharjito, M.Ed

Drs. I Putu Sukmaantara, M.Ed

Dra, Musli Ariani, M.Appl.Ling

Dra. Made Adi Andayani T, M.Ed

Dra. Asih Santihastuti, M.Pd

Dra. Eka Wahyuningsih, M.Pd

Reviewers

Dr. Budi Setyono, M.A

Dr. Aan Erlyana Fardhani, M.Pd

Drs. Bambang Arya W.P, Ph.D

Address:

The English Education Department, the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, the University of Jember

Kampus Bumi Tegalboto Gedung III FKIP

Jl Kalimantan Jember

Telpon/Fax: 0331-330738 / Contact phone: 08155930172

Email Address: mrsugengariyanto@yahoo.com

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

Policy. The EFL Education Journal is one of the professional publications of both the lecturers and teachers' research findings or conceptual issues of EFL education in and outside the FKIP Jember University. It appears 3 times a year in the months of March, July, and November. The Journal presents information and ideas on English as a foreign language (EFL) learning and teaching. Articles based on the teachers' research findings are of primary interest and relevance to the EFL teacher training and education, Jember University.

Contributions. Contributions, which should be original and not published elsewhere, are welcomed from educationists: both the lecturers and students in EFL education. Main articles should be between 1000 and 5000 words in length. Manuscripts for review should be sent to the Editor, EFL Education Journal, Prodi Bahasa Inggris, FKIP Jember. A contributor will receive one copy of the issue in which his/her article appears.

Subscribers. The subscription is highly recommended for sophomores as references in their study.

EFL EDUCATION JOURNAL

Budi Setyono	The Use of Process and product Assessment in Teaching EFL Writing Applying Genre-Based Approach	1 - 8
Sugeng Ariyanto	An Applied Linguistic Analysis of EFL Teacher Trainees' Communicative Language Ability in Academic Writing	9 - 22
Wiwiek Istianah	Developing Students' Participation through Learning Community Technique in the Reading Class of Non-English Department Students	23 - 30
Fitri Wijayanti	Poem as Creative Writing Form: a source of pedagogical language input	31 - 40
Avilanofa Bagus Budi	EFL Poetry Writing on e-Classroom for Creating Expressive Pedagogy	41- 52
Mohammad Zaeni	Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Ability Through the Combination of Pair Work And STAD Model	53 - 64
Siti Sundari	The Analysis of the Grammatical Errors Made by the English Students in Writing a Descriptive Text at FKIP, The University of Jember	65 - 78

AN APPLIED LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF EFL TEACHER TRAINEES' COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE ABILITY IN ACADEMIC WRITING

Sugeng Ariyanto

The Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
The University of Jember

Abstract: This article presents the research findings on EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teacher trainees' communicative language ability (CLA) in academic writing. Although CLA in English has long been the major concern in an EFL teacher training program, it remains to a large extent a problematic issue in EFL teaching. The research was conducted at the FKIP, Jember University, and the informants were 50 students. The research design was qualitative with the synthetic approach of obtaining the research data. The research data were compiled by using questionnaire, interview, and documentary studies. The data were analyzed by using the ethnography of communication and the gooficon analysis for the respondents' essays and thesis extracts. The result shows that the EFL teacher trainees' communicative ability in academic writing did not, to a large extent, control the cohesion and coherence of their essays. This remains problematic issues of the teacher trainees' academic writing today.

Key words: The EFL Teacher trainees, CLA, academic writing

Since the last three decades, the EFL teacher training program in Jember university, has been developing an EFL program. This program has designed its curriculum that also supports the existing development of the teacher trainees' CLA in academic writing. The EFL teacher trainees on the program are therefore academically trained to develop their writing skill in English. Instead, they certainly develop the other language skills and learn the teaching strategies that enable them to practise communicative language teaching. However, the story of the teacher trainees' goofs in writing relatively remain the same as that of those in the mid of 1990s. In other words, the teacher trainees' CLA in academic writing has long been vulnerable to their own goofs in writing since the mid of 1990s, and they might now remain suffering from their goofs that are indeed the problem of conveying and negotiating meanings in their academic writing.

Such a problem of conveying and negotiating meanings in the TL use might also occur in the other applied linguistic aspects of ELT (English language teaching). For example, most EFL teachers at secondary schools have attempted to apply the competence based approach in their English teaching activities. The application of this teaching approach promotes the development of the students' communicative competence or what Bachman (1990: 81) calls CLA as well. Moreover, a number of workshops and seminars on the application of the 'Communicative Approach' (CA) have been conducted over many years. These workshops and seminars aim to solve the socio-psychological problems that affect the CLA of the EFL learners and to meet their learning needs in accordance with their circumstances. However, the results of the workshops do not live up to the theoretical solutions to the socio-psychological problems of the EFL teacher trainees. Similarly, Loveday's (1982: 17) research findings confirm how difficult it is to develop non-native language learners' communicative competence. Leo Loveday (1982: 137, 178) recommends that EFL language teachers develop communicative competence or CLA by focusing on tolerance of learners' mistakes as long as meaning is still conveyed and understood, but this certainly violates academic writing rules.

Some applied linguists' findings deal with communicative teaching strategies, such as the steps of CLT and 'the components of communicative competence' (Canale: 1983: 6 -14). Yet, they do not show to what extent the development of the construct, communicative competence can meet the specific learning needs of the EFL classroom. I also note that most studies of non- native language learners do not show to what extent CLA can be observed in EFL classrooms where the non-native learners are dependent on the help of their non- native teachers. Though much research on non- native language teaching classrooms has been done, more studies on applied linguistics need to be carried out to observe the existing development of CLA in real- life teacher training programs. Such empirical studies should be conducted to perceive the actual rather than theoretical effects of CLT programs. This can also be done by observing the nature of the teacher trainees'CLA in especially academic writing classes as conducted in 1990s.

With reference to the above background, especially the conceptual tentativeness of both EFL practitioners and applied linguists on developing CLA and the relatively recent issue noted by Nezakatgoo (2011) that 'there is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill for EFL learners to master', there arise a number of questions. The questions include how the EFL teacher trainees develop CLA in academic writing; to what extent the academic writing of EFL teacher trainees reveal a control of the cohesive and coherent textual features of English, and how a greater control can be achieved; and to what extent socio-psychological factors affect the teacher trainees' performance in academic writing.

Related Research Findings on CLA in Academic Writing Classes

It is easy to say that such and such a learning approach of developing Bachman's (1990) CLA in writing should be applied in a foreign language (FL) context, but to apply it is not an easy endeavor since what happens in real and classroom interactions is not and cannot be easily predicted. On this point, there has been a number of relevant researches on the CLA classes. Tomlinson (1987: 34) recognizes two types of EFL teachers, 'the untouchables' and 'the guilty' who cannot optimally perform well in FL classroom interactions especially academic writing classes. In other words, such EFL teacher trainees as non-native prospective teachers or especially writers of the TL may not effectively work in FL contexts, and that consequently, their language development in the classroom may not survive.

The real classroom interactions not only provide the socio-cultural activities of language use, but also the reflection of the socio-cultural interference involving the psychological aspects of the FL learning. If the FL teaching environment happens to conform to the cultural practices of the TL community, the socio-cultural impact of the learners' psychological state is then positively reflected in the real classroom interactions. Conversely, if the culture in the language teaching environment is different from that of the TL, the socio-cultural impact might destroy the learners' interest in learning the TL especially how to write in the TL. This is a point that many applied linguists, such as Canale (1983) or Nezakatgoo (2011) virtually ignore.

Another finding from Hymes's (1992) communicative competence and the derived method of Bachman's (1990) CLA and Nezakatgoo's (2011) portofolio assessment are at present the key notions of language teaching. Their presence is so central in academic writing that all the language teacher trainers attempt to find out the best way to apply the academic writing in English. In doing this, they sometimes apply other approaches of writing assessment, such as 'portfolio assessment to develop their learners' CLA. However, CLA cannot be well developed without due regard to the FL learners' interpretative abilities that allow them "to make judgments as how to act and how to interpret actions within communicative contexts" (Figueroa: 1994: 132). Their interpretative abilities determine the meaningfulness of a certain message before they develop adequate CLA. Besides, what is meant by 'communicative' in communicative competence or CLA depends on whether or not EFL learners have the opportunity formally or informally to use the TL in the classroom or in real communication. If they are not used to writing in the TL in the either classroom or the non-classroom setting, their communicative competence might be very low because of for example having a lot of goofs in their academic writing..

The above findings have long contributed to the study that CLA requires not only more flexible writing strategies, but also more learning and communication strategies

to enhance interpretative abilities. Therefore, teacher trainees should learn how to use the TL in its cultural context when they directly interact with its native speakers and negotiate their meanings with them. If this is not taken into account, CLT in non-native teacher trainees' environments with different socio-cultural backgrounds is unlikely to develop their CLA at all. This is notwithstanding the applied linguists' creative interpretation of certain theories of language use generated from sociolinguistics and some other interdisciplinary studies.

Applied linguistics in for example Richards, Platt and Weber's (1985) sense is the study of how to use and interpret the language theories: generated by linguists, psycholinguists and sociolinguists for teaching and learning purposes. It is concerned with analyzing and applying communicative language ability. The applied linguistic analysis of CLA therefore largely deals with language learners in language teaching and the socio-psychological factors influencing their language learning. Such an applied linguistic analysis of EFL teacher trainees' CLA in academic writing at Jember University has not yet been made prior to this research. In view of this situation, the focus of the research on "An Applied Linguistic Analysis of EFL Teacher Trainees' CLA" was on the empirical evidence regarding academic writing in the mid of 1990s..

As regards the ethnography of communication-based norms of the academic writing forms, such as theses and essays, Halliday and Hasan's (1976: 8) research findings suggest the criteria of cohesion in sense as "a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it". The criteria include text coherence whereby coherent paragraphs of academic writing in English should be based on the principle that "The normal organisation of sentences (and texts) in English is that topic (shared information) precedes comment (new information)" (Canale: 1983: 10). The essay or thesis should also follow the points suggested by Marshall and Rowland (1993);

- "After the introduction, your theme, thesis, argument should be developed clearly and logically throughout the essay and restated in the conclusion,*
- *when you make general statements, support them with reasons or examples,*
 - *each main point should consist of one or more paragraphs'*
 - *each of the other sentences in the paragraph should explain or illustrate the point which the paragraph is making, but each should also have a purpose of its own"* (Marshall and Rowland: 1993: 171 - 173).

The genres in theses or essays deal with the writing category or the register of academic writing, not conversational speech". The analysis of academic writing includes Burt and Kiparsky's (1972) 'gooficon' ('a collection of goofs' see Key Notions); a) Global and local goofs (instrumentalities). These parameters measure grammatical structure of sentences and their relationship within the text to show text

cohesion (norms); i.e. they pertain to grammatical competence; b). Information packaging: the construct of ideas, arguments and evidence: (act sequence or message content) using what Gerot and Wignell (1994: 103) noted as the interaction of theme and rheme in the clauses of a text.

The information in the first line of a paragraph provides the themes of the second line, the second provides themes of the third, the third to the fourth and so forth. This has been used to measure whether or not the teacher trainees (informants) answer the questions of their thesis extracts or essays (*text coherence*). This measurement deals with discourse competence or what Bachman (1990: 87) called “textual competence”. Academic register (*genre*) avoids conversational register or what Fabb and Durant noted as; “**contractions** like “there’s”, “it’s”, “they’ve” et;. **informal colloquialisms** like “OK”, “maybe” etc. and **exclamations** like “How awful the line is !”, (Fabb and Durant: 1993: 74).

In this research, the above criteria have been used to measure how far the teacher trainees apply the register of academic writing.

Research Design

In view of the fact that EFL teacher trainees were trained to meet the requirement of CLA in academic writing, the research was conducted to survey their actual CLA in academic writing and the factors influencing such ability. Therefore, this research was designed to describe and synthesize a number of linguistic and non linguistic aspects which influence the EFL teacher trainees’ CLA in academic writing. To this purpose, I have employed a synthetic approach for obtaining the research data (Seliger and Shohamy: 1989: 26- 29) and used an ethnographic approach for observing the teacher trainees’ CLA in using the TL (also see Byram and Essarte-Sarries: 1991: 10, 13). The research also uses the heuristic approach of achieving its objectives. The objectives of such an approach are to generate some hypotheses relating to the existing development of CLA in the aspect of the way the EFL teacher trainees convey meanings in academic writing and of the factor that influence the performance of the EFL teacher trainees’ CLA in academic writing.

The research was conducted within the English education program, the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, The University of Jember. The research informants were mainly the EFL teacher trainees. For management reasons, i.e time allocation (for example see Byram and Essarte- Sarries: 1991: 25), 50 informants from different year levels were selected.

The research method was based on the qualitative design of analyzing data on the teacher trainees' CLA in using English. On this point, I did not use the quantitative

design of analysis because this study was not concerned with the testing of a new teaching method by for example comparing two classes with different treatments. Besides, this study did not deal with experiments supporting hypotheses. Rather, it generated some hypotheses, and I used the ethnography of communication and the gooficon parameters to analyze the data on the teacher trainees' performance in using English in academic writing. The research methods for collecting the data of the teacher trainees' CLA in academic writing and of the factors associated with their use of English were documentary studies, interviews, and questionnaires.

Thesis extracts and essays were analyzed with reference to 1) the structure of academic writing: this has been assessed with reference to the existing academic writing system accepted in the institution; 2) the purpose of writing: this has been used in assessing how far meaning is conveyed in the teacher trainees' academic writing; 3) sentence construction: this point deals with grammatical competence; 4) paragraph organisation: this refers to the discourse competence, logical meaning and theme and rheme relationships used in creating coherence and cohesion; and 5) any other relevant points in a document of this nature. Interview questions were used for investigating the informal data regarding some non linguistic factors influencing the EFL teacher trainees' CLA.

All the data - documentary studies, interviews, and questionnaires, - were analyzed in a qualitative way by using parameters and rating scales for identifying cohesion and coherence in academic writing; coding systems for categorizing questionnaire results. The ethnography of communication framework was also used to analyze the documentary data. Besides, the rating scale of the informants' essays adapted from FSI Language-Proficiency Rating Scale (Higgs and Clifford: 1982: 63) was used to measure the level of academic writing and the control of text coherence and cohesion. The labelling system adapted from The Gooficon: a repair manual for English (Burt and Kiparsky: 1972) was also used to analyse the informants' essays.

The Information packaging using theme and rheme was used to measure whether or not the informants' essays answered the question (*text coherence*). Further, control of redundancy and writing register were used to measure the teacher trainees' strategies of expressing their ideas when writing in English and how they applied the writing register throughout their essay texts. Message content and norm control (*text cohesion* and *coherence*) were supposed to explain to what extent the informants' academic writing revealed a control of the cohesive and coherent textual features of English.

The information relating to academic writing was taken from the results of the essay writing task given exclusively to the research informants. The informants' (teacher trainees') essays were analyzed based on their goof types, such as errors in syntax, inflections, spelling, auxiliary system, and lexical choice. This was used to measure

how the teacher trainees constructed grammatically correct sentences and their relationship between sentences to convey meaning (*text cohesion*). Their essays were analyzed in two aspects, namely text cohesion and information packaging (text coherence). Text cohesion was concerned with the types of goof: local and global found in the informants' (teacher trainees') essays. Meanwhile, information packaging was observed to see if the inter-sentential relationships that might show coherent or not coherent. In this regard, the revision of one of the analyzed essays was made as a model

Research Findings

The findings from the qualitative data analysis using the parameters of gooficon and ethnography of communication: *Setting, Participant, End, Act (voice) sequence, Key, Instrument, Norm, and Genre* (Hymes: 1992) are presented below. The results of the gooficon analysis of the teacher trainees' (the *Participants*') essays and thesis (the *Genre*) extracts demonstrate the types of their goofs (errors) in academic writing and the level of their academic writing in English (the *Instrument*). The style (the *Norm*) of the informants' (teacher trainees') academic writing can be seen table 1: Conversational Register in the Informants' Essays. Further, the percentage of the informants' goofs in essay writing and the revision of one of their essays as the model are respectively represented in Table 2 and table 3.

Some findings in the interview and questionnaire showed that most of the teacher trainees were not interested in academic writing, and they also complained about problems in organising their own ideas (the *Act sequence* or the sequence of their ideas or voice) despite having completed essay writing courses. Teacher trainees were given the linguistic grammar for the writing skill. Writing a thesis in the institution (this research area or the *Setting*) involved giving the teacher trainees the experience in academic writing, not the opportunity to communicate with readers of English (the *End* or purpose). In other words, the trainees' theses were written for academic purposes.

The collected documentary data consisted of extracts of the teacher trainees' thesis and essay writing (the *Genre*) and of teacher training courses (the *Setting*). The teacher trainees' theses were in English, and their theses were expected to be intelligible to native speakers of English. Besides, they had to be presented and examined in the pre-thesis examination before they were taken into the final examination. During the examination, these theses had to be defended orally in English. The content of the teacher trainees' theses was based on research findings conducted at secondary schools. In writing their theses, the teacher trainees were required to describe the background, purposes, limitations and problems of their studies.

As regards the style of academic writing (the Instrument), most of the teacher training graduates' theses developed their arguments in a similar manner. For example, they did not come straight to the point in limiting their topics, but rather before describing the limitation of their topics, they showed what limitation was, and why limitation was necessary. Besides, they mostly used a lot of redundant words, thereby losing control of the expression of their ideas. The extracts of the teacher trainees' theses showed that their approach and writing styles in discussing a particular topic were subject to a number of difficulties. They did not directly discuss the points of sub-chapters. Rather, they tended to define rather than discussed the terms, such as "limitation", "objectives" or "problems" and often fail to arrive at the point of the discussion.

The informants' (the teacher trainees') essays were mostly written in one paragraph which contained numerous local and global goofs. In other words, the writing level of their essays to a large extent belonged to the level of being able to write a paragraph based on the rating scale of the informants' essays adapted from FSI Language-Proficiency Rating Scale (Higgs and Clifford: 1982: 63). In their essays, the teacher trainees often ignored the differences between the conversational register and the register of academic writing. Many of them used contractions, such as, "*can't, don't, isn't* etc" or almost half (21 informants) of the whole informants (50) used contractions and colloquial words that belong to conversational register in their essays (see table 1).

Table 1: Conversational Register in the Informants' Essays

Essays	Types of Conversational Register	Lines
1. Essay 4	the contractions " <i>I'll</i> ", " <i>There'll</i> ", " <i>there's</i> "	1, 11, 17
2. Essay 6	the contraction " <i>it's</i> "	7
3. Essay 8	the contraction " <i>it's</i> ", the colloquial word " <i>yes</i> "	1, 9
4. Essay 10	the contraction " <i>can't</i> "	3
5. Essay 11	the contractions " <i>can't</i> ", " <i>isn't</i> " and " <i>doesn't</i> "	5- 10
6. Essay 12	the contraction " <i>doesn't</i> "	3
7. Essay 13	the contraction " <i>doesn't</i> ", the colloquial word " <i>it is right</i> "	1, 6
8. Essay 14	the contraction " <i>can't</i> "	1
9. Essay 15	the contraction " <i>don't</i> "	15
10. Essay 21	the colloquial words " <i>You see</i> "	1
11. Essay 24	the contractions " <i>can't</i> "; " <i>don't</i> "	2, 3
12. Essay 25	the contraction " <i>That's</i> "	4
13. Essay 30	the contraction " <i>doesn't</i> "	10
14. Essay 31	the contraction " <i>it's</i> ", " <i>won't</i> "	1, 10
15. Essay 35	the contractions " <i>can't</i> ", " <i>didn't</i> "	3
16. Essay 37	the contraction " <i>don't</i> "	2
17. Essay 38	the contraction " <i>it's</i> "	3
18. Essay 39	the contraction " <i>can't</i> "	2
19. Essay 40	the contraction " <i>can't</i> "	9
20. Essay 47	the contractions " <i>can't</i> ", " <i>people's</i> "	7, 8
21. Essay 49	the colloquial word " <i>yes</i> "	1

As can be seen in the above table, a significant number of teacher trainees used conversational registers, such as contractions, and many of them used redundant words. This reflects their being used to using conversational spoken English rather than the more concise written register. Besides, their essays to a large extent showed particular difficulties with the auxiliary system, subject- verb agreement (36 %) and inconsistency in using noun modifiers (20 %). Similarly, their essays contained many global goofs, such as subject or object missing (26 %) and misusing prepositions (38 %) as can be seen in table 2. Besides, in developing their essays, the teacher trainees tended to stray away from the main idea of their essay topics. As a result, many of them did not answer the question of the essay topic. Rather, they introduced a range of different ideas without showing the relation of those ideas to the main topic

Table 2: Percentage of The Informants' Goofs in Essay Writing

Goof Types	Informants Number	Percentage
Local goofs		
2a (Spelling)	13	26 %
1. Auxiliary systems:		
2b1 (Tense misplacement)	5	10 %
2b2 (Be /does/do/did missing)	4	8 %
2b3 (Inconsistency in perfect use)	1	2 %
2. Inflections:		
2c1 (Subject- verb agreement)	18	36 %
2c2 (Plural/singular forms)	23	46 %
2c3 (Article missing)	8	16 %
2c4 (Inconsistency in using noun modifiers)	10	20 %
2c5 (Misplacement of adverbs)	8	16 %
Global goofs		
1. Syntax		
1a (Surrogate subject missing)	1	2 %
1b (Simple predicate missing)	7	14 %
1c (Object pronoun missing)	4	8 %
1d (Subject pronoun missing)	6	12 %
1e (Subject or object missing)	13	26 %
1f (Main or sub clause missing)	9	18 %
1g1 (Subject and object permuted)	4	8 %
1g2 (Misordering in subordinate constructions)	5	10 %
1g3 (Passive order but active form)	8	16 %
2. in Inflections		
1h (Misformation of gerunds after preposition)	5	10 %
1i (Inconsistency in using pronouns)	9	18 %
1j (Misusing prepositions)	19	38 %
1k (Misplacement of signposting and conjunction)	10	20 %
1l (Misusing surrogate subjects)	14	28 %
1m (Comparison markers missing)	6	12 %
Lexical choice	39	78 %
Redundancy	25	50 %
Conversational register	21	42 %
1. Answer the question by direct statement	24	52%
2. Answer the question by discussion	2	4 %
2. No answer	24	48 %

Some comments on the informants' goofs can also be seen in the analysis of text cohesion on their essays, such as Essay 1. This essay consists of many local goofs and

global goofs, and thus this reduces its textual cohesion. Examples for local goofs include the phrase “*the speaker want*” (see 2c1 line 14) which should read “the speaker wants”, the misspelling of “*mean*” for the word “means” (see 2a line 2) and the word “*form*” for the word “language” (see 2d lines 3). Regarding global goofs, we note that subject and object are permuted in the line “*It is very different between communication in written form and communication*” (see 1g1 line 6) which presumably means “spoken language is different from the written form”. Further, there is inconsistency in using pronouns, as in the pronoun “*they*” instead of “s/he” as the antecedent of the noun “*The listener*” in “*The listener can ask directly to the speaker if they do not understand what the speaker want*” (see 1i lines 13 - 14). Both the local and global goofs have a negative effect on text coherence, and this shows difficulties in organising ideas as reflected in the above global goofs.

Essay 1

“Spoken language is essential for communication. I know that language is a - 1
/mean/(2a) of communication. Communication itself can be written /form/(2d)
and oral /form/ (2d). For oral communication, of course we must /say everything
we want/(2d) by using /our organs of speech/(2d) ; in this case the existence of
spoken language is very essential. - 5
/It is very different between communication in written form and communication/(1g1).
In /oral form/(2d), /for me myself/(2d), /communication in oral form or by
spoken language/(3) is easier than /communication in/ written. Why? /because
I have been accustomed/(2b3) to /have/(1h) /conversation //(2d) with others.
besides, oral communication does not need a hard thinking in organizing the idea 10
we want to say/(1g2). We just speak /everything we want/ (1g2).
In addition, /communication by using/ (3) /spoken language is easier to understand
by listeners/(1g3). /The listener can ask directly to the speaker if they do not
understand what /the speaker want/(1i,2c1). /b/(5)esides, /there is interaction
between speaker and listener if they communicate by usingspoken - 15
language/(1g1).”(written by male informant 22: 1994)

The teacher trainees' redundant words and expressions merely reflect their communication strategies through, for instance 'word coinage' (for example see Larsen- Freeman and Long: 1991: 127) and repetition. This may be acceptable in conversations since the information is more easily understood. However, their redundant words may violate the register of academic writing since redundancy in words might negatively affect the development of information in the essays. Examples of information packaging (text coherence) include the analysis of Essay 1 as quoted before. This essay does not show the answer of the essay question as to whether spoken language is essential for communication (see the first sentence).

The teacher trainees' essays required that English be used as a means of expressing their writers' ideas in academic writing. By writing their theses in the TL, the teacher trainees were expected to communicate their ideas effectively in English. Given that most of the informants' essays contained local and global goofs and that the information packaging conveyed a moderate amount of text coherence, the following was the revision of one of the informants' essays.

Table 3: The Revision of One of the Informants' Essays

The informant's essay	The revised version
"Spoken language is <u>very important to master</u> for communication for some reasons.	Spoken language is essential for communication for several reasons.
<i>Firstly, most of our communication takes place using spoken language.</i>	<i>Firstly, most of our communication takes place using spoken language.</i>
<i>It is unrejectable that anytime we meet <u>someone especially we are familiar with</u></i>	For example, if we meet our acquaintances
<i>we will be automatically involved in the communication <u>just for respecting him/her, showing our cordial attitudes</u></i>	we automatically become involved in communication in order to demonstrate our friendship
<i>ormay be any other thing <u>more important (business affairs)</u></i>	and perhaps to discuss specific matters, such as our business.
<i>If we go to the <u>beaches, supermarket, movie or anywhere</u>, we usually meet <u>one at least we familiar with</u>.</i>	If we go to the beach , supermarket, movie or anywhere else , we usually meet our family or friends.
<i><u>In this case, a spoken language must be used to converse.</u></i>	In such situations , spoken language is used to communicate with other people.
<i>In brief, <u>when, where and however</u> we are, we often get involved</i>	In brief, whenever and wherever we are, we become involved
<i>in the <u>interaction</u> with others, and <u>a spoken language is used for this need.</u></i>	in communication with others, and spoken language is used for this.
<i>Secondly, spoken language is more effective than <u>written one.</u></i>	Secondly, spoken language is more effective than the written form.
<i><u>When we use a spoken language, there are still many things (aids) available to help clarify our idea.</u></i>	When speaking, we can use other means of communication to clarify our ideas.
<i>If we <u>have</u> a face-to-face conversation, we <u>are aided by</u> our facial <u>expression, body movements, tone or other situational circumstances</u></i>	In a face to face conversation, we can, for instance, use our facial expressions or gestures.
<i><u>that can help us docorrectly, convincingly and appropriately convey our idea</u></i>	In this way, we can clearly express and convey our ideas.
<i><u>Especially when it is very important thing, then a spoken language will be more helpful and, we successful to use.</u></i>	In contrast, we cannot use any additional aids for communication in written language. Therefore, I think spoken language is more effective than the written form.
<i>Thirdly, using spoken language has some benefits.</i>	Thirdly, we can get some benefits from using spoken language.
<i><u>It shows our respect to the one we converse</u></i>	For instance, we can directly show our respect,
<i><u>with. It is also important when there is misunderstanding. If so, a fast and polite correction can be made. If we can use it appropriately it is very useful to convince, persuade or bring about someone to an action we want"</u></i>	and if there is misunderstanding, fast and polite correction can be made. If we can use it appropriately, we can persuade or introduce someone to an action we want. Perhaps, for these reasons, I believe that spoken language is essential for communication.

Pedagogical Implications

Regarding the nature of the EFL teacher trainees' CLA in academic writing, the research findings provide evidence that the EFL teacher training and education needs to develop CLA in academic writing. Some evidence in the interview and questionnaire: the fact that most of the teacher trainees were not quite interested in academic writing and that they were liable to make both local and global goofs

suggests that the development of CLA needs more emphasis on practice in writing exercises and that EFL teacher training requires opportunities to use the TL as well as learning syntactical and lexical aspects of the TL (*'discourse competence'*). Without such opportunities for language use, the development of CLA in the TL might not be feasible in EFL contexts. This is because *'discourse competence'* or *'textual competence'* is an integral part of communicative competence (see Bachman: 1990: 87).

The findings also confirm the idea that the different culture in the language teaching environment might destroy the EFL teacher trainees' interest in learning the TL. Although the teacher trainees have been given essay and thesis writing courses and suggested to express themselves in English, their being non native writers of the TL cannot effectively work in EFL contexts. Indeed in the research fieldwork the teacher trainees' theses were expected to reflect their ability to convey their research findings in English. By describing their research findings in English, they were expected to communicate with both the native and non-native readers of English. However, this attempt at developing communicative language ability has not solved the problems of the teacher trainees' linguistic competence if the teacher trainees' essays have many global and local goofs that violate text cohesion and coherence. They must attempt to cope with deficiencies in grammatical and discourse competence in organising their ideas. Besides, their tendency to verbosity in writing might be due to the feeling that it is insufficient to write a few sentences, although they already express their ideas. They may even think it desirable to use as many words as possible to express their ideas since communication also requires redundancy for clarity purposes. This reflects a greater command of informal, spoken language, and perhaps a greater interest in this area. This is supported by the results of interview data analysis showing that most teacher trainees were interested in speaking rather than writing, often expressing the view that speaking was easier than writing.

The level of academic writing of most of the teacher training trainees' theses develops their arguments in a similar manner. For example, they did not directly show the point in limiting their topics, but rather before describing the limitation of their topics, they defined the word *'limitation'* and why limitation is necessary. In addition, the teacher trainees' essays showed their ignorance of the differences between the conversational register and the register of academic writing. Many of them used contractions, such as, *"can't, don't, isn't etc"* and used a lot of redundant words, thereby losing control of the expression of their ideas. This reflects a greater command of informal, spoken language, and perhaps a greater interest in this area, and their tendency to verbosity certainly violates their CLA in academic writing.

In short, the teacher trainees still need to learn and distinguish the register of academic writing from the conversational register. In this way, they may be able to avoid conversational register whilst writing their essays or theses.

Conclusion

Referring to the research findings, I conclude that EFL teaching in the teacher training program of the FKIP has not optimally developed the teacher trainees' CLA of using the TL in academic writing. Furthermore, the teacher trainees' inadequate CLA, especially in writing skills, reflects lack of using the TL as a means of communication.

In short, the teacher trainees' CLA in academic writing is indeed to a large extent undeveloped in the aspects of text cohesion, academic register and information packaging. However, writing a thesis in the institution involves giving the teacher trainees the experience in academic writing, not the opportunity to communicate with readers of English. For this reason, the trainees' theses or essays are certainly different from those written overseas since writing theses in the institution is only to give them an academic experience. Thus, the institution has its own rules of academic writing which may differ from those in English-speaking countries.

Reference

- Bachman, L. F. 1990. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,.
- Burt, M. K. and Kiparsky, C. 1972. *The Gooficon: a repair manual for English*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers,.
- Byram, M. and Essarte-Sarries. 1991. *Investigating Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Teaching: A Book for Teachers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters,
- Canale, M. 1983. From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy, in J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt, (eds). *Language and Communication*, 2- 27. London: Longman.
- Fabb, N. and Duran, A. 1993. *How to Write Essays, Dissertations & Theses in Literary Studies*. London: Longman.
- Figuroa, E. 1994. *Sociolinguistic Metatheory*. Oxford: Elsevier Science,
- Gerot, L. and Wignell, P. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Gerd Stabler, Antipodean Educational Enterprises,.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London.: Longman
- Higgs, T. V. and Clifford, R. 1982. The Push Toward Communication, in T. V. Higgs (ed.) *Curriculum, Competence and The Foreign Language Teacher*. 57- 79. Illinois: National Textbook Company.

- Hymes, D. 1992. The Concept of Communicative Competence Revisited, in M. Pütz (ed) *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution*. 31- 57 Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Loveday, L. 1982. *The Sociolinguistics of Learning and Using a Non- Native Language*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Marshall, L. and Rowland, F. (1993) *A Guide to Learning Independently*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire
- Nezakatgoo, B. 2011. The Effect of Portofolio Assessment on Writing of EFL Students. *English Language Teaching. Canadian Center of Science and education* vol 4, 231- 241
- Richards, J' Platt, J, and Weber H 1985. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman
- Seliger, H. W. and Shohamy, E. 1989. *Second Language Research Method*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. 1987. Choices in CELT, in V. Bickley (ed) *Re-exploring CELT; Continuing Education for Language Teachers*. 30 - 35 Hongkong: Institute of Language in Education,.

ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (EFL) EDUCATION JOURNAL

GUIDELINES FOR ARTICLE CONTRIBUTORS

1. EFL Education Journal accepts articles on English language education which have not been published elsewhere.
2. For publication purposes, manuscripts should be typed in MS Word doc.format, using 12 size Times New Roman fonts, one and a half spaced on A4- size paper, 7 - 20 pages in length with one hard copy and the related CD
3. Articles will be reviewed by subject reviewers, while the editors reserve the right to edit articles for format consistency without altering the substance.
4. Articles are to be written in essay style with subheading for each part, except for the introduction.
5. Research report/thesis articles should contain: (a) Title; (b) Full name of contributor(s) without title(s), and Institution; (c) Abstract (max 150 words); (d) Key words; (e) Introduction without heading, that contains rationale, problems; and previous related research findings (f) Research design; (g) Research findings; (h) Pedagogical implications; (i) Conclusion and Suggestion; (j) References
6. Non- research articles should include; (a) Title; (b) Full name of contributor(s) without title(s), and Institution; (c) Abstract (max 150 words); (d) Key words; (e) Introduction without heading, (f) body text; (g) References
7. The references should be presented alphabetically and chronologically, and be written as follows:
Hudson, T. 2007. *Reading in a Second Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Pulido, D. 2009. Developing reading skills in a foreign /second language. In Andrzej Cirocki (ed.). *Extensive reading in English language teaching*, 27-45. Muenchen, Germany: Lincom.
Watson-Gegeo, K.A. 2004. Mind, language and epistemology: Toward a language socialization paradigm for SLA. *The Modern Language Journal* 88. 331-350.
8. Manuscripts, as well as contributors' brief CV, two hard copies and CD are to be sent to the following address: EFL Education Journal Publication Team c.o. Prodi Bahasa Inggris, FKIP Jember

Chief Editor of the journal

EFL EDUCATION JOURNAL

A journal of education and research in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts
The journal appears three times a year and a subscription may begin with either the
March, July, or November issue.

The annual subscription is two hundred thousands rupiahs only for subscription
within Jember University and three hundred thousands rupiahs for the alumni and
EFL teachers from the areas outside Jember, inclusive of postage.

Please fill in the form below in block capitals, and send it to

The EFLE Journal Publisher
The English Education Program
The Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Jember University
Jl. Kalimantan No 37 Kampus Bumi Tegalboto Jember 68121
Jember

With your bank draft or money order payable to the EFL Journal publisher or send the
money to the bank account number:.....

Single issues of the Journal are available at Rp 75000/ per copy and only purchasable
directly at the English Education Program, FKIP, Jember University

For the complete list of all EFLE Journal, please send a message to the Journal
Publishers; the email address: mrsugengariyanto@yahoo.com

I have sent the bank draft of my payment in the PDF files. Please send me the EFL
Education Journal for one year, beginning with the issue for.....

Name:.....

Address:.....