PART III

EAP and language skills
Introduction

As English for academic purposes (EAP) has evolved over the past four decades, an emphasis on writing has been one of its key features. This is hardly surprising, given that much of what students are asked to do in academic settings in order to both acquire and display knowledge revolves around some type of writing. What has changed over time has been increased interest in the role of reading as related to writing in line with the fact that, in academic contexts, students are not often asked to write without some kind of stimulus or input, usually in the form of reading materials (i.e. source texts). In short, they are reading for writing (heretofore RFW). Expectations for how they do so may vary across disciplinary community contexts, but the ‘bottom line’ is that it is essential for students to become adept at RFW, because this is ‘an index of successful academic achievement for students’ (Shaw & Pecorari 2013, A1). These circumstances have led to a steady focus on RFW in EAP scholarship since the mid-1980s.

Shaw and Pecorari also note ‘the intertextuality practices of academic writing are hard to learn…particularly [for] those studying in a second language [because they] have to go through a complicated process of development in their management of intertextual links’ (2013, A1). The ‘management’ they refer to revolves heavily around learning how to move from reading to writing. They note, too, that ‘EAP teachers have to guide them through’ that process (2013, A1). In EAP, then, we have an important and challenging mission as we attempt to help second language writers acquire command of the knowledge and skills necessary to perform RFW effectively.

My purpose in this chapter is to look at some key literature related to RFW and EAP in order to establish a clear sense of the current state of inquiry and understanding regarding RFW in this important domain. The thesis I will discuss later in the chapter is that precisely because RFW is hard to learn, and difficult to teach, there may be a tendency on the part of EAP teachers to seek the safer routes and be content with ensuring that students gain a minimal level of command of RFW, rather than pushing them to actively engage in moving from reading to writing in productive ways. I think this ‘good enough’ approach needs to change if the field is to move forward.

A noteworthy dichotomy underlying my thesis is found in the seminal book, Reading to Write (Flower et al. 1990), where, in the book’s introduction, Flower theorized reading to
write as reflecting two primary activities: (1) as a receptive process promoting basic academic literacy, and (2) as a transformational process geared toward the acquisition of critical literacy. As she characterized the distinction, the receptive activity (such as summary writing) is a limited and unproductive use of reading for writing, and teachers should not stop at that point in the instructional act but instead should be striving toward helping students learn about RFW as a transformational activity as well. I will return to that distinction in the discussion section at the end of the chapter.

**Contextualizing reading for writing**

In this first part of the chapter, I revisit some key points in the literature regarding the construct of reading for writing itself in order to establish a conceptual foundation from which to work in the remainder of the chapter.

Hirvela (2004) asserts that RFW has followed two general directions since its foundational work in the 1980s. One direction is input based; the other is output based. The input-based view is one in which learners use reading as input for learning about writing in the target language, as in the use of models of writing. The models illustrate the rhetorical and linguistic features that learners can then imitate in their own writing. Thus, they learn about target language writing through the act of reading.

The output-based approach is one in which students must transfer content from material read to a text that they write. Here the focus is on the act of writing and the text-production processes that enable the writer to appropriate source text material in accepted ways. This is the approach that appears to dominate RFW instruction in EAP. As Carson (1993) has explained, ‘The phrase reading for writing can be understood as referring most specifically to the literacy act in which readers/writers use text(s) that they read, or have read, as a basis for text(s) that they write’ (p. 85). Flower (1990), operating in a direction similar to Carson’s, defined reading for writing as ‘the goal-directed activity of reading in order to write’ in which ‘the reading process is guided by the need to produce a text of one’s own’ (pp. 5–6).

Another helpful attempt to capture the nature of reading for writing, from Jakobs (2003), builds around the analogy of reproduction, or what she calls ‘reproductive writing.’ In her typology, reproductive writing is the byproduct of the interaction between three components. One is a receptive process, which she characterizes as an early stage in which readers are focused mainly on reading and understanding source text material. They move from there to a reproductive process, in which they analyze and arrange the sources in a way that eventually leads to writing. This allows movement to the production process, in which the actual product of reading for writing emerges. Her core term reproductive captures the dynamic nature of the interaction that takes place across these stages.

What we see in these different depictions of RFW is that EAP teachers face important options and choices as they plan and implement their teaching.

**A look at the reading for writing scholarship**

In this section I will look briefly at RFW scholarship by breaking it into several categories. One purpose in this section is to generate a sense of the scope of investigation in this field. Another is to provide some baseline understanding of what we’ve learned about RFW. A third purpose is to provide some initial direction for those who wish to learn more about this topic. The material in this section will lead into a discussion that follows in the discussion and conclusion section below.
Conceptualizing RFW

A number of sources have provided discussions of theories and models of RFW, often within the larger framework of reading–writing connections, with RFW seen as one of the core manifestations of those connections. My focus will be on literature specifically in the L2 realm, and focused in particular on RFW. Earlier work on this topic that helped lay a foundation for understanding RFW from different perspectives includes Carson (1993) and Hirvela (2004). Carson’s book chapter highlights the cognitive processes at work in the writing of summaries and syntheses, two key tasks in EAP writing pedagogy, while Hirvela examines several ways in which students can learn how to use reading as a tool for learning about L2 writing. He focuses in particular on what he calls ‘writerly reading,’ which involves ‘thinking like a writer rather than a reader so as to focus on and better understand the features of writing that make the text work as a piece of writing’ (p. 118). Also noteworthy in this earlier work is the aforementioned article by Jakobs (2003) which articulates her ‘reproductive writing’ model of RFW.

As for more recent work, an article by Dovey (2010) examines RFW from both process and product perspectives in an effort to demonstrate how EAP teachers can link genre awareness with the teaching of RFW tasks. This approach involves both directions for RFW identified earlier: reading to learn about writing, and writing based on reading. Furthermore, an article (2013a) and a book chapter (2013b) by Grabe and Zhang operate as comprehensive reviews of the reading–writing connections literature, with an overlap onto RFW, especially in the 2013a journal article.

Collectively, these sources provide a solid grounding in the dynamics associated with RFW. They also illustrate the continuing need to arrive at conceptual understandings of RFW that enrich both EAP research and pedagogy.

Source use

The RFW literature can be broken down into two general categories: that which looks at the topic more broadly, and that which addresses specific components of RFW. In the former category, there are a number of especially useful sources, beginning, chronologically, with a book chapter (1990) by Campbell, who described her study of native and non-native English-speaking students using sources while writing. A major contribution of her chapter was her introduction of a typology for examining source text use across different RFW tasks that included: Quotation (direct correct copying of material with no changes made), Exact Copy (direct copy without punctuation marks indicating the copying function), Near Copy (quotations rearranged syntactically or including some synonyms replacing original words in the text), Paraphrase, Summary, and Original Explanation (student added comments explaining cited material). That typology remains an important one today.

Also notable is Zhu’s (2005) discussion of source text use from a scaffolding perspective; that is, how a student’s task representation of an assigned RFW paper was assisted by his or her reading and note-taking connected with the source texts used to complete the task. More recent research by Plakans and Gebril (2012) looking at RFW within integrated reading–writing tasks essentially echoed the findings of Zhu’s study. These studies suggest that EAP teachers should account for such scaffolding activities when teaching students how to read sources so as to enrich the writing activity that follows.

Four articles appearing in the previously cited special issue of the Journal of English for Academic Purposes (2013) on source text use guest-edited by Shaw and Pecorari provide...
current insights into the topic. These studies by Davis, Li, McCullough, and by Thompson, Morton, and Storch looked across different students’ use of sources and found variations in how they approached RFW tasks, thus demonstrating the difficulty of trying to pin down universal or common properties in students’ engagement with source use in RFW tasks. That is, individual and contextual variables must also be accounted for in attempting to capture EAP students’ use of sources. Thus, as the search for conceptual understanding and viable models of RFW continues, the importance of gathering and analyzing individual student encounters with RFW remains an important need as well.

**Textual appropriation**

A closely related topic in scholarship on source use in RFW is that of textual appropriation; that is, students’ ability to use source texts in appropriate ways relative to target language citation conventions.

The RFW focus is much more a product of this century than earlier work on this topic. Some of it overtly discusses plagiarism. For instance, Pecorari (2003, 2008) and Li and Casanave (2012) have examined this area through the lens of ‘patchwriting,’ a ‘grey area’ between outright and intentional copying of source material without proper attribution and fully appropriate use of such material. In patchwriting, students provide some degree of alteration of the original material, but not necessarily as extensively or as ‘correctly’ as others may require. Both of these studies highlight the complexities involved in distinguishing between plagiarism as a deliberate act of misappropriation and patchwriting as a more difficult act to interpret. Each study shows that students struggle to determine what constitutes correct use of source texts and may unintentionally plagiarize, through patchwriting, in the course of learning about textual appropriation practices.

Other important work in this area avoids characterizations involving plagiarism and investigates ‘textual borrowing’ as a more conventional issue in learning about second language writing. For example, in a series of papers, Shi (2004, 2006, 2008, 2011) studied different groups of L2 writers with an interest in their cultural and rhetorical backgrounds, and how they understood source text use and citation practices in L2 writing in English. She found that, for them, this knowledge and understanding was difficult to obtain and to apply. Similar results were reported in a study by Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005), who found that their Japanese university student participants had little knowledge of Western conventions for citation and felt it was appropriate to use source text material without attribution.

**Summary writing**

Some EAP scholarship has focused on specific applications of reading for writing, especially summary writing. One reason for this is that summaries appear to remain an essential RFW task in EAP courses. Another is that summaries provide important insights into how students move from source text reading to writing based on that reading. In other words, summaries are an ideal place for examining the relationship between EAP and RFW.

Historically speaking, summary writing is where connections between EAP and RFW were first explored, as seen most prominently in ground-breaking articles by Johns (1985) and Johns and Mayes (1990). The importance of this topic in EAP has not diminished since. As Johns (1985) explained, ‘the summary task requires the use of higher order reading skills; identification of main ideas and condensation of text while maintaining the focus of the
original’ (p. 495). These are challenging tasks for students reading and writing in a second language, and they help explain why EAP teachers continue to focus on summary tasks. That is, students can learn substantially from completing them. Using ‘summary protocols’, Johns, and Johns and Mayes, investigated the processes at work in students’ efforts to summarize what they had read, and in doing so not only provided some initial insights into those efforts, but also demonstrated how such work could be carried out. In other earlier summary research, Sarig (1993), observing that ‘summarizing tasks are junctions where reading and writing encounters take place and it is here that a complex composing process begins’ (p.161), also set forth an important direction for summary research by categorizing the operations performed by students in generating summaries.

As summary research moved on, Kim’s (2001) study of Korean college-level English as a foreign language (EFL) students offered yet another direction to pursue. In her case, the focus was on the effects of source text difficulty on students’ writing of summaries. While examining their use of different operations necessary to produce summaries, Kim found that source text difficulty had some impact on which operations students used, and how well they used them. Ascención Delaney (2008) took up task effects in summary writing in a different way in her exploration of what she called the ‘reading-to-write construct.’ In her case, the emphasis was on different kinds of RFW tasks—writing a summary and a response essay—and the effects of different variables on students’ performance of those tasks. She found that these tasks constituted different dimensions of RFW ability rather than drawing on identical abilities.

Further demonstrating the value of researching summary writing as a means of better understanding students’ engagement with RFW, Yu (2008, 2009) has presented findings from two studies comparing Chinese students’ summary writing in Chinese as L1 and English as L2. She found that ‘the use of the different languages had significant effects on both summarization processes and products’ (2008, p. 521), and that ‘source text had significant and relatively larger effects than the summarizers’ language abilities on summarization performance’ (2009, p. 116). In other recent research, Baba (2009), examining the effect of lexical proficiency on summary writing, found that the effects of reading comprehension ability and the length of summaries produced were more significant factors in summary writing performance than lexical knowledge.

Collectively, these findings make a point that many EAP teachers have to confront in their instructional practice: that summary writing is more difficult for students than its task dimensions may suggest, and that there are multiple factors to be accounted for in trying to understand how students read and write for summarization purposes.

Citations

Much of the recent work of note in this area has come, singly and working together, from Nigel Harwood and Bojana Petrić. In two studies by Petrić, the focus was on the rhetorical functions performed by citations (2007) and students’ preferences for how to use citations (e.g., direct copying of longer statements or fragments taken from those statements) (2012). Petrić and Harwood (2013), Harwood (2009), and Harwood and Petrić (2012) have also looked at issues explored in Petrić (2012) under the umbrella term of what they call students’ ‘citation behaviours.’ Employing a variety of research approaches, with an emphasis on interview methods and case studies, these scholars have found, as in other RFW research, that consistent patterns across students and contexts are difficult to discern. Instead, there is considerable individual variability among research participants.
Other work by Pecorari (2006) and Swales (2014) has demonstrated a rather different way of looking at citation practices. In their work, these scholars have investigated students’ use of citations within the realm of academic disciplinary community practices and expectations. That is, they have sought to capture students’ ability to regulate their citation practices relative to what a particular community prefers, such as the use of direct quotation rather than paraphrasing. What marks this line of research as especially valuable is the way in which it reminds EAP practitioners that citation practices, which are commonly taught in EAP courses, cannot be treated only as generic operations devoid of contextual influences. Instead, students must also learn to be sensitive to what a particular academic community prefers.

**Paraphrasing**

Overlapping with citations, but deserving of treatment of its own, is the topic of paraphrasing. Like summary writing, paraphrasing appears to be a commonly assigned task in EAP instruction. Like summary writing, it can be said to be at the nexus of the academic reading–writing connections at the heart of RFW. The act of paraphrasing, similar to other RFW activities, begins with reading and moves to writing, with each skill dependent on the other.

While not the topic of an extensive amount of RFW scholarship, paraphrasing is an area where some of the most interesting RFW work has taken place. A good case in point is Keck’s (2006) study that compared the paraphrasing of L1 and L2 writers in a summary writing task by looking at how they approached different types of paraphrasing. Here, Keck, like Campbell (1990) cited earlier, introduced an important typology of choices available to students. These paraphrase types, which reflect the extent to which student writers altered the original material being cited, include: *Near Copy*, *Minimal Revision*, *Moderate Revision*, and *Substantial Revision*. The study found a heavy reliance on *Near Copy* among the L2 writers, while the L1 writers were more inclined toward *Moderate* and *Substantial Revision*. Just as useful as the findings of this study was Keck’s paraphrasing typology, which laid a foundation for future scholarship (research and pedagogy) related to paraphrasing.

Several years later, Keck (2014) conducted a study that revisited issues investigated in the 2006 study cited earlier, and that also compared L1 and L2 writers. This study, working with the same typology introduced in the 2006 research, found that the L2 writers relied more on forms of copying (*Near Copy* and *Minimal Revision*) and were reluctant to attempt more involved forms of paraphrasing (*Moderate* and *Substantial Revision*).

A 2012 study by Shi, which reported the findings of interview-based research looking at student and teacher beliefs about paraphrasing, identified a key finding that mirrors what many EAP teachers have probably found: that students tend to struggle with paraphrasing, and for a variety of reasons. Hirvela and Du (2013) produced similar findings in looking at both students’ paraphrasing products and their comments on paraphrasing. In addition to reflecting Shi’s findings about the complexity involved in paraphrasing effectively, Hirvela and Du’s study showed that students struggled with paraphrasing partly because of how it was taught: as a decontextualized activity lacking meaningful applications and purposes. They saw no value in replacing or rearranging a few words within a sentence. What did that achieve? Why not simply quote sentences directly? Thus, lacking motivation to learn about paraphrasing, they did not take the paraphrasing exercises seriously.
Electronic sources

An important shift in RFW research in this century has been an interest in students’ use of electronic source texts for RFW tasks, given the now common reliance on such texts for academic purposes.

Some of this research has focused on students’ use of what have been called ‘unconventional sources’; that is, those that are not considered more traditionally academic, such as materials appearing on a political group’s website. In particular, Helms-Park, Radia, and Stapleton (2007), Radia and Stapleton (2008), Stapleton (2005), and Stapleton, Helms-Park, and Radia (2006) published a series of studies examining student writers’ use of such sources for various RFW tasks. They found that students relied somewhat heavily on what Stapleton (2005, p. 177) called ‘Web genres of questionable suitability for an academic paper,’ and without an ability to discern problems with the reliability of those sources as compared to others that would be seen as more acceptable from an academic perspective. Research by Wang and Artero (2005) brought to light similar concerns, leading them to conclude that ‘there is an urgent need for students to develop information literacy skills and apply to these skills in the electronic information environment’ (p. 71).

Li (2012) has looked at this topic from the perspective of how students actually work with electronic sources while completing a task involving RFW. Li found that the students showed considerable variability in the search engines selected to find source materials, but engaged in only superficial reading of the sources, with the intent of finding only what they needed to provide citations for their writing. As individuals long accustomed to conducting electronic searches for their own purposes as well as academic ones, these students were well versed in techniques for quick and purpose-driven reading of their RFW sources. Another study looking at student preferences for electronic sources (and not examining the quality of the sources) is the already cited research by Thompson, Morton, and Storch (2013), who found that first year undergraduate students, while searching for source materials, relied heavily on electronic sources located mainly through Google searches.

Assessment

Another more recent development in scholarship related to EAP and RFW is an interest in integrated assessment tasks, including reading and writing tasks where students are responding to sources. Interest in this line of research arose in large part out of the adoption in 2005 of an integrated reading–writing task in the internationally dominant Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) in its internet-based (IBT) format. Other large-scale assessments have likewise moved toward integrated assessment.

Much of the work in this area has come from Lia Plakans, who, on her own and with others, has investigated integrated RFW from a variety of angles. In her 2008 work, she compared test-takers’ composing processes in RFW and writing-only tasks. While finding variability among her participants, Plakans also found that the RFW tasks generated ‘a more authentic’ set of composing practices (p. 111). A 2009a study she conducted also focused on composing processes and once again revealed variability among her participants. Meanwhile, Plakans (2009b) examined test-takers’ reading strategies and found some differences in strategy use between those receiving higher and lower writing scores, and that reading has an important role in performance on such tasks. Strategy use was also the focus of a study by Yang and Plakans (2012), which found that test-takers needed to rely on a variety of strategies as they moved between listening, reading, and writing. This study showed that a variety of
strategies are necessary for higher level performance. Plakans’ 2010 study focused on test-takers’ representation of the RFW tasks and the impact of that representation, and revealed differences in the participants’ task representations. Other work she has been involved in has looked at, and supported, the validity of integrated RFW tasks with respect to mirroring academic writing processes used in actual academic tasks (Plakans & Gebril 2013).

In other research in this area, Weigle (2004) and Weigle and Parker (2012) examined the effectiveness of a university-generated competency test utilizing various RFW tasks. The 2004 study found that the test required students to use RFW skills necessary for actual classroom use, and thus lent support for the validity of the test. In Weigle and Parker (2012), they were interested in the extent to which takers of the same test examined in the 2004 study were relying on copying from the source texts provided, which would compromise the validity of the test. They found that most students did not rely unnecessarily on such copying, thus further validating the test as a measure of academic writing ability.

Collectively, the growing body of literature in this area suggests the importance of continuing to study this new domain of RFW, especially since the kinds of skills involved in integrated reading–writing tasks are those that are also normally the concern of EAP courses.

Discussion and conclusion

What I hoped to convey in the previous section was the fact that RFW is a topic of ongoing and strong interest among EAP specialists, and one with an array of dimensions worth exploring. My focus now shifts to a short discussion of what I feel we need to consider as we move forward in our efforts to help students learn how to read for writing in meaningful ways that lead to valuable transfer from the EAP classroom to other academic contexts in which RFW is required. Among the issues worth exploring, I want to address the role that models of target-language writing should play. My discussion will be based on a notion introduced by Macbeth (2010) in an article describing her students’ use of models in an undergraduate EAP writing course. Macbeth problematized the use of models of the kinds of texts students are expected to produce, such as summaries, through the lens of what she called the ‘deliberate false provisions’ of those models.

Macbeth’s thesis is that, in using models, writers ‘forfeit some things in order to make others vivid,’ and in doing so they have to ‘confront the betrayal’ caused by reliance on the models (p. 33). That is, they obediently do what a model shows them to do: for example, write the first sentence this way, be sure to use at least two paraphrases in your summary, etc. However, implementing these moves is often harder than it appears, plus doing so does not necessarily help students actually learn how to paraphrase, summarize, synthesize, etc.; it only helps them to follow decontextualized directions and ‘rules’ and mimic moves that require deeper understanding in order to be used effectively. Consequently, imitating the models does not ensure effective transfer to other contexts outside the EAP course; this is the betrayal that students encounter. This is where Macbeth feels we engage in providing ‘deliberate false provisions.’ That is, in teaching skills like paraphrasing and summarizing through models, we are creating false notions of learning and of achievement in our students, as they may well discover when they attempt to use those skills in another course and find themselves unprepared to do so.

Whatever one’s position on the use of models, I see Macbeth’s notion of deliberate false provisions as extremely useful in thinking about RFW-oriented EAP instruction, where the use of models has a great deal of understandable appeal in terms of illustrating for students the various moves involved in producing successful writing based on writing. It seems safe to
assume that many, if not most, EAP writing teachers employ such models. I have myself, and
I have found them both enjoyable to work with and popular among students. This is likely
what many EAP practitioners have experienced. However, should that be the end of the
story? Macbeth’s point of view suggests that there is a need to take a closer look at the use of
models in teaching RFW. I agree, and I encourage EAP specialists to engage in a meaningful,
open-minded discussion of this important topic.

The debate over models in writing scholarship is not new, but in EAP circles we have
not recently addressed it in any substantive way. This strikes me as odd and seems to me
to be counter-productive to the continued growth of the field, as we don’t actually know
how well they work. Perhaps we have avoided such a debate because, given the kinds of
challenges L2 writers understandably face in learning how to read for writing in another
language, we, as EAP teachers, feel compelled to rely on the instructional materials that
make as visible and as concrete as possible the content that needs to be learned; that is, we
look to simplify as much as we can. This almost inevitably leads us to some use of models, as
they demonstrate graphically how we want our students’ writing to look. As teaching tools,
they’re wonderfully manageable. As such, they make our job much easier, and these are
attributes worth remembering and valuing as we debate the use of models.

However, as we continue to use them, I believe we need to be asking ourselves if models
really work as well as we assume they do, and if they are ultimately beneficial or harmful.
We need to do so because these issues take us into the heart of EAP instruction; that is, what
is it that we ultimately want our students to learn? Here I think there’s value in revisiting
the dichotomy from Flower (1990) I mentioned briefly at the beginning of this chapter:
receptive versus transformative processes of learning reading to write. That may be our real
topic of debate as we ponder the use of models. Should we focus on the receptive or aim for
the transformative? What is in our students’ best interests? These are difficult questions to
answer. A productive debate over models is one way of addressing them.

One of the most powerful themes that emerges from much of the literature I reviewed in
the previous section of this chapter is that reading to write is difficult for students to learn.
Even such shorter activities as paraphrasing and writing brief summaries of articles continue
to be challenging tasks for many students. Faced with this obstacle, EAP teachers perhaps
cannot help but feel the strong temptation to turn to a reliance on models, knowing that they
may well provide the students with some much needed guidance. However, as Macbeth
asserts, in adopting such a practice, we are risking contentment with short-term and perhaps
simplistic solutions to complex problems, rather than adopting pedagogical practices that
can lead to genuine learning about how to produce the various artifacts of RFW; that is, the
more transformative pedagogy Flower (1990) advocates. That is one side of the debate. On
the other hand, it may be that these short-term solutions are, realistically speaking, the best
we can manage given the limited amount of instructional time normally available to us, and
they may work better than critics of models claim.

Of course, it could also be the case that the real issue is not a choice between a receptive or
transformative orientation, but rather a wise, effective combination of the two, where models
are used at some earlier stages and then abandoned later, or perhaps used in different ways
when pursuing transformative processes in the EAP classroom. In other words, we could
move along a continuum from receptive to transformative. This approach would require
some keen understanding of models so as to know when to move away from them or how to
adjust the approach to their use. It might also be a matter of which students we have in mind.
For instance, the RFW-related needs of undergraduates may well not be the same as those of
post-graduate students. This could lead to an argument for flexible use of models relative to
who is being taught, and what they are being taught. There may be EAP courses where an emphasis on the receptive processes (and thus the use of models) makes good sense, just as other courses are better suited for an orientation toward a transformative approach.

In closing, what I encourage is an active debate (and research) on this surprisingly neglected topic of the use of models to teach RFW, especially because of the integral role that models play in RFW instruction, as well as continued uncertainty over the degree to which they contribute meaningfully to learning. In the final analysis, it may not be a debate over whether to use models, but rather when and how to use them. EAP will be a stronger field when we have a better understanding of where models fit in EAP pedagogy.
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