

# An Exploratory Sequential Mixed Method Design to Discern Textuality Needs of Social Sciences' Researchers of Pakistan

Misbah Afsheen Khan<sup>1</sup>

Prof. Dr. Mamuna Ghani<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of English, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

<sup>2</sup> Director, Executive Training Center, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

Correspondence: Misbah Afsheen Khan, Assistant Professor, Department of English, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

E-mail: [misbah.afsheen@iub.edu.pk](mailto:misbah.afsheen@iub.edu.pk), Phone No: 03366050437

---

## Abstract

This study is an exploration-explanation based attempt to discern the textuality needs of Social Sciences Researchers in Pakistan. At first, with QUAL-priority, the phenomenon of Social Sciences Student Writers' textual incompetence was explored through a group discussion with colleagues from Social Sciences Discipline. Their responses not only mirrored the current situation of Social Sciences Researchers writing-up their dissertations/theses but also helped in the development of the Needs Analysis Questionnaire sections: Target Situation Analysis, Present Situation Analysis and The Textuality Course. The sample of Senior and Junior Researchers studying in the discipline of Social Sciences was selected through convenient and snowball sampling techniques. The obtained responses were analysed statistically and presented graphically. This exploratory sequential design of the research confirmed that Social Sciences Researchers' textual competence is insufficient enough to maintain text cohesion and coherence well. Therefore, these researchers find it very difficult to write-up their respective dissertation/thesis. This study has implications for the future. \

**Keywords:** academic writing, dissertation/thesis writing, textuality, cohesion and coherence, social sciences, needs analysis, EAP

---

## Introduction

One of the significant features of academic writing is maintaining text cohesion and coherence. The unification of information chunks into a text becomes difficult when writing an extensive argument that extends

over to hundreds of pages like in a dissertation/thesis. Moreover, text creation becomes a challenge when writing in a language that is not one's mother tongue (Thompson, 2013: 284). Generally speaking, dissertation/thesis write-up demands careful use of cohesive links and proper flow of the text from one paragraph to another to

maintain ‘the red thread’ (Golding, 2017: 53) of the lengthy argument. This is why these researchers need to develop textual competence sufficient enough to present their research process and showcase their scholarly work very well.

What is important to mention is the role of Social Sciences Researchers (SSRs) who explore and explain the possible ways to solve societal intricacies and offer research-based solutions. They make their way through various research methodologies – qualitative, quantitative or both – to gather data, analyse and interpret it for the sake of their valuable contribution to the betterment of human existence and society. They go a long way to step-by-step finish the stages of the research process with the 'last leg' of the process to be the write-up stage (Gruba & Zobel, 2017). This stage appears to be challenging for them as they need to pile the chunks of information (gathered over time) up together cohesively and coherently well to present their drafts as texts.

Presentation of the research process in writing a full-length document like thesis or dissertation involves skills of repetition, relation, comparison, differentiation, elaboration, illustration, exemplification, and description. Unlike Natural Sciences, the researchers in Social Sciences need to make extended claims and arguments, give supporting details time and again as evidence from other studies, and even refute or justify some theory. To do so, SSRs require good command over linguistic cohesiveness and coherence. They rely much on repetitions, signposting, connections and relations between

information bits to let the chaotic stuff appear organized, readable, and easy to follow.

Thesis and dissertation writing in Social Sciences involve several characteristics which are presented by various researchers like Becker (2007), Burnett (2009), Gruba and Zobel (2017) and Smith et al. (2009). These characteristics are:

- i. Selecting a researchable question
- ii. Finding enough supporting details from previous studies through a review of related literature
- iii. Selecting suitable ways of handling the researchable question
- iv. Gathering of presentable data, its analysis and interpretation as per the selected question for research
- v. Presenting a critical stance of results and its findings to discuss the researchable question in detail
- vi. Suggesting possible solutions to eradicate or improve the problem under research along with their practical implications.

Here it is an important point of note that thesis or dissertation writing conventions are almost the same in all other disciplines as are for Social Sciences. However, Social Sciences theses and dissertations involve the presentation of extended argument based on a set of hypotheses or research questions which is not required in Natural Sciences though it follows the same IMRD information pattern. The length of Social Sciences theses or dissertations increases

due to the supporting pieces of evidence, inferences, interpretations, details and arguments the researchers require for the justification of their research problem they take for the study. All this lengthy stuff needs to be organized well enough in a unified whole to look like a thesis or a dissertation.

The rationale to conduct this study came from my own experience as a supervisor at BS (Hons.) and M. Phil levels. My students could write the research process but in broken chunks with no connectedness and relatedness between/across sentences and ideas. The parts of the chapter and the chapters themselves were not found unified to make up a thesis. The cohesive links were either not used at all or if they were used they were found wrong. The lexical linkages and references (nouns and pronouns) appeared to be missing or massively repeated. Furthermore, ideas were incomprehensively presented at times due to which researchers' point of view appeared vague and incomplete. Thus, for connectedness and relatedness, the paragraphs and the information chunks needed to be shifted from one place to another. There were several unnecessary sentences embedded which needed to be removed. Moreover, recursion was found excessively used.

The researchers' inability to cope up with the textuality issues of writing-up their theses arises for many reasons though; however the most vital are two as cited in the previous studies. One of these reasons is the Higher Education Curriculum (Hunter, 2020; Khan, 2017) does not include comprehensive

coverage of textuality in the courses outlined at all three levels. In universities, Functional English Courses are taught to students in the first semester and Communication Skills Courses in the second or third semesters in almost all disciplines. These courses do not prepare students to become authors of their dissertations and theses in future. Especially, the master's or honours' students receive a sudden shock when they enter the research output stage. However, when they enter higher education programs like M. Phil. and Ph. D., the situation gets better though; but they face problem in developing connections and relations between/across sentences and paragraphs when producing an extended argument of their respective thesis. Their communicative purpose gets at stake due to poor linkages and to avoid this they contact proof-readers (proficient users of English who are very few) who demand high prices for giving their services.

Another reason for Student Writers' textual incompetence arises out of the pedagogic insufficiency to teach academic writing. It is noteworthy that current pedagogic practices to teach academic writing in Pakistani ESL setting by language teachers are outdated and ineffective (Ahmad et al., 2014; Ashraf et al., 2015; Fareed et al., 2016; Garcia, 2018; and Haider, 2012). Mostly, extensive use of a bottom-up approach to teaching writing is done i.e. the teaching of writing by focusing on parts of grammar in an atomistic way to show students how sentences are built in English. Resultantly, student writers learn to write grammatically correct sentences but fail to produce a well-knit structure of a text. For these student writers, writing a thesis cohesively and

coherently well in English is the biggest challenge. As put by Paltridge and Starfield (2020:27):

“For all students writing a thesis is a challenge, for those writing in English whose first language is not English, the challenges are even greater.”

Besides, it is important to mention the challenge for the Supervisors supervising these student writers for whom reading their drafts proves to be very hectic and effortful (see the analysis for Supervisors Responses). Though rare, their feedback appears to be more like a 'rewriting' process with lots of crosses, rethinking and redrafting sentences and paragraphs. Moreover, much time of Supervisors is spent in instructing these writers on 'Mechanics of writing'. Yet the resultant product contains information in chunks and pieces. Therefore, the Supervisors feeling all in vain, put their effort by rewriting parts of their drafts for consistency and unification purposes. This situation arises due to the insufficiency of academic writing teaching at the tertiary level. As pointed out by Biggs et al. (1999), SL student writers spend too much time on writing mechanics i.e. on constructing grammatical sentences and word-level features rather than on 'generating meaning at a higher level by organizing sentences and using appropriate words'. Consequently, the overarching themes of writing' vanish away leaving the draft unsupported and irrelevant even though well written at the sentence level. Thus, this study attempts to prove the given hypothesis:

‘SSRs’ textual competence is inadequate to produce a well-knit dissertation and thesis.’

The research objectives of this study are to

- i. explore the extent to which SSRs (master of philosophy and doctor of philosophy) lack textual knowledge to write coherently and cohesively very well (explore the subjective needs of the researchers: present situation analysis),
- ii. explain the extent to which SSRs (master of philosophy and doctor of philosophy) need to gain textual knowledge to accomplish their respective degrees very well (explain the objective needs of the researchers: target situation analysis)
- iii. find the extent to which SSRs (master of philosophy and doctor of philosophy) wish to join an ESP Textuality Course (if offered) in future.

So the present study attempts to address the textual needs of student writers from the Social Sciences discipline so that they may produce their respective dissertation or thesis as coherent texts to get their message through successfully. The present study is unique of its kind as such a study has not been conducted in Pakistan before though this problem has received enough attention worldwide. Therefore, keeping in mind the above-mentioned scenario in Pakistan, this study aims to discern the textual needs of SSRs.

## Literature Review

Textuality refers to the two important aspects of weaving a written document which is Cohesion and Coherence. These are text-centred standards (de Beaugrand & Dressler, 1992) without which a document fails to appear as a unified whole and a text. In an academic context, students need to compose assignments, reports, essays, summaries, reviews and proposals all of which are 'researched writings' (Lester & Lester Jr.: 2015, p. 19). Highly formal and purposeful researched writing is found to be of theses or dissertations written at Masters, M. Phil. and PhD levels not only in Pakistan but worldwide because they are considered to be rich communicative discourse types especially those of M. Phil. and PhD.

Research and experience show that teaching and learning EFL/ESL writing has been a sad failure (Baroudy, 2008). Similarly, Haider (2012) argues that for EFL/ESL student writers writing is one of the most difficult and complex human activities. There are several previous studies conducted in the EFL/ESL context worldwide to highlight the complexity of academic writing in English at different study levels. These can be found conducted in Pakistan (Ahmad et al., 2016; Al Hussein, 2014; Dar & Khan, 2015; Fareed et al., 2016; Haider, 2012; Ismail, 2011; Jabeen, 2013; Khan & Ghani, 2015; Khan & Khan, 2015; Muhammad Mushtaq et al., 2019; and Sajid & Siddiqui, 2015); India (Nusrat, 2016 & Shokrpour & Fallahzadeh, 2007); Iran (Ismail, 2008; Loghmani et al., 2019); Malaysia (Abdulkareem, 2013; and Ghabool et al., 2012), Arabia (Al-Fadda, 2012; May Al-Gharabally, 2015); Iraq (Muhammad,

2018; Sura Muttalak, 2019); Sudan (Alfaki, 2015) and Uzbekistan (Mustafayeva, 2018). But none of these studies has emphasized the textual incompetence of ESL/EFL student writers. Thus, the current study has moved one step further to explore the extent to which student writers are textually incompetent and require improving their ability to produce cohesive and coherent drafts of their respective thesis and dissertation.

Keeping the EFL/ESL learners' scenario, recently studies have been carried out to help novice writers in their big task of drafting their dissertation/thesis. Bruce (2018) has carried out a study on the textual expression of critical thinking in PhD Discussions in Applied Linguistics. It is a qualitative design to identify the range of textual resources used by five PhD researchers to express critical thinking in discussion parts/chapters. This study offers a kind of analytical lens to the novice writers to develop an awareness of the textual resource types available for the user to write discussions well. Similarly, Paltridge (2018) and Paltridge & Starfield (2020) have addressed the difficulties ESL students face in writing-up their theses or dissertations. They have reported that 'second language students often face difficulties meeting the demands of thesis and dissertation writing'. Their work can be taken as a complete guide for ESL student writers instead of taking it as a sole piece of research.

There is extensive literature found on the use of cohesion and coherence in EFL/ESL writings concerning problems in constructing text (Abdelreheim & Hussein,



2014; Ahmadi & Parhizgar, 2017; Alzankawi, 2017; Bahaziq, 2016; Briesmaster & Etchegaray, 2017; Coskun, 2011; Darweesh et al, 2016; Farghal, 2017; Fatimah & Yunus, 2014; Hellalet, 2013; Karadeniz, 2017; Kargozari et al., 2012; Lanjwani Jat et al., 2019; Masadeh, 2019; M. Ahmed, 2010; Mensah, 2014; Mohamad & Mudawi, 2015; and Faradhibah, 2017; and RahmatAllah, 2020) causes of textual incompetence (Sadighi & Heydari, 2012), and teaching implications to improve academic writing quality at various levels of study (Afful & Nartey, 2014; Ghasemi, 2013; Gunes et al., 2017; Menzel, 2016; Tahara, 2014; Yin, 2015; and Zhang, 2015). Few of the studies are also found discipline-specific (Alyousef & Alnasser, 2015; Liu & Qi, 2010; Nur Aktas, 2005; and Yin, 2015). It is noteworthy that some studies have been found related to the use of text features in research articles and PhD theses (Ahmad et al., 2019; Afful & Nartey, 2014; Azadina et al., 2016; Gunes, 2017; Kurniati, 2019; Sharif, 2015; and Zhang, 2015). However, none of these studies has addressed the textual incompetence of SSRs while writing-up up their dissertations or theses. These studies are summarized under separate headers as per their focus.

Moreover, there are several studies carried out to do comparative analysis in one way or the other. Medve and Takac (2013) differentiated between successful and unsuccessful EFL learners by characterizing their written compositions in terms of dominant and ineffective use of cohesive devices and topical structures. A study by Menzel (2016) attempted to lay foundations for a discourse-oriented contrastive grammar

on textual cohesion and coherence by analyzing corpus (both written and spoken) from English and German Languages. The study by Yoon-Hee Na (2011) attempted to highlight the similarities and differences in the use of cohesive devices by non-native speakers (Korean EFL learners) and native speakers (American) at the college level. Similarly, Hessamy and Hamedy (2013) tried to compare and contrast the use of cohesive devices in two different writing forms i.e. independent and integrated essays. Moreover, Yang and Sun (2012) carried out their study on Chinese EFL learners to examine their use of cohesive devices in argumentative writing at different proficiency levels. A study by Ersanli (2015) carried out their study to compare the use of cohesive devices by students from Turkish State University and native speakers of English in an academic writing context.

However, there are few studies found in the context of Pakistan which is carried out by Ahmad et al. (2019) and Lanjwani Jat et al. (2019). Ahmad et al.'s study tried to investigate organisational Skills in academic writing by analyzing research abstracts retrieved from two Pakistani Journals in terms of Coherence and Cohesion. Their study is relevant as it highlights the researchers' use of organizational skills in writing abstracts. They have found the excessive use of reference to achieve directive and referential functions of language. Furthermore, they found that researchers organize their texts at the syntactic level paying less attention to the semantic level of language. Lanjwani Jat et al.'s study attempted to investigate the organizational patterns of cohesion and

coherence in the essays of Sindh higher secondary school students. They found that students' writings lack the organisation of ideas and connectivity. This study suggested modifications to be made in their curriculum to enhance their academic writing presentation, structure and connectivity. It is important to note that there is not a single study carried out in terms of fulfilling the needs of student writers who tend to start the write-up phase of their dissertations/theses in Social Sciences. This indicates the higher levels of ignoring the stance of SSRs up till now.

The available extensive literature related to the phenomenon under the study of this research work shows the universality of the problem. However, it is quite unfortunate that this issue has received less attention in Pakistan so far. The Pakistani student writers' textual needs have hardly been addressed before by the researchers though it is a serious matter of concern country-wide especially when it comes to talking about dissertation and thesis writing in Social Sciences. Thus, the present study has attempted to address the student writers' textual needs so that they may produce their respective dissertation or thesis as coherent texts to get their message through successfully.

The present study will be significant in making the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC) to modify English Language Curriculum at all three levels of study in HEIs i.e. BS (Hons.), M. Phil and PhD. This study will make HEIs hold training and workshops locally to enable

their ESL teachers to improve their academic writing as well as pedagogic practices. Besides, this study will benefit ESL teachers to improve their pedagogic practices as per the needs of their students. The Student Writers of Pakistan will be benefitted from this research study as they are the primary stakeholders of this study.

## Methods

The study underpinned exploratory mixed methods research design. The exploration (QUAL-strand) was carried out through a group discussion with Colleagues from the Social Sciences Discipline who are currently serving in various institutes of Bahawalpur District. The sample for the discussion was selected through the snowball sampling technique as those whom I could access in the Bahawalpur City nominated other senior researchers (or supervisors) whom they knew and could contact. The QUAL-strand was the exploration-phase that resulted in the formulation of the hypothesis (see Introduction). Resultantly, the quant-strand was developed based on the needs analysis framework proposed by Dudley-Evans & St. John (1998) and Basturkmen (2010). The quant-strand consisted of a three-part needs analysis (NA) questionnaire with 15 closed-ended items in each with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree. It was the questionnaire consisted of 45 closed-ended items in total. These items were divided into three sets under three headings. Each section covered the textuality needs of the researchers. Table 3.1 depicts the questionnaire distribution as under:

**Table 3.1. Description of NA Questionnaire for Researchers and Senior Researchers**

Target Situation Analysis (TSA)	Present Situation Analysis (PSA)	The Textuality Course (TC)
15 Items	15 Items	15 Items
Minimum Score=15 Maximum Score=75	Minimum Score=15 Maximum Score=75	Minimum Score=15 Maximum Score=75
Greater the better	Lower the better	Greater the better

The research sites to collect quant-data were the post-graduate institutes of Bahawalpur and Multan, Punjab, Pakistan. These were: (i) Baghdad-ul-Jadeed Campus, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB), (ii) Bahawalnagar Campus, The IUB, (iii) Rahim Yar Khan Campus, The IUB, (iv) Govt. College for Women University, Bahawalpur, (v) the University of Education, Multan, and (vi) Bahauddin Zakria University, Multan.

The multi-stage sampling technique was employed to select the sample from five Departments of Social Sciences Discipline: Department of Economics, Department of Education, Department of History, Department of Library and Information

Sciences and Department of Media Studies. The sampling criterion used to select the sample was researchers from the Social Sciences discipline working/have worked on the first drafts of their respective dissertation or thesis. Accessing such students was very difficult. They were accessed through their Supervisors and peers as seniors or juniors or classmates who knew them and could contact them for the research purpose. Even, accessing Supervisors (also termed as Senior Researchers in this study) from other research sites was not so easy. Thus, through the snowball sampling technique, the final sample of both Senior Researchers and Junior Researchers was selected. Table 3.2 shows the multi-stage sampling:

**Table 3.2. Multi-stage Sampling**

Multi-stage Sampling		
<b>Level 1</b>	Punjab Province	Stratified Sampling
<b>Level 2</b>	Post-graduate Institutes	Purposive Sampling
<b>Level 3</b>	Social Sciences Discipline	Purposive Sampling
<b>Level 4</b>	Economics, Education, History, Library Information Sciences, Media Studies	Convenient Sampling
<b>Level 5</b>	Honours/Masters, Master of Philosophy and Doctor of	Purposive



	Philosophy	Sampling
<b>Level 6</b>	Researchers working/have worked on the first drafts of their respective dissertation or thesis (both researchers and Senior Researchers for NA questionnaire)	Snowball Sampling
<b>Level 7</b>	Senior researchers who were engaged in writing research articles (for group discussion)	Snowball Sampling

Moreover, the needs analysis questionnaires were set for both Supervisors and their students. Again, it was through Supervisors and peers (as seniors or juniors or classmates) from The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, the questionnaires were distributed and collected. The Supervisors (Senior Researchers) from this university helped to access Supervisors from other research sites whom they knew or were in

contact with either personally or professionally.

The questionnaires distributed were countless. Their distribution was made before the availability of the participants; therefore, extra questionnaires were distributed than the estimation shared by the Supervisors and peers. The number of questionnaires received in total is shown in table 3.2.

**Table 3.2. NA Questionnaires received from social sciences' researchers as participants of the study**

Program Level	Questionnaires Received	Session
Honours/Masters	52	2016-20, 2017-21
Master of Philosophy	31	2017-19, 2018-20
Doctor of Philosophy	8	2016-20, 2017-21
<b>Total</b>	91	

The detail of questionnaires received from Senior Researchers is displayed in table 3.3. below:

**Table 3.3. NA Questionnaires received from social sciences' Senior Researchers as participants of the study**

Senior Supervising Researchers at various Program Levels	Questionnaires Received
Honours/Masters	12

Master of Philosophy	9
Doctor of Philosophy	5
Total	26

The discussion responses were descriptively analysed; whereas, the average was used as a statistical procedure to show participants' responses. Tables are used to show quantitative analysis.

### Analysis

The responses collected through group discussion gave rise to the following points:

- i. The senior researchers responded that they were engaged in writing research articles for publication purposes. Whatever their specific area of research is, they need to write in English medium connecting and relating the underlying idea. They further shared that their compulsion to write in English medium is because national journals of good repute (HEC recognized journals) demand so. Moreover, some of them were writing the first drafts of their Ph. D. thesis; so they were of the view that writing in English is a compulsion for them as their theses will be evaluated by two International experts at this level of study. Almost all of the researchers were serving in HEIs. Thus, they were also supervising students at Honours/Masters, M. Phil. and Ph. D.
- ii. The level of difficulty, for these researchers, is still high while they write their research articles/theses chapters. They shared that they take time in writing the research process to give it the shape of a text. They frankly shared that they find it very difficult to develop connections and relations between/across sentences, paragraphs and ideas. Every time they revise their draft, they find paragraphs and ideas separate and broken. They added that they experience depression while writing-up the research process as they cannot shape up their drafts as perfectly as they wish to.
- iii. All of them agreed that the proofreading process takes much time. At first, they need to access proofreaders who can proofread their drafts for coherence and cohesive links. Second, they require paying heavy amounts to these proofreaders for the task. Third, they require spending time on the editing of drafts to confirm if the proofreading process does not disturb the underlying concept.

- iv. Submitting the drafts before a deadline, according to them, is the biggest matter of concern. Thus, they try to access an expert user of English to proofread their articles/chapter drafts in terms of coherency and cohesiveness. They further added that it is unfortunate that courses to improve English writing skill in terms of developing connections and achieve communicative goals properly have never offered.
- v. They showed keen interest in joining a separate course if offered in future. They wished to have such a course offered soon not just for them but also their research students as they need it direly too.
- iii. SSRs face difficulty in linking and relating ideas within and across the following organizational patterns in their theses:
  - a. Abstract
  - b. Introduction of the Study
  - c. Background of the Problem
  - d. Statement of the Problem
  - e. Research Objectives, Hypotheses and Questions
  - f. Theoretical Framework
  - g. Research Design and Procedure
  - h. Results and Findings
  - i. Discussion and Conclusion
- iv. SSRs direly need to improve their writing skill in terms of cohesion and coherence.

The understanding based on the above-mentioned points is generated in the form of the given statements:

- i. Documenting the research process is a tiresome job for SSRs as they lack competence in writing cohesively and coherently well.
- ii. SSRs are good at constructing meaningful sentences but are

This understanding helped to develop NA questionnaires for Junior Researchers as well as for Senior Researchers. The reliability of the questionnaire was checked which proved to be excellent in all three sections and total. Table 4.1 shows the alpha values of three separate sections along with their cumulative reliability.

**Table 4.1. Reliability analysis**

	TSA	PSA	TC	Cumulative
Cronbach's Alpha	0.967	0.974	0.974	0.904
N of Items	15	15	15	45

The responses collected through NA questionnaires are presented in the figures below:

Sr. No .	Target Situation Analysis: Average of the Responses of Researchers	Target Situation Analysis: Average of the Responses of Senior Researchers
1	4.415254	5
2	4.415254	4.866667
3	4.610169	4.733333
5	4.584746	4.666667
6	4.550847	4.8
7	4.550847	4.8
8	4.584746	4.733333
9	4.550847	4.6
10	4.550847	4.6
11	4.550847	4.6
12	4.550847	4.466667
13	4.70339	4.733333
14	4.627119	5
15	4.957627	5

Senior Researchers' responses range between 4.4 and 5.0; whereas those of Junior Researchers' range between 4.4 and 4.9. There is a slight difference between their responses though, but their average ranges are high which indicate that

researchers must attain textual competence for the accomplishment of their respective degree. Textual competence includes the ability to establish connections between/across sentences and ideas to achieve the communicative purpose.

**Table 4.1. One sample t-test**

One-Sample Statistics	Mean	Std. Deviation
Average of responses of Researchers: Target Situation Analysis	4.5836	0.12565
Average of responses of Senior Researchers: Target Situation Analysis	4.7511	0.16226

Table 4.1. displays the difference between the means of the responses collected from Senior Researchers and Junior Researchers. Senior Researchers' mean is higher which indicates the higher emphasis they seem to put on the importance of coherency and

cohesive links as experts. Comparatively, Junior Researchers' mean shows that they seem to have less understanding of the phenomenon than what Senior Researchers appear to have perceived.

**Table 4.3. Present situation analysis**

Sr. No.	Present Situation Analysis: Average of the Responses of Researchers	Present Situation Analysis: Average of the Responses of Senior Researchers
1	1.483050847	1.466666667
2	1.491525424	1.466666667
3	1.491525424	1.466666667
4	1.491525424	1.466666667
5	1.584745763	1.6
6	1.771186441	1.733333333
7	1.584745763	1.6
8	1.56779661	1.533333333
9	1.584745763	1.533333333
10	1.584745763	1.533333333
11	1.584745763	1.533333333
12	1.593220339	1.533333333
13	4.372881356	4.066666667
14	4.423728814	4.4
15	4.466101695	4.466666667

The average range of Senior Researchers' responses is lower than that of Junior Researchers. This seems to indicate that they (as experts) believe their students' capacity (as researchers) in terms of establishing connections between/across sentences and ideas is not good enough to accomplish their 'write-up' task; therefore, they require professional help to get their drafts checked

for coherency and cohesiveness. However, the Junior Researchers' responses show the present situation of their textual competence to be better. Little contrast has been found between the two ranges though, but the average of both ranges is low and confirms that SSRs' present textual competence needs to be up to the standards of the research task



they conduct but fail to shape it in a text structure.

**Table 4.4. One sample t-test: Present situation analysis**

One-Sample Statistics	Mean	Std. Deviation
Average of responses of Researchers: Present Situation Analysis	2.138418	1.183486753
Average of responses of Senior Researchers: Present Situation Analysis	2.093333	1.152719352

The t-test means score indicates the slight difference between the two ranges of the responses. The Junior Researchers seem to believe their present textual competence to be better as compared to what Senior

Researchers have perceived it to be. But it is noteworthy here that this difference is minimal and insignificant to leave an impact on the findings.

**Table 4.5. The textuality course**

Sr. No.	The Textuality Course: Average of the Responses of Researchers	The Textuality Course: Average of the Responses of Senior Researchers
1	4.915254237	4.933333333
2	4.483050847	4.8
3	4.63559322	4.8
4	4.601694915	4.733333333
5	4.762711864	4.866666667
6	4.601694915	4.866666667
7	4.491525424	4.666666667
8	4.601694915	4.8
9	4.677966102	4.733333333
10	4.601694915	4.733333333
11	4.601694915	4.866666667
12	4.601694915	4.866666667
13	4.745762712	4.733333333
14	4.974576271	4.933333333
15	4.983050847	5

Like target situation analysis, here the range of Senior Researchers' responses is higher than that of Junior Researchers. But as the difference is found to be slight, therefore, the interpretation will be the same i.e. there is a need to design a separate textuality

course for SSRs to develop their capacity in terms of establishing links and weave a unified text to fulfil the communicative purpose with which they conduct research work.

**Table 4.6. One sample t-test: the textuality course**

One-Sample Statistics	Mean	Std. Deviation
Average of responses of Researchers: An ESP Textuality Course	4.68531 1	0.159861621
Average of responses of Senior Researchers: An ESP Textuality Course	4.82222 2	0.093151751

The t-test presents the mean of the average range of responses collected from Senior Researchers as experts and SSRs. Like target situation analysis and present situation analysis, there is a slight variation with insignificant difference between their perception. Both groups believe that there is a dire need for researchers to join a separate textuality course to get their textual competence enhanced; thus, the textuality course needs to be designed and offered to them in future.

## Discussion

The study has explored that SSRs lack good textual competence; that is why they cannot establish links between/across sentences and ideas while writing-up a dissertation or thesis. It has been found that these researchers direly need a separate course to enhance their textual competence to achieve communicative competence. Thus, the results show that there is a need to design an

ESP/EAP textuality course for the researchers to facilitate them in the accomplishment of the big task of 'write-up' of their respective dissertation or thesis.

Thus, SSRs being ESL learners lack textual competence and cannot maintain cohesion and coherence in their writings. This finding is most relevant to the findings of Ahmad et al. (2019), M. Ahmed (2010) and Lanjwani Jat et al. (2019). The results of the Needs Analysis show that SSRs being ESL learners are limited English users who cannot maintain text cohesion and coherence when writing an extended document like a dissertation or thesis. This finding is supported with the pieces of evidence from the studies carried out by Abdulaheim and Hussain (2014), Afful and Nartey (2014), Alzankawi (2017), Azadnia et al. (2016), Ersanli (2015), Gunes (2017), Lanjwani Jat et al. (2019), M. Ahmed (2010), Kargozari et al. (2012), Kurniati (2019), Medve and

Takac (2013), Mensah (2014), Sadighi and Hedari (2012), Sharif (2015), Yang and Sun (2012), Yoon-Hee Na (2011), and Zhang (2018). It is noteworthy that these studies are conducted in the EFL/ESL context that is why their results and findings are relevant to the finding of the present study. However, these studies are different from the present study in terms of their research objectives, aims, and methods.

The NA results also need to be interpreted cautiously. As SSRs are ESL learners of Pakistan, they face a lot of problems to maintain cohesion and coherence thoroughly. Their situation is not different from EFL/ESL learners worldwide. They are alike all those student writers who are dealt with in the previous studies so far conducted with a similar focus. This shows the universality of the issue of English textuality. Thus, it would not be wrong to say that English textuality is a matter of concern for EFL/ESL learners worldwide. With the globalization of the English language, the problem of maintaining text cohesion and coherence has also become a globalised phenomenon. What is of much concern in Pakistan is that this issue was not dealt with by any researcher before to support SSRs and to help them become successful authors.

Keeping the results of NA in view, there is a need to propose an ESP Textuality Course for SSRs for the enhancement of their textual competence. This will be an intervention course as suggested in the

studies by Abdelreheim and Hussein (2014), Bahaziq (2016), Briesmaster and Etchegaray (2017), Darweesh et al. (2016), and Gunes (2017). In these studies, the explicit teaching and learning of cohesive links and coherence are recommended in the form of intervention. Cheung (2018) used the Coherence-creating mechanism as an intervention to see its influence on the development of coherence in expository essays. This proved to be useful in creating a significant influence on the development of coherence. This study can be taken as evidence showing the effectiveness of intervention sessions or courses. Thus, explicit teaching and learning of cohesive links and coherence may enable SSRs to get their understanding enhanced.

The current level of textual incompetence among SSRs may indicate their English proficiency to be narrow. The researchers whose English proficiency is narrow are those who have good academic English reading knowledge and weaker written or oral abilities (Paltridge & Starfield, 2020: 25). These researchers are termed as narrowly English proficient (NEP) researchers by Swales (2004). Furthermore, the researchers are termed as Junior and Senior by Paltridge and Starfield (2020:26) in terms of research, writing and publication. They have presented a matrix of interrelationships between the level of English language proficiency (NEP and BEP) and researcher status (senior and junior). That matrix has been presented in the form of a table below:

**Table 6. Interrelationships between the level of English proficiency and researcher status (2020:26)**

	<b>NARROW PROFICIENCY</b>	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	<b>BROAD PROFICIENCY</b>	<b>ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>
<b>SENIOR RESEARCHERS</b>	Could benefit from an academic writing support			Pretty much ok
<b>JUNIOR RESEARCHERS</b>	Need academic English and academic literacy support especially for thesis writing		May benefit from an explicit thesis writing support	

Paltridge and Starfield have mentioned that researchers, both senior and junior, can have narrow English proficiency (NEP). For senior researchers with NEP, an academic writing support program can be beneficial whereas, there shall be academic English and academic literacy support program for thesis writing for a junior researcher with NEP. To Swales 'NEP individuals are typically those who are identified as needing further EAP [English for Academic Purposes] help' (2004:57).

To help Pakistani ESL Student Writers to be successful authors of their dissertations/theses, there is a need to base ESL teachers pedagogic practices to teach writing at tertiary level on the concepts of Halliday's (1975, 1985a, 1985b & 1995) textual function, Cook's (1998) discourse grammar, Canale's (1983) and Celce-Murcia et al.'s (1995) discourse competence and Bachman's (1990) textual competence. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 1-2):

"A text is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit, like a

clause or a sentence; and it is not defined by its size... A text is not something that is like a sentence, only bigger; it is something that differs from a sentence in kind...A text is best regarded as a SEMANTIC unit: a unit not of form but of meaning. Thus it is related to a clause or sentence not by size but by REALIZATION, the coding of one symbolic system in another. A text does not CONSIST OF sentences; it is REALIZED BY, or encoded in sentences..."

Weaving a text significantly varies from constructing grammatical sentences. It has an attribute of unity in terms of structure and texture (Halliday & Hasan, 1985). This attribute is absent in sentences that are mostly constructed for teaching sentence grammar. It is this attribute of being a unified whole that text performs its communicative functions. The textual component enables the readers to understand the ideational and interpersonal meanings of the text (Halliday, 2002:26). Otherwise, reading becomes an effortful process

making readers lose their interest in the message of the text because it is the function of the textual component to create text and to keep apart language in the abstract and language in use. In other words, 'it is through the semantic options of the textual component that language comes to be relevant to its environment' (Halliday, 2002: 29).

Moreover, teaching text production is complex as compared to the teaching of sentences and grammar within them. That is why; ESL teachers seem to prefer teaching writing skill through sentence grammar without emphasizing the underlying message. Resultantly, the message gets in pieces increasing readers' effort to make meaning out of what the writer wants to report or inform. Like Halliday, Cook (1998) has differentiated sentence grammar from discourse grammar. According to him, sentence grammar stops with a full stop but discourse grammar goes beyond sentences and continues to expand over a complete book or volume. This difference calls for the different treatment of the two aspects within the ESL context. However, in Pakistan, the writing of texts is taught with the help of sentence grammar putting behind the actual need i.e. teaching of writing through discourse/textual grammar. This worsens the situation as much of the time of student writers gets wasted in preparing themselves for the 'write-up' phase. They do not jot their ideas right from the beginning due to which their 'write-up' process gets delayed. As put by Paltridge and Starfield (2020:45):

"One of the impediments to writing can be the idea of delaying writing until a few months before the thesis is due and then sitting down to write it up'."

Thus, the thesis being a lengthy, extended, formal and structured piece of researched writing (Becker, 2007; Burnett, 2009; Golding et al., 2017; Gruba & Zobel, 2017; Paltridge & Starfield, 2020; and Smith et al., 2009) follows several academic writing conventions. So, one has to keep in mind that there is often a relationship between the quality of the presentation and the quality of scientific results (Johnston, 1997:340). Evans et al. (2014: 153-155) have also mentioned characteristics of high and low-quality doctoral theses. The qualities of a good thesis to be well presented coherently and cohesively are mentioned in the following words:

- i. It is well planned and executed, with each section building on the last.
- ii. There is clear signposting and linking between paragraphs, sections, and chapters. The thesis consistently (but not repetitively) reminds the reader of the purpose, argument, or overall thrust of the thesis. (cited from Paltridge & Starfield, 2020:19)

The opposite of these characteristic features of good quality thesis categorises the bad thesis. A badly written thesis is mentioned as to 'have no clear connection between the focus of the study and the logic and



foundations of the research on which it is based' (Evans et al., 2014: 153; cited from Paltridge & Starfield, 2020: 19). It is significant to note that here importance has been laid on the links between/across sentences and ideas throughout dissertation and thesis writing. This is the clear evidence that supports the notion of thesis and dissertation to be cohesively and coherently well presented for the sake of accomplishing the respective degree. Such evidence has been found in the following words too that strengthens this study:

"An important feature of a well-written text is the unity and connectedness with which individual sentences relate to each other. This is, in part, the result of how ideas are presented in the text, but it also depends on how the writer has created cohesive links within and between paragraphs in the text." (Paltridge & Suefield, 2020: 19)

It is interesting to note that the English language has been termed as 'writer responsible' language because it is the writer's responsibility to make sense of the text clear for the reader which is not the case in other languages like Japanese which has been termed as 'reader responsible' (Paltridge & Starfield, 2020: 19). Therefore, when writing in English, ESL learners need to take care of connections and relations between/across sentences and paragraphs; without which, the text appears vague and loses the strength of its argument for the examiners. Thus, writing dissertations and

theses with a good level of English proficiency is an important matter of concern for social sciences' researchers in Pakistan. As mentioned by Paltridge and Starfield (2020):

"A completed thesis or dissertation is never simply a description of what you read and what you did, it is a sustained argument developed over the entire thesis, supported by evidence, usually from your study, and supported by you've read, in which you attempt to persuade the reader – your supervisor and the examiners – of the validity of the claims you are making and of the arguments you are putting forward." (p.45)

### Recommendations

To help and facilitate the thesis and dissertation writers, many researchers have recommended solutions to their textual problem. These are presented in the form of points below:

- i. There are several prompts as a useful strategy to create text the thesis writers can use in the early stages of their research as recommended by Murray (2017:118-19). On all, these prompts consist of 325 words which can work better to make a start with thesis writing. The prompts are presented as under:

**Sr. No. Prompts for ‘The context/background to my research’ Word limit**

1	My research question is ...	50
2	Researchers who have looked at this subject are ...	50
3	They argue that ...	25
4	Smith argues that ...	25
5	Brown argues that ...	25
6	Debate centres on the issue of ...	25
7	There is still work to be done on ...	25
8	My research is closest to that of X in that ...	50
9	My contribution will be ...	50

- ii. The thesis and dissertation writers can benefit from the guidelines suggested by Golding (2017:53) and the tools (p.54) to write coherently well. The tools are presented as under:

Sr. No.	Tools	Bottom-line
1	Use of meta-text and signposting	Writing about what you are writing
2	Writing summaries and previews	Write previews in the beginnings and Summaries at the ends of the chapters
3	Use of backward and forward references	Developing reference chains
4	Use of repetition	Main idea repetition in chapters to maintain coherence
5	Do what you say	Write what you have done – so keep revising the first chapters for the sake of any change
6	Stay consistent	Words and ideas shall be consistent

- iii. There are three simple rules suggested by Hartley and Cabanac (2016) for making thesis text easier to read. These rules are given below:

Rule No. 1	Rule No. 2	Rule No. 3
If a paragraph is too long split it in two.	Long sentences can be split into two or more.	Examine each sentence, in turn, to see if you can delete two or more words from each one.

- iv. Explicit instruction on how to structure a thesis, organize ideas in paragraphs and chapters has been recommended by many researchers (Biggs et al., 1999; Torrance & Thomas, 1994; Paltridge & Starfield, 2020). According to them, explicit instruction will benefit all writers – both NEs and NNEs. ESP/EAP course may be beneficial to assist such students.
- v. Extensive reading of the related books and articles will be beneficial for the thesis writers to pay attention to the structure and linguistic resources. Extensive reading can enable thesis writers to employ the ‘language re-use strategy’ (Flowerdew & Li, 2007) (Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999; Flowerdew, 1999; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Shaw, 1991).
- vi. Like ‘language re-use strategy’, the use of ‘sentence skeleton’ or ‘template’ as a model to build a paragraph on by using the discipline-specific content has been recommended by Swales

and Feak (2012), Cargill and O’Connor (2009) and Thomson and Kamler (2016).

- vii. There are several guide books internationally written and published to ease the writing process of theses and dissertations for ESL/EFL student writers whose first language is other than the English language. Some of the guide books are enlisted here for convenience:

### Conclusion

The current study attempted to discern the textual needs of SSRs in Southern Punjab, Pakistan. The thesis writers in social sciences cannot draft their thesis coherently. Sustaining a coherent argument is a problem for them as in social sciences theses and dissertations are lengthier than other disciplines. Maintaining coherence and cohesive links becomes a challenge for them. Double gets the challenge for their Supervisors who read their initial drafts to give feedback. As academic reader, their effort to process their students' drafts to gain understanding gets doubled too. Moreover, prolonged revision time is taken by these

researchers to reach up to the International standards of research and publication for the sake of getting the degree accomplished.

This phenomenon has not been explored by any researcher in Pakistan though many pieces of research have been carried out to facilitate ESL/EFL thesis writers at master and doctoral levels with a general as well as a specific focus on their textual incompetence. However, this study has attempted to explore and explain this phenomenon by doing needs analysis through exploratory sequential research design. Further, a similar study can be conducted by doing manual text or discourse analysis of the drafts produced by these researchers. Moreover, corpus analysis can also be done through an online service 'Coh-Metrix.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research paper has been extracted from the PhD Thesis entitled 'Designing an ESP Textuality Course for Social Sciences Researchers of Pakistan' by Misbah Afsheen Khan, supervised by Prof. Dr. Mamuna Ghani (Director, Executive Training Center (ETC), The Islamia University of Bahawalpur) and has been published in the partial fulfillment of requirement of the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy in Linguistics from the department of English, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur Pakistan.

## References

1. Abdelreheim, Hussein Maghawry Hussein. 2014. A Corpus-Based Discourse Analysis of Grammatical Cohesive Devices Used in

Expository Essays Written by Emirati EFL Learners at Al Ghazali School, Abu Dhabi. PhD. Dissertation, The British University in Dubai (BUiD), Dubai, UAE.

2. Abdulkareem, M. N. 2013. An Investigation Study of Academic Writing Problems faced by Arab Postgraduate Students at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9). 1552-1557.  
DOI: [10.4304/tpls.3.9.1552-1557](https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.9.1552-1557).
3. Abdulkerim Karadeniz. 2017. Cohesion and Coherence in Written Texts of Students of Faculty of Education. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*. Vol. 5, No. 2. Redfame Publishing  
doi:10.11114/jets.v5i2.1998
4. Afful, J. B. A., & Nartey, M. (2014). Cohesion in the abstracts of undergraduate dissertations: An intra-disciplinary study in a Ghanaian university. *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL)*, 2(1): 93-108.
5. Ahmed, Abdelhamid. (2010). Students' Problems with Cohesion and Coherence in EFL Essay Writing in Egypt: Different Perspectives. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal*. 10.20533/licej.2040.2589.2010.0030.
6. Ahmed, F., Amin, R. U., & Qureshi, A. W. (2016). Error analysis: A study of Pakistani second language learners' written compositions. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 2, 167-176.

7. Ahmadi, A. & Parhizgar, S. (2017). Coherence Errors in Iranian EFL Learners' Writing: A Rhetorical Structure Theory Approach, *Journal of Language Horizons*, Alzahra University, 1 (1). DOI: 10.22051/lghor.2017.8588.1011.
8. Ahmad, I. Rehman, K. Ali, A. Khan, I. and Khan, F. A. 2014. Critical Analysis of the Problems of Education in Pakistan: Possible Solutions. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 3(2). Pp. 79-84.
9. Ahmad, M. Mahmood, M. A. & Siddique, A. R. 2019. Organisational Skills in Academic Writing: A Study on Coherence and Cohesion in Pakistani Research Abstracts. *MDPI Languages*. 4(4). 1-25. DOI: [10.3390/languages4040092](https://doi.org/10.3390/languages4040092)
10. Ahmad, N., Khan, F. N., Munir, N., et al. (2013). Factors affecting the learning of English at secondary school level in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(2), 95-101.
11. Al-Fadda, H. 2012. Difficulties in Academic Writing: From the Perspective of King Saud University Postgraduate Students. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3). 123-130. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n3p123
12. Alfaki, I. M. 2015. University Students' English Writing Problems: Diagnosis and Remedy. *International Journal of English Language Teaching* 3(3). 40-52.
13. Al Hussein, S. S. (2014). ACADEMIC WRITING SKILLS DEMONSTRATED IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' FINAL YEAR PROJECT REPORTS, AND IMPLICATIONS ON THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES, IN THE ARAB WORLD. *European Scientific Journal*, ESJ, 10(10). <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2014.v10n10p%20>
14. Alyousef, H. S. & Alnasser, S. M. 2015. A Study of Cohesion in International Post-graduate Students' Multimodal Management Accounting Texts. *Arab World English Journal*, 6(3). 30-46.
15. Alzankawi, M. 2017. "[Kuwaiti Undergraduate Problems with Cohesion in EFL Writing](#)," [Proceedings of International Academic Conferences](#) 5807931, International Institute of Social and Economic Sciences.
16. Angelova, M., & Riazantseva, A. (1999). "If You Don't Tell Me, How Can I Know?" A Case Study of Four International Students Learning to Write the US Way. *Written communication*, 16(4), 491-525.
17. Ashraf, I. Ashraf, F. Saeed, I. Gulzar, H. Shah, K. Azhar, N. Bukhari, S. R. Ilyas, T. & Anam, W. 2015. Reasons for Low Performance of Teachers: A Study of Government Schools Operating in Bahawalpur City, Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive*



- Education and Development, 4(2).  
Doi: 10.6007/IJARPED/v4-i2/1764.
18. Azadina, M. Biria, R. & Lotfi, A. R. 2016. A Corpus-based Study of Text Cohesion by CohMetrix: Contrastive Analysis of L1/L2 PhD Dissertations. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 6(2).
  19. Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford university press.
  20. Bahaziq, A. (2016). Cohesive devices in written discourse: a discourse analysis of a student's essay writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(7), 112-119. DOI: 10.5539/elt.v9n7p112"
  21. Baroudy, I. 2008. *Process Writing: Successful and Unsuccessful Writers; Discovering Writing Behaviour*. *International Journal of English Studies* 8(2).p. 43-63. DOI: [10.6018/ijes.8.2.49171](https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.8.2.49171).
  22. Basturkmen, H. 2010. *Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
  23. Becker, H. S. 2020. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Chicago Guides to Writing, Editing and Publishing.
  24. Biggs, J., Lai, P., Tang, C. and Lavelle, E. (1999) 'Teaching writing to ESL graduate students: a model and an illustration', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69: 293–306.
  25. : Briesmaster, M. and Etchegaray, P. (2017). Coherence and cohesion in EFL students' writing production: The impact of a metacognition-based intervention. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura* 22(2), 183-202. DOI: 10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n02a02
  26. Bruce, I. (2018). *The textual expression of critical thinking in PhD discussions in applied linguistics*.
  27. Burnett, J. 2009. *Doing Your Social Sciences Dissertation*. SAGE Publications. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446279717](https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446279717)
  28. Canale, Michael. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In *Language and Communication*. Edited by Jack C. Richards and Richards W. Schmidt. London: Longman, pp. 2–27.
  29. Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35.
  30. Cheung, Y. L., & Lee, J. P. A. (2018). The influence of coherence-creating mechanisms on the development of coherence in expository essays: A case study. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 20(4).
  31. Cook, G. 1998. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  32. Coskun, E. 2011. Cohesion in Compositions of Turkish and Immigrant Students. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(2). Pp. 892-899.

33. Darweesh, A. D. & Kadhim, S. A. H. 2016. Iraqi EFL Learners' Problems in Using Conjunctions as Cohesive Devices. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(11). Pp. 169-180.
34. De Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. (1992). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.
35. Dudley-Evans, T. & St. John, M. J. 1998. *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36. Evans, D. Gruba, P. & Zobel, J. 2014. *How to Write a Better Thesis*. Springer International Publishing. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-04286-2.
37. Ersanli, C. Y. 2015. Insights from a Learner Corpus as Opposed to a Native Corpus about Cohesive Devices in an Academic Writing Context. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 3(12): 1049-1053. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2015.031214
38. Faradhibah, R. N. 2017. *Analyzing Students' Difficulties in Maintaining their Coherence and Cohesion in Writing Process*. Master's Dissertation. Tarbiyah Teaching Science Faculty, UIN Alanddin Makassar.
39. Fareed M., Ashraf A., Bilal M., 2016. ESL Learners' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*. [Electronic resource]. URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311669829\\_ESL\\_Learners'\\_Writing\\_Skills\\_Problems\\_Factors\\_and\\_Suggestions/](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311669829_ESL_Learners'_Writing_Skills_Problems_Factors_and_Suggestions/) (date of access: 23.03.2018).
40. Farghal, M. 2017. Textual Issues Relating to Cohesion and Coherence in Arabic/English Translation. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature* Vol.9, No. 1, 2017. pp 29-50.
41. Fatimah, S. N. & Yunus, M. M. (2014). The Use of Lexical Cohesion among TESL Post Graduate Students in Academic Writing, *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3 (2), 847-869. Retrieved from [http://jehdnet.com/journals/jehd/Vol\\_3\\_No\\_2\\_June\\_2014/52.pdf](http://jehdnet.com/journals/jehd/Vol_3_No_2_June_2014/52.pdf).
42. Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Language re-use among Chinese apprentice scientists writing for publication. *Applied linguistics*, 28(3), 440-465.
43. Garcia, M. I. M. 2018. Improving University Students' Writing Skills in Pakistan. *The European Educational Researcher*. Doi: 10.31757/euer.111.
44. Ghabool N., Edwina M., Kashef S.H., 2012. Investigating Malaysian ESL Students' Writing Problems on Conventions, Punctuation, and Language Use at Secondary School Level. *Journal of Studies in Education*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jse/article/viewFile/1892/1733/> (date of access: 26.03.2018).

45. Ghasemi, M. (2013). An investigation into the use of cohesive devices in second language writings. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(9), 1615. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.9.1615-1623>
46. Golding, C. 2017. Advice for writing a thesis (based on what examiners do. *Open Review of Educational Research*. 4:1, 46-60, DOI: 10.1080/23265507.2017.1300862.
47. Gruba, P. & Zobel, J. 2017. *How to Write Your First Thesis*. Springer International Publishing.
48. Gunes, H. 2017. A Corpus-based Study of Linking Adverbials through Constrastive Analysis of L1/L2 PhD Dissertations. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 9(2), 21-38.
49. Haider, G. 2012. Process Approach in Writing: Issues and Implications for Teaching in Pakistan. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(2). Pp. 147-150.
50. Haider, G. 2012. An Insight into Difficulties Faced By Pakistani Student Writers: Implications for Teaching of Writing. *Journal of Educational and Social Research* 2 (3). DOI: [10.5901/jesr.2012.v2n3p17](https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2012.v2n3p17).
51. Halliday, M. A. K. (1985a). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
52. Halliday, M. A. K. (1985b). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
53. Halliday, MAK. 1994. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd edition, London: Edward Arnold.
54. Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). *Linguistic studies of text and discourse*. (Collected works of M.A.K. Halliday). London: Continuum.
55. Halliday, M. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
56. Hartley, J. & Cabanac, G. 2016. *Simplifying Text: Three Rules for Making Academic Text Easier to Read*. Doctoral Writing SIG. <https://doctoralwriting.wordpress.com/2016/08/22/simplifying-text-three-rules-for-making-academic-text-easier-to-read/>
57. Hessamy G.R. & Hamedy S. (2013). A comparison of the use of cohesion devises in EFL learners' performance in independent vs integrated writing Tasks. *Study in English language Teaching* 1(1) 121-146
58. Hellalet, N. (2013). Textual coherence in EFL Student Writing, *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 15 (3). Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosrjhss/papers/Vol15-issue3/J01535458.pdf>
59. Hunter, R. 2020. Education in Pakistan. *World Education News and Reviews*. World Education Services (WES).

- [www.wenr.wes.org/2020/02/education-in-pakistan](http://www.wenr.wes.org/2020/02/education-in-pakistan).
60. Ilyas, A.I. (2014). Cohesive devices in the short suras of the Glorious Quran. Arab World English Journal, special issue on translation (3), 135-146.
  61. Jobling, M. M. Cargill and P. O'Connor: Writing scientific research articles: strategy and steps. Aquacult Int **18**, 705–706 (2010).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10499-009-9261-7>
  62. Johnston, S. (1997). Examining the examiners: An analysis of examiners' reports on doctoral theses. Studies in higher education, 22(3), 333-347.
  63. Kargozari, H.R., Ghaemi, H., & Heravi, M.A. (2012). Cohesive Devices in Argumentative, Descriptive, and Expository Writing Produced by Iranian Efl University Students. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 2, 25.
  64. Khan, S. I. 2017. An Investigation of the Concept of Critical Thinking in the Context of a Functional English Course in a Bed Degree in Pakistan. PhD Dissertation, University of Glasgow, School of Education. UK.
  65. KURNIATI, Ruri Fadhilah. CONJUNCTIONS IN INDONESIAN UNDERGRADUATE THESIS ABSTRACTS. *ETNOLINGUAL*, [S.l.], v. 3, n. 1, p. 27-42, may 2019. ISSN 2580-0280. Available at: <https://e-journal.unair.ac.id/ETNO/article/view/12059>>. Date accessed: 06 feb. 2021.
  66. Lanjwani Jat, A., Jarah, A., Channa, S., & Mirani, J. (2020). An investigation of Students' Organizational Problems of Cohesion and Coherence in English Essay Writing at Higher Secondary Levels of Sindh, Pakistan. *International Journal Of Social Sciences, Humanities And Education*, 3(4), 244-252. Retrieved from <http://www.ijsshe.com/index.php/ijsshe/article/view/149>
  67. Lee, I. (2002). Helping Students Develop. Coherence. In Forum. US Department of State.
  68. Lester, J. D., & Lester, J. D. (2016). Writing research papers: a complete guide (Fifteenth edition.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
  69. Liu, L. & Qi, X. 2010. A Contrastive Study of Textual Cohesion and Coherence Errors in Chinese EFL Abstract Writing in Engineering Discourse. *Intercultural Communication Studies* XIX: 3.
  70. Loghmani, Z., Ghonsooly, B., & Ghazanfari, M. (2019). Textual engagement of native English speakers in doctoral dissertation Discussion sections. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 78-107.
  71. May Al-Gharabally. 2015. The Writing Difficulties Faced by L2 Learners and How to Minimize

- them. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 3(5). 42-49.
72. Masadeh, T. S. 2019. Cohesion and Coherence in the Writings of Saudi Undergraduates Majoring in English. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(3). Pp. 200-208.
  73. Medve, V. B., & Takač, V. P. (2013). The influence of cohesion and coherence on text quality: A cross-linguistic study of foreign language learners' written production. In *Language in cognition and affect* (pp. 111-131). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35305-5\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35305-5_7)
  74. Mensah, G. (2014). Cohesion in the Essays of Final Year Senior High School Students in Accra Academy, Thesis (MPhil), University of Ghana. Retrieved from <http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh/handle/123456789/8133>.
  75. Menzel, K. Lapshinova-Koltunski, E. & Kunz, K. 2017. Cohesion and coherence in multilingual contexts. In Katrin Menzel, Ekaterina LapshinovaKoltunski & Kerstin Kunz (eds.), *New perspectives on cohesion and coherence*, 1–11. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.814458
  76. MD NAIM, Irwan Affendi. 2020. Enhancing Students' Writing Performance in Higher Learning through Think-Write-Pair-Share: An Experimental Study. **Asian Journal of University Education**, 16( 3), p. 255-264. ISSN 2600-9749. Available at:  
<<http://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/AJUE/article/view/8396>>. Date accessed: 13 jan. 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v16i3.8396>.
  77. Mohamed, S.Y.S. & Mudawi, A.K. (2015). Investigating the use of cohesive devices in English as the second language writing skills. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*, 6(4), 3484-3487.
  78. Muhammad, M. Q. 2018. Difficulties of Iraqi EFL Learners with Substance Errors in Writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 5(3). 131-147.
  79. Muhammad Mushtaq, Mahmood, M. A. & Ismail, M. K. A. et al. 2019. A Corpus-based Analysis of EFL Learners' Errors in Written Composition at Intermediate Level. *Indian Journal of Natural Sciences* 9(52).
  80. Murray, R. 2017. *How to Write a Thesis*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Open University Press: McGraw Hill Education.
  81. Mustafayeva, M. A. 2018. Approaches to Teaching Writing. Текст научной статьи по специальности «Языкознание и литературоведение».
  82. Nasser, S. M. 2019. Iraqi EFL Students' Difficulties in Writing Composition: An Experimental Study. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 9(1). DOI:[10.5539/ijel.v9n1p178](https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n1p178).



83. Nusrat, A. 2016. DEVELOPING ESL LEARNERS' WRITING SKILLS: A NEEDS ANALYSIS. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, ISSN: 2165-6266 :: 05(02):251–264.
84. Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. 2020. *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Routledge.  
<https://bookshelf.vitalsource.com/books/9781351690669>.
85. Paltridge, B. 2018. *Theses and Dissertations in English for Specific Purposes*. Wiley Publishers.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1211.pub2>
86. RahmatAllah, E. A. E. 2020. EFL Students' Coherence Skill in Writing: A Case Study of Third Year Students of Bachelors in English Language. *English Language Teaching: Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 13(8). Pp. 120-126. Doi: 10.5539/elt.v13n8p120
87. Sajid, M. & Siddiqui, J. A. 2015. Lack of Academic Writing Skills in English Language at Higher Education Level in Pakistan: Causes, Effects and Remedies. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. 2(4).
88. Shokrpour, N., & Fallahzadeh, M. (2007). A Survey of the Students and Interns' EFL Writing Problems in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(1).
89. Sadighi, F . Heydari, P. 2012. Cohesion Analysis of L2 Writing: The Case of Iranian Undergraduate EFL Learners. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 3(2):557-573.  
DOI: [10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n2.557](https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n2.557)
90. Sharif, A.M. (2015). The analysis of cohesive devices in psychology research papers using discourse analysis technique. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, 3(6), 125-143.
91. Smith, K., Todd, M., & Waldman, J. (2009). *Doing Your Undergraduate Social Science Dissertation: A Student's Handbook* (1st ed.). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203881262>
92. Swales, M. & Feak, C. B. 2012. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Michigan Publishing. University of Michigan Press.
93. Swales, J. 2004. *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 314 pp. ISBN: 0-521-53334-1.  
DOI: [10.1017/CBO9781139524827](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827)
94. Tahara, N. (2014). Metadiscursive nouns and textual cohesion in second language writing. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 37, 13-26.
95. Thompson, P. (2013). 15 *Thesis and Dissertation Writing. The handbook of English for specific purposes*, 283.
96. Thomson, P. & Kamler, B. 2016. *Detox Your Writing: Strategies for*



- Doctoral Researchers. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
97. Torrance, M., Thomas, G. V., & Robinson, E. J. (1994). The writing strategies of graduate research students in the social sciences. *Higher education*, 27(3), 379-392.
  98. Ulla Connor (1984) A study of cohesion and coherence in English as a second language students' writing, Paper in *Linguistics*, 17:3, 301-316, DOI: [10.1080/08351818409389208](https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818409389208)
  99. Yang, W. & Sun, Y. 2012. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Argumentative Writing by Chinese EFL Learners at Different Proficiency Levels. *Linguistics and Education*, 23(1). DOI: 10.1016/j.linged.2011.09.004.
  100. Yin, Z. (2015). The use of cohesive devices in news language: overuse, underuse, or misuse?. *RELC Journal*, vol. 26(1), pp. 1- 18.
  101. Yoon-Hee Na. 2011. Cohesive Devices in CMC Texts Produced by American and Korean EFL Writers. *Linguistic Research* 28(3), 743-771.
  102. Zhang, J. (2015). An analysis of the use of demonstratives in

argumentative discourse by Chinese EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(2), 460-465.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Interview Questions

- 1. What different research tasks you are currently engaged in?**
- 2. To what extent you find it difficult to report research process in writing for publication?**
- 3. To what extent your research students find it difficult to draft their dissertations/theses textually well?**
- 4. How much revisions approximately your research students need to write textually well?**
- 5. To what extent you and your students require professional help to seek coherency check and edit the drafts?**
- 6. How many times research students do cross their deadlines to submit their drafts due to their lack of textual competence?**
- 7. Do you think there shall be a separate course for Social Sciences Researchers to gain textual competence?**

**Appendix B: Needs Analysis Questionnaire for Researchers and Senior Researchers****A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESEARCHERS TO DO NEEDS ANALYSIS****A LETTER OF CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION**

This study attempts to design an ESP (Intensive/Extensive) Textuality in Writing Course for Researchers doing research at any level. Therefore, to develop this course, it is necessary to do needs analysis. All items under every section of this questionnaire address both objective and subjective needs of researchers. Hence, you are requested to respond the given items truthfully so that this research may meet its objectives very well. The information provided will be kept confidential. It is further ensured that the provided information will be used for the research purpose only.

You are directed to provide information in the given table below:

<b>Name:</b> _____	<b>Department:</b> _____
<b>Current Educational Degree (in process):</b> _____	
<b>Research Stage (in process):</b> _____	

The information in this table will not be mentioned or revealed anywhere in the whole research process. This information will be kept as a consent for your participation in the present study.

**Signatures:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NEEDS ANALYSIS**

**TARGET SITUATION ANALYSIS**  
**(OBJECTIVE NEEDS OF RESEARCHERS)**

<b>KEY</b>				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/ Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>5-point Likert Scale</b>				
1.	The M. Phil. and PhD students need to write academically as a good researcher for the award of their respective degree.	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Writing a research dissertation demands excellent grip on creating cohesive links and coherence.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Writing a research dissertation demands creating proper grammatical and lexical linkages in drafting.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Writing a research dissertation demands creating smooth flow of sentences from one to another.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Writing a research dissertation demands creating even flow of paragraphs from one to another.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Writing a research dissertation demands linking new and old information together properly.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Writing a research dissertation demands organizing and clarifying ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Writing a research dissertation demands establishing links in meaning within and between sentences.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Writing a research dissertation demands meaningful writing by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. putting ideas in an order of importance</li> <li>b. putting events in an order of occurrence</li> <li>c. putting facts in an order of existence</li> <li>d. putting information in an order of familiarity</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Writing a research dissertation demands expressing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. cause and effect</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5

	<div><div>b. reasons</div><div>c. arguments</div><div>d. summaries</div><div>e. comparison and contrast</div><div>f. problems and solutions</div><div>g. opinions and reviews</div><div>h. interpreting</div><div>i. commenting</div><div>j. evaluating</div></div>						
10.	<div>Writing a research dissertation demands clarity of thought via relating</div> <div><div>a. ideas</div><div>b. paragraphs</div><div>c. sections/chapters</div><div>d. beginnings and ends</div></div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
11.	<div>Writing a research dissertation demands skills of editing to ensure textual flow.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
12.	<div>Writing a research dissertation demands skills of revising to ensure textual flow.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
13.	<div>Gaining textual flow while writing research dissertation/thesis demands professional development through a proper course.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
14.	<div>The HEI’s offer their student writers such academic writing courses before and during the course of study in M. Phil. and PhD.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
15.	<div>There is a need to offer an academic writing course with a special focus on textual needs of researchers.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			

### **PRESENT SITUATION ANALYSIS**

### **(SUBJECTIVE NEEDS OF RESEARCHERS)**

KEY				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/ Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Sr. No.	Items	5-point Likert Scale
---------	-------	----------------------

16.	I can write any document ranging from research reports and letters to research papers.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I have excellent grip on writing skill.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I can create proper grammatical and lexical linkages in drafting.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I can write smoothly from one sentence to another.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I can write evenly from one paragraph to another.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I can link new and old information together properly.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I can organise and clarify ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I can establish links in meaning within and between sentences.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I can write meaningfully by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. putting ideas in an order of importance</li> <li>b. putting events in an order of occurrence</li> <li>c. putting facts in an order of existence</li> <li>d. putting information in an order of familiarity</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
25	I can express while writing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. cause and effect</li> <li>b. reasons</li> <li>c. arguments</li> <li>d. summaries</li> <li>e. comparison and contrast</li> <li>f. problems and solutions</li> <li>g. opinions and reviews</li> <li>h. interpret</li> <li>i. evaluate</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
26	I can write with clarity of thought via relating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ideas</li> <li>b. paragraphs</li> <li>c. sections/chapters</li> <li>d. beginnings and ends</li> </ul>	1	2	3	4	5
27	I can draft research process in a unified manner					

	to make it reader-friendly.	1	2	3	4	5
28	I take time to check my draft for cohesiveness and coherency.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I find revising and editing of draft to be very tiresome job.	1	2	3	4	5
30	I require professional help of an expert user of English language to check my thesis draft for cohesiveness and coherency.	1	2	3	4	5

### THE WRITING COURSE

KEY				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/ Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Sr. No.	Items	5-point Likert Scale				
31	I wish to learn how to create proper grammatical and lexical linkages in drafting.	1	2	3	4	5
32	I wish to learn to write in smooth flow of sentences from one to another.	1	2	3	4	5
33	I wish to learn to write in even flow of paragraphs from one to another.	1	2	3	4	5
34	I wish to learn how to link new and old information together properly.	1	2	3	4	5
35	I wish to learn how to organize and clarify ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
36	I wish to learn how to establish links in meaning within and between sentences.	1	2	3	4	5
37	I wish to learn how to write meaningfully by a. putting ideas in an order of importance b. putting events in an order of occurrence c. putting facts in an order of existence d. putting information in an order of familiarity	1	2	3	4	5
38	I wish to learn how to express a. cause and effect b. reasons c. arguments	1	2	3	4	5



	<div>d. summaries</div> <div>e. comparison and contrast</div> <div>f. problems and solutions</div> <div>g. opinions and reviews</div> <div>h. interpret</div> <div>i. evaluate</div>						
39	<div>I wish to learn writing with clarity of thought via relating</div> <div>a. ideas</div> <div>b. paragraphs</div> <div>c. sections/chapters</div> <div>d. beginnings and ends</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
40	<div>I wish to learn cohesion and coherence to enhance writing skill.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
41	<div>I wish to join some EAP textuality course to draft dissertation/thesis free of anxiety.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
42	<div>I wish to join some EAP textuality course to record research process successfully.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
43	<div>I wish to join some EAP textuality course to improve formal written discourse skill.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
44	<div>I wish to join some EAP textuality course to improve proofreading skill.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			
45	<div>I wish to join some EAP textuality course to draft dissertation / thesis very well to accomplish my respective degree.</div>	<table><tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5			