# THE INTERDEPENDENCE HYPOTHESIS: EXPLORING THE EFFECTS ON ENGLISH WRITING FOLLOWING AN EXPOSITORY WRITING COURSE IN ZULU

by

### WENDY SUE RODSETH

submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for

the degree of

### MASTER OF ARTS WITH SPECIALISATION IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

at the

### UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF EH HUBBARD

JANUARY 2005

#### ABSTRACT

This study explores Cummins' interdependence hypothesis in the South African context. The design is experimental, involving Zulu primary language writing instruction to explore whether skills taught in Zulu composition classes transfer into English expository writing. The intervention and control groups were drawn from two ex-Model C high schools and the focus was on measuring use of coherence and cohesion in English essays. Quantitative findings showed, although the intervention group's writing skills did not improve significantly, they did not decline. By contrast, the control group's writing skills declined significantly. A more qualitative investigation of the corpus supports the statistical findings. However, because of the limitations of this study, more research is required into Cummins' hypothesis, bilingual programmes and teaching academic writing skills in African languages. It is hoped that this research design will benefit future researchers investigate the current debate about the efficacy of bilingual and multilingual approaches to education.

### Key terms

Interdependence hypothesis; Transference of writing skills; Expository writing; Coherence; Cohesion; Bilingualism and Multilingualism; Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP); Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS); Home Language Project.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people:

Prof. Hilton Hubbard, my supervisor, for the invaluable learning experience he provided, for the sharing of his great knowledge and understanding, his support, guidance and patience;

Vic, my husband, for his help, great expertise and unfailing enthusiasm for this research study;

The Home Language Project team: Margie Owen Smith for allowing the study to take place and for her support; Fikile Msibi and Colleen Moabelo for their great contribution in translating the workbook into Zulu, their teaching of the expository writing course, and for their warmth and cooperation at all times.

Molly Bill for her generous assistance and for allowing me access to her unpublished manuscript;

My children, Philippa, Alison and Mark for their patience, and my sister, Denise for her continued support over all these years.

# ABSTRACT

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER 1	: INTRODUCTION	1
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	1 1
1.1.1 1.1.2. 1.1.3	Research questions Background considerations Aims	1 2 3
1.2	PRELIMINARY PERSPECTIVE ON KEY CONCEPTS OF THE STUDY	5
1.2.1 1.2.2 1.2.3 1.2.3(a) 1.2.3(b) 1.2.4 1.2.5	The interdependence hypothesis Basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) Expository writing skills: coherence and cohesion Coherence Cohesion Errors in conjunctive cohesion The Home Language Project	5 6 7 8 8 9
1.3	RESEARCH FOCUS	10
1.3.1 1.3.2	The corpus Hypotheses	10 11
1.4	STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY	12
CHAPTER 2	2: RESEARCH AND SOURCES: A SURVEY	13
2.0	INTRODUCTION	13
2.1	BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT	13
2.1.1 2.1.2	Opposing ideologies Studies on the relationship between bilingualism and cognitive	14
2.1.3	development Bilingual programmes	14 19
2.1.3(a)	Structured immersion (i) Additive bilingualism (ii) Late immersion bilingualism	20 20 20

2.1.3(b) 2.1.3(c)	Transitional bilingual education (TBE) English as second language	21 21
2.1.3(d)	English immersion	21
2.1.4 2.1.4(a) 2.1.4(b) 2.1.4(c) 2.1.4(d)	Bilingual education: models and hypotheses Common underlying proficiency of bilingualism (CUP) Interdependence hypothesis Threshold hypothesis Separate underlying proficiency model of bilingualism (SUP)	22 22 23 23 23
2.1.5	Research findings on the efficacy of bilingual education	24
2.2	SOCIOPOLITICAL BACKGROUND TO LANGUAGE TEACHING AND APPLIED LINGUISTIC RESEARCH IN SOUTH AFRICA	28
2.2.1	Sociopolitical background of language teaching in South Africa	28
2.2.2 2.2.3	Research on the language of learning and teaching (LOLT) The Home Language Project	32 40
2.3	THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF EXPOSITORY WRITING SKILLS	43
2.3.1 2.3.1(a) 2.3.1(b)	Expository writing: coherence and cohesion Coherence Cohesion	43 44 44
2.3.2 2.3.3 2.3.4 2.3.4(a) 2.3.4(b)	Problems with teaching and learning expository writing skills Writing programmes The Home Language writing programme: coherence and cohesion Coherence Cohesion	45 47 52 53 54
2.4	QUANTITATIVE STUDIES OF COHERENCE AND COHESION	54
2.5	ERROR ANALYSIS	60
2.6	CONCLUSION	62
CHAPTER 3	: ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES	63
3.0	INTRODUCTION	63

63

3.1

**RESEARCH DESIGN** 

3.2	ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	63
3.2.1	Coherence	63
3.2.2	Cohesion	65
3.2.3	Functional relations	66
	Textual units	
3.2.4		75
3.2.5	Error analysis	77
3.3	RESEARCH PROCEDURES	81
3.3.1	Subjects	81
3.3.2	Data collection	82
3.3.3	The intervention programme: materials and method	83
3.3.3.1	Materials (workbook)	83
3.3.3.1(a)	Coherence	84
3.3.3.1(b)	Cohesion	87
3.3.3.2	Method	88
3.3.4	Essay evaluation and analysis	89
3.3.5	Sample analyses	92
3.3.5.1	Pre-test	92
3.3.5.2	Post-test	98
3.4	CONCLUSION	103
CHAPTER	104	
4.0	INTRODUCTION	104
4.0	INTRODUCTION	104
4.1	RESULTS	104
4.1.1	Statistical procedures	104
4.1.2	Results and interpretations	105
4.1.2.1	H1: Holistic coherence transfer hypothesis	105
4.1.2.2	H2: Conjunctive cohesion density hypothesis	107
4.1.2.3	H3: Functional relations density hypothesis	109
4.2	DISCUSSION	111
4.2.1	Aims and results	111
4.3	REVIEW	112
4.3.1	Holistic coherence rating findings	113
4.3.2	Interdependence hypothesis	113
4.3.3	Threats to the study	115
	5	-

4.4	QUALITATIVE FINDINGS	118
4.4.1	Criterion 1: Topic specification	118
4.4.2	Criterion 2: Organisation of information	121
4.4.3	Criterion 3: Sense of closure	123
4.4.4	Criterion 4: Length and detail	125
4.4.5	Criterion 5: Vocabulary	129
4.4.6	Criterion 6: Conjunctive cohesion	12)
4.4.0 4.4.7	Difficulties	131
4.4.7	Difficulties	152
4.5	ERROR ANALYSIS	134
4.6	CONCLUSION	137
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION		139
5.0	INTRODUCTION	139
5.1	REVIEW	139
5.2	QUESTIONS	143
5.3	LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	144
5.3.1	Scale	144
5.3.2	Scope	144
5.3.3	Time allocated	145
5.3.4	Organisation	146
5.3.5	Education background	146
5.3.6	Conclusion	147
2.2.0		117
5.4	CONTRIBUTION MADE BY THIS STUDY	147
5.4.1	Theoretical	147
5.4.2	Descriptive	148
5.4.3	Applied	149
01110	. ipp.ied	117
5.5	CONCLUSION	150
APPENDICE	ES .	151
APPENDIX		151
APPENDIX		1.51
AI LINDIA	SCALE	154
APPENDIX		154
APPENDIX		162
APPENDIX	E: TABLES	176
BIBLIOGRA	APHY	179