Teaching Argumentative Writing through Reading Argumentative Texts: The Case of the Teachers of Writing at the Teachers Training School of Assia Djabar, Constantine

Nedjoua KIOUCHE [1], Youcef BEGHOUL [2]

[1]Constantine 1- Frères Mentouri University (Algeria),
kiouche.nedjoua@ensc.dz
[2]Constantine 1-Frères Mentouri University (Algeria),
beghoul.youcef@umc.edu.dz

Abstract:

This paper aims at gaining insight on the Writing teachers at the training school-Assia Djebar-Constantine perceptions of using argumentative texts to teach argumentative essay, and the influence it has on their students' written argumentative discourse. The study uses a questionnaire to collect data to answer three main questions: Do teachers use argumentative reading to teach argumentative writing? Do teachers emphasize the writer-reader interaction in teaching reading and argumentative essay? And how does reading argumentative texts affect positively the students' written production? The study reveals the teachers' use of argumentative texts in their writing class and their major focus on the pattern of organization and arguments where its positive effects are reflected in students' argumentative essays.

Keywords: Reading-Writing Relationship; Argumentative Texts; Argumentative Writing; Writer-Reader Interaction; Critical Reading.

Corresponding author: *Nedjoua KIOUCHE,*

1. INTRODUCTION

Reading and writing are important literacy skills that contribute considerably in the process of language learning. For a long time, reading and writing were considered two distinct disciplines with different components. However, many research findings (Shanahan, 1988; Eisterhold, 1990; Spivey 1990) asserted that there is a solid bond between reading and writing and they have to be taught in tandem. The major objective of teaching writing and reading in an integrated manner is to reach what Langer (2002, p. 3) refers to as 'high literacy' which is a 'deeper knowledge of the ways in which reading, writing, language, and content work together'. At the Teachers Training School (TTS Constantine, Algeria) reading and writing are taught in two separate modules. Integrating reading in a writing class is not a requisite. When it is used, as a teacher's initiative, it is confined to modeling the structure and organizational patterns of an essay. The aim of this paper is to investigate the teachers' perceptions about integrating reading in a writing class with special focus on the argumentative type which is the most common type of essay to write at TTS. Students are required to write rhetorical as well as academic arguments throughout their years of study, and a good mastery of this type of essay is crucial for their academic success. This study attempts to answer the following research questions: Do teachers use argumentative reading to teach argumentative writing? Do teachers emphasize the writer-reader interaction in teaching reading and writing argumentative essays? And how does reading argumentative texts affect positively the students' argumentative written production? To answer these questions, a questionnaire was administered online to 13 writing teachers at the Teachers Training School-Assia Djabar- of Constantine. The major aim of the questionnaire is to investigate the teachers' perceptions of the use of reading argumentative texts to teach argumentative essay, and the teachers' focus when using argumentative reading samples in a writing class. The positive effects of reading argumentative samples on students' argumentative writing are also dealt with.

2. Literature Review
2.1 The Significance of Reading and Writing and Their Interconnection

Reading and writing play an important role in the process of language learning. The receptive skill of reading and the productive skill of writing contribute significantly in constructing students' literacy. Through reading and writing, students gain knowledge, understand others' ideas, and express their own thoughts. Being able to read and write is a prerequisite for success in studies, careers, and life. According to Freire (1983) the aim of reading is not confined to deciphering the written words, but it transcends to comprehend the world, in his words '[r]eading the world precedes reading the word, and the subsequent reading of the word cannot dispense with continually reading the world' (p.5). On the other hand, writing is an important persuasive means; through written words the world can be

transformed. Writing is also an essential means for learning, 'we use it to gather, preserve and transmit information widely' (Graham, Gillespie, & McKeown, 2013, p. 3). Therefore, reflective reading and effective writing are fundamental to construct knowledge and develop language skills.

The relationship between writing and reading has been viewed from three different perspectives. The first is the directional perspective which maintains that reading and writing share similar structures and mechanisms, and once those have been acquired for one skill, they can be transferred to the other skill (Eisterhold, 1990). Despite the fact that the transfer is unidirectional; either from reading to writing or from writing to reading, myriad of research has emphasized the one direction reading-writing relationship. In investigating the different models of reading-writing relationship, Shanahan and Lomax (1886) highlight the superiority of the reading-writing model over writing-reading model due to vaster transfer of information from reading to writing. Krashen (1985, 1993) argues that extensive and pleasure reading has a crucial effect on L2 writing skills, and that the regular exposure to reading enhances writing abilities that cannot be developed relying exclusively on practice of writing.

In the same vein, Eisterhold (1990), in his own words, asserts that reading practice is considered to be the proper input for the acquisition of writing abilities, "reading passages will somehow function as primary models from which writing skills can be learned, or at least inferred" (p.88). Spivey (1990) argues that the writer who generates his/her text by reading several sources transfers the cognitive operations of organization, selection, and connection from the read sources to his own text. Following the same line of thought, Zamel (1992) considers that in unidirectional reading-writing relationship, the ideas that are provided in reading texts can be used as a foundation for writing our own texts. Therefore, reading precedes writing and offers 'a paradigm to internalize, to act as a stimulant for writing, or to provide subject matter to write about' (p.468).

The second view of the reading-writing relationship is the non-directional perspective. This view rests on the assumption that reading and writing share comparable cognitive structures and processes. Therefore, the transfer can occur in either direction, and the improvement in one skill leads to the improvement of the other (Shanahan, 1884) . For Kucer (1985) the connection between reading and writing can occur only 'if the two processes are viewed not as mirror images, one being the reverse of the other, but as running in parallel and using the same mechanism' (p.4). Certain features of processing apparently shared by reading and writing are the use and activation of schemata and construction of meaning. Following the same line of thought, Zamel (1992, p. 463) contends that reading and writing are both characterized by 'active engagement through which meaning is created'. For Shanahan and Lomax (1986) this model provides the best description of the reading-writing relationship.

The reading-writing relationship is also viewed from a bidirectional perspective. It considers reading and writing as 'interactive but also interdependent' (Eisterhold, 1990, p. 92) that entails numerous relations whose nature may change depending on language proficiency (ibid.). Shanahan (1884) considers that the reading-writing relationship is developmental and states that 'what is learned at one stage of development can be qualitatively different from what is learned at another stage of development' (p. 467). Following the same line of thought, Grabe and Zhang (2016, p. 341) assert that reading and writing have 'bidirectional developmental paths. They are two aspects of literacy abilities that mutually support each other'. Ahmed, Wagner, and Lopez (2014) investigated the bidirectional relationship between reading and writing at the lexical, sentence, and discourse level using longitudinal data from the first grade to the fourth one. A unidirectional relation was detected at the lexical and discourse levels; however, a bidirectional relation was found at the sentence level.

2.2 Argumentative Texts from Reading to Writing

According to Smith (2004), reading and writing as forms of thinking can never be detached from the purpose, prior knowledge and the nature of text. 'The conventions of the text permit the expectations of readers and the intentions of writers to intersect' (p. 192). The structural conventions are one of the similarities between reading and writing argument. Relying on Toulmin model (2003), both reading and writing argument encompass the identification of a claim, evidential support, and the warrant that links support to claim. In other words, an argument encompasses making a claim that is supported by reasons and evidence from different sources that links with the claim in a proper way. This structuralist view of argument is effective in highlighting patterns of reading and writing in order to stimulate the argument schemata into the minds of students (Reznitskaya & Anderson, 2002).

Finder (1971) suggests that there are six parts in the construction of an argument: object of the argument, the selection of details and evidence, the organization, a scale (a focus devoted to details or sections), the representation of the writer's attitudes and stance, and means (selection of specific words and sentences). Writing is assembling these six parts, and each in its own manner influences the reader. Furthermore, an argument entails skills in using two conventions; the one of capitalization and punctuation, and the other of style of writing. At this stage 'all the skills of writing may be inferred from reading' (ibid. p. 616). The skills required for reading and writing clarify the principles of composition and comprehension. Through a reading activity, students learn to build an argument and adjust discourse to the reader. The knowledge students use in writing is the knowledge students use in critiquing the others work. (ibid.)

Bazerman (1980) considers that summary and paraphrase are good manifestations of the reading- writing relationship, and effective skills for crafting original arguments. He also adds that responding to reading enables

students to delimit their own opinions and identity compared to those expressed in the written piece. Students -as readers- discover their own beliefs and thoughts as they attempt to merge the writer's thoughts with their own. Reading critically and analytically others' writing enables students to frame and review their own writing to be a purposeful and proper contribution to a permanent writer-reader conversation.

It is important for students to develop their critical reading since it exerts a crucial role in analyzing texts logically which is an essential element in academic writing. Through practicing reading, students acquire the ability to have a voice in their writing and influence their audience as well (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). In other words, the constant exposure to argumentative samples engages students-readers in the text by developing a thorough comprehension of the writer's stance and ideas, and then assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments which enables them to form or reform their own stance. Through reading arguments, students can, then, learn to construct arguments, consider the audience, and interact with the reader.

3. Data Collection and Results Analysis
3.1 Data Collecting Tools

In order to collect data from writing teachers -at the Teachers Training School- concerning their perceptions about the use of argumentative texts to teach argumentative writing, a questionnaire was designed. 'These days online questionnaires have largely taken over from pen-and-paper questionnaire' (Fife-Schaw, 2006, p. 344). Consequently, we opted for an online questionnaire which includes 27 questions assembled in three sections. The primary aim of the questionnaire is to investigate the teachers' perceptions about the use of argumentative texts to teach argumentative essays. Another aim of this questionnaire is to elicit the teachers' viewpoints about the reading-writing relationship in a writing class. It also aims to gain insight on teachers' focus in selecting argumentative texts, and to find out whether the existence of a writer-reader interaction is a requisite. The positive effects argumentative texts might have on students' argumentative writing are also investigated. Through the questionnaire, the following research questions would be answered.

1. Do teachers use argumentative reading to teach argumentative writing?
2. Do teachers emphasize the writer-reader interaction in teaching reading and writing argumentative essays?
3. How does reading argumentative texts affect positively the students' argumentative written production?

The questionnaire has been designed and administered electronically to 13 Teacher Training School Writing teachers, representing 81.25% of the population. Yet, one teacher did not answer the questionnaire. Consequently, the sample is regressed into 12 teachers representing 75% of the population.

The questionnaire consists of 27 questions that are assembled in three sections. The first section aims to gather general information about the respondents; it includes two questions (Q1 and Q2) which inquire about the degree held by the respondents and their teaching experience. The second section which deals with the argumentative writing encompasses nine questions (from Q 3 to Q 11) while the third section contains sixteen questions (from Q12 and Q27) that inquire about teaching argumentative essay through reading argumentative texts. Most of the questions are closed-ended questions (23 questions including the follow up questions) and only 4 are open-ended questions.

3.2 Results Analysis

The respondents of the questionnaire hold either a magister degree (50 %) or Ph.D. degree (50 %) -one is a professor. The majority of teachers have more than 5 years of experience in teaching writing, and only a minority has less than 5 years of experience. This wide variety of experience (from one year to more than 20 years) yields data that represents the spectrum of a teaching experience; from a novice to an expert. All teachers consider 'providing feedback' as the most important activity that improves students' writing. It has been noticed that the majority of teachers do not perceive reading as an activity capable to develop students' writing since it gets the least percentage (41%). On the other hand, they prioritize other activities such as 'practice', and 'explicit instruction' to enhance students' writing (table n° 1).

Table 1. Activities/Tasks for Enhancing Students' Writing

	Respondents	
Options	**N°**	**%**
1. Explicit instruction	9	75%
2 .Reading	5	41%
3. Providing feedback	12	100%
4. More assignment (practice)	11	91%
5. Others, please specify	0	0%

Concerning the weeks spent in teaching argumentative essay, the teachers answers vary considerably; we can cluster their answers into three categories: the first one covers the argumentative essay in a month or less (2, 3, or 4 weeks). The second one prefers to cover this type of essay in more than a month (6, 8 weeks, or a whole semester). The third category of teachers believes that many factors determine the number of weeks to spend covering the argumentative essay. They consider that the teaching situations or external circumstances dictate the duration of the coverage of such type of essay; some mentioned the circumstances of the Covid-19 pandemic as an example. While 50% of respondents consider the time devoted to argumentative writing sufficient, 50% deem it as insufficient. In explaining their attitudes, the teachers stressed the importance of the argumentative essay to students who

need more practice in this particular type of essay. In comparing the importance of one-side and two-sided essays, 50% of respondents consider a two-sided argumentative essay as more important than a one-sided argumentative essay while 50% consider that both types are equally important. We can infer that two-sided argumentative essay is considered as more important than one-sided argumentative essay since no one chose the one-sided essay.

As far as rating the students' argumentative writing is concerned, the majority of the respondents (75%) rate their students' argumentative writing as 'average' while a minority of respondents (25%) esteem their students' argumentative writing as 'good'. We notice that the students' argumentative writing level ranges from good to average. In other words, it is neither excellent nor weak. The primary criterion on which all teachers rely in evaluating their students' argumentative writing is 'the variety and complexity of arguments'. Other criteria such as 'organization', 'audience consideration', 'grammar' and 'vocabulary' are also considered in the evaluation at different degrees.

Regarding the misconceptions students may have about 'an argument', the majority of the respondents consider that students misconceive 'argument' as a mere opinion, while a small minority of respondents consider that students misconceive 'argument' as a verbal fight. Furthermore, the majority of teachers notice several weaknesses in their students' argumentative writing since they selected several areas that might create difficulties for students' argumentative writing such as generating arguments, providing counterarguments and refuting counterarguments.

Despite the fact that reading and writing are actually taught in two separate modules at the Teachers Training School, the majority of the respondents lean towards an integration of reading and writing in a single module. In respect to the reading-writing relationship, the majority of teachers 58.3% consider that the relationship between reading and writing is non-directional while 25% of respondents view the connection between reading and writing as unidirectional. A minority (16.7%) see the reading-writing relationship as bidirectional.

Concerning the use of reading in a writing class, the majority actually use reading to teach writing. Yet, a small minority still believe that reading is irrelevant in a writing class (table 02). Although a great majority use reading in their class, the frequency of its use varies considerably. While the majority of the respondents (41.7%) use reading at the maximum frequency 'always', 16.7%, of the teachers 'never' use reading in their writing class. With regard to the reasons behind the use of reading in a writing class, the majority of the teachers use reading for different purposes, but the primary reason selected by 83.3% of the respondents is to model the organization and the structure of the essay.

Table 2. Using Reading in a Writing Class

Options	Respondents	
	N°	%
Yes	10	83.3%
No	2	16.7%
Total	12	100%

Concerning the argumentative type of essay, the totality of the respondents confirms the use of argumentative texts in teaching argumentative essays. Teachers use argumentative essays for different reasons. Yet, an overwhelming majority (91.7%) use argumentative texts to model the types of argumentative essay (one sided or two-sided). When selecting the argumentative reading texts, the focus of 100% of teachers is on the quality of arguments. 75% of the teachers also choose samples with language that corresponds to their students' language proficiency.

Concerning the existence of rhetorical strategies in the reading samples, selected by teachers, 50% of the respondents consider the existence of writer pronouns (I, me, my) mandatory in the argumentative texts, while for 50% of the respondents insist on the presence of rhetorical questions in argumentative samples. Inclusive pronouns (we, our) and reader pronouns (you, your) are less required than the previously mentioned strategies. A minority of the respondents select samples that include all the rhetorical strategies mentioned in the options (see question n° 20 appendix 1) whereas no respondent opted for the 'imperative' which receives 0%. Although the majority of teachers do not consider 'writer-reader' interaction as a focus when selecting the argumentative texts, the totality of teachers confirms the mandatory existence of one or more rhetorical strategies. This inconsistency reveals the majority of teachers' unawareness of the role 'pronouns', 'questions', and 'imperative' can play as rhetorical strategies able to generate writer-reader interaction in argumentative texts. According to the teachers' answers, students use rhetorical strategies in their argumentative writing at different degrees. While the majority of students use writer's pronouns, a scarce minority employs all of them.

50% of the respondents use argumentative text as an explanatory element (to explain the different characteristics of the argumentative essay). Furthermore, 100% of the teachers follow up reading with a discussion. This result highlights the importance teachers allocate to discussion as a post reading activity. For 24.9% of the teachers, the discussion relies mainly on the organizational aspects of the text. 16.6% of the respondents use discussion for reflecting on the writer's assumptions beliefs and values. The same percentage (16.6%) opted for assessing, interpreting, critiquing arguments and claims. 8.3% of the respondents use the post-reading discussion to assess the writer-reader interaction in the text. 24.9% of the respondents selected the option 'other' and explained that any/all option (s) could be the focus of the discussion. It is noticed that while the majority of

the respondents (66.4%) selected one option, which represents the focus of the discussion, a minority of 24.9% could not select only one option to be the focus of the discussion. In addition, it has been observed that one respondent did not answer this question. The reason could be either it was done intentionally, the teacher could not focus on a particular element in a post reading discussion, or unintentionally, she did not pay attention to question N°24.

Since all the respondents confirmed the use of a post reading discussion the great majority did not answer the follow up question (Q 24) inquiring about the reasons for not using discussion. Only one respondent provided an answer for this question. The respondent's answer is not consistent with her previous answers where she maintained the use of post-reading discussion that focus on the organizational aspects of the text. However, it is in accordance with her answer in question N°14, in which she confirms not using reading in her writing class.

Teachers perceive the positive effect of reading argumentative texts on their students' argumentative writing in several aspects. All teachers notice the constructive influence of reading argumentative texts on students' written arguments and pattern of organization of their essays. Improvement at the levels of vocabulary, structure and support is also detected at different degree. Writer-reader interaction is not considerably enhanced in students' argumentative essays, as confirmed by teachers.

Table 3. The Positive Influence of Reading Argumentative Essay on Students' Argumentative Writing

	Respondents	
Options	**N°**	**%**
1.Words	8	66.7%
2. Structure	9	75%
3. Pattern of organization	12	100%
4. Arguments	12	100%
5. Support	5	41.7%
6. Writer-reader interaction	3	25%

A few teachers provide comments in the section devoted for suggestions. The respondents emphasize the importance of argumentative essay for the development of the students' cognitive abilities. They recommend the use of cognitive strategies to analyze the argumentative texts.

4. CONCLUSION

The present study investigates the teachers' perceptions about the use of reading in a writing class with special emphasis on the argumentative type of essay. This study has shown that the majority of teachers are aware of the importance of using reading in a writing class. Yet, a minority still believe that the focus in Writing is on the production of written discourse and not reading texts. Teachers also confirm the use of argumentative reading to teach argumentative writing for several reasons, but the primary aim is to model the type of essay (one-sided or two-sided).

In selecting argumentative texts, all teachers' major focus is on the quality of arguments. Only a minority of teachers consider the existence of writer-reader interaction, in the sample texts, of paramount importance. The majority underestimate the existence of the writer-reader interaction in the argumentative texts, paradoxically, they insist on selecting reading samples that include one or more of rhetorical strategies [pronouns (writer, reader, inclusive) and rhetorical questions, imperative]. Apparently, the majority of teachers perceive 'pronouns', questions, and imperatives solely as grammatical elements, they are unaware of the function these devices can play rhetorically. There is no justification for selecting reading samples that include a number of grammatical elements when teaching an argumentative type of essay. The major aim of choosing reading samples with a number of rhetorical strategies is to highlight the rhetorical aspects of an argumentative essay such as writer-reader interaction.

Further, the majority of teachers use argumentative text as an explanatory element (to explain the different characteristics of the argumentative essay). This is consistent with the teachers' confirmation of the use of post-reading discussion. The latter focuses mainly on the organizational aspects of the text as confirmed by the majority of the respondents. The positive influence of reading argumentative texts on students' written arguments is noticed by teachers, on several aspects. Yet, the most noticeable positive effects are detected on the pattern of organization and on the arguments. This is congruent with the criteria teachers' set for selecting argumentative essay-concentrating on arguments of the texts- and their major aim in using reading to teach writing -modeling the pattern of organization. This proves that using reading argumentative texts in a writing class yields positive effects on students' argumentative writing.

Implication and Recommendation

Integrating reading in a writing class is a crucial step for enhancing students' written production as it allows students to transfer several elements from the reading texts to their written essays. In reading an argumentative type of essay, for example, students become familiar with the pattern of organization and the types of arguments. Therefore, teachers need to use reading in their writing class not only to model the pattern of organization,

but also to discuss the components of the essay such as the types of arguments, support, vocabulary, and writer-reader interaction. These elements could be fully explored and tackled through a post-reading discussion. This can play an important role in heightening the students' understanding and interaction with the text. In other words, the argumentative samples used in writing class are not merely models of the structure of the text; they are a significant tool to expose students to different types of arguments and audiences. Therefore, exposing students to argumentative texts permits students to familiarize not only with the text structure but also with the types of evidence, arguments, counterarguments and rebuttals. Consequently, students will engage in a writing task with a good understanding of the requirements of an argumentative type of essay. The teachers' role, then, is not limited to selecting argumentative texts and assigning tasks. More importantly, they have to engage their students in critical reading that paves the way to a thoughtful, reflective and argumentative writing. Finally, having two separate modules to teach reading and writing -at the TTS- is an excellent opportunity to maximize the integration of both skills. In other words, in a writing class, reading is used as a primary tool in teaching writing, and similarly writing is used in a reading class. Consequently, the transfer in both directions will be reflected in students' written production and comprehension.

Limitation of the Study

We acknowledge the existence of some limitations in this study. Two respondents have admitted not using reading in their writing class, yet, they kept answering the questions which deal with teaching argumentative writing through argumentative texts. One of these teachers explained that her answers are primarily from a researcher's perspective and not from a teacher's experience. The other teacher may have misunderstood question N° 14, or she may have felt obliged to keep answering the questionnaire. Another possible interpretation is that the teacher does not generally use reading in her writing class, but when it comes to the argumentative type, she feels the necessity to use argumentative texts. This could partly affect the results of the study, which aims to obtain data from the teacher's practices and experience in a writing class. Since the sample includes 12 teachers and the two teachers represent a minority, we believe that this would not affect significantly the results of the study.

5. Bibliography List :

Ahmed, Y., Wagner, R. K., & Lopez, D. (2014). Developmental relations between reading and writing at the word, sentence, and text levels: A latent change score analysis. *Journal of educational psycology, 106*(2), 419-434.

Bazerman, C. (1980). A relationship between reading and wrting: The conversational model. *College English, 41*(6), 656-661.

Eisterhold, J. C. (1990). Reading-writing connections: Towards a description for second language learners. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 88-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fife-Schaw, C. (2006). Questionnaire design. In G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, C. Fife-Schaw, & J. A. Smith (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology* (5th ed., pp. 344-371). LA, USA: Sage.

Finder, M. (1971). Reading and writing exposition and argument: The skills and their relationships. *The English Journal, 60*(5), 615-620.

Freire, P. (1983). The importance of the act of reading. *Journal of education, 165*(1), 5-11.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing.* New York: Longman.

Grabe, W., & Zhang, C. (2016). Reading-writing relationship in first and second language academic literacy development. *Language Teaching, 49*(3), 339-355.

Graham, S., Gillespie, A., & McKeown, D. (2013). Writing: Importance, development, and instruction. *Reading and writing, 26*(1), 1-15.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis.* London: Longman.

Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading.* Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Kucer, S. L. (1985). The making of meaning: Reading and writing as parallel processes. *Written Communication, 2*(3), 317-336.

Langer, J. A. (2002). *Effective literacy instruction: Building successful reading and writing programs.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Reznitskaya, A., & Anderson, R. C. (2002). The argument schema and learning to reason. *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices*, 319-334.

Shanahan, T. (1884). Nature of reading-writing relation: An exploratory multivariate analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(3), 466-477.

Shanahan, T. (1988). The reading-writing relationship: Seven instructional principles. *The Reading Teacher, 41*(7), 636-647.

Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. G. (1986). An analysis and comparison of theoretical models of the reading-writing relationship. *Journal od Educational Psychology, 78*(2), 116-123.

Smith, F. (2004). *Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read.* New Jeresy: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.,Publishers.

Spivey, N. N. (1990). Transforming texts: Constructive processes in reading and writing. *Written Communication, 7*(2), 256-287.

Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The uses of argument.* Cambridge University Press.

Zamel, V. (1992). Writing one's way into reading. *Tesol Quarterly, 26*(3), 463-485.

6. Appendices

Teachers' Questionnaire

This questionnaire is a part of a research work that investigates the teaching of argumentative writing through reading argumentative texts. You are invited to fill it in.

We would very much appreciate your help.

Section One: General Information

Teaching Argumentative Writing through Reading Argumentative Texts: The
Case of the Teachers of Writing at the Teachers Training School of Assia Djabar, Constantine

1. Degree held:
2. MA (Master/Magister) ☐
3. PhD   ☐
2. How long have you been teaching writing?
……………. years.

Section Two: Argumentative Writing

3. Among the following, which do you use to enhance students' writing?
      1. Explicit instruction   ☐
      2. Reading   ☐
      3. Providing feedback   ☐
      4. More assignments (practice)   ☐
      5. Others please specify   ☐

4. How many weeks do you spend teaching argumentative essay?
…………………weeks
5. Do you think the amount of time devoted to teaching argumentative essay
is sufficient to develop students' argumentative writing?
      1. Yes   ☐
      2. No   ☐
      6. If no, why? please
          explain…………………………………………

7. Which type of argumentative essay do you consider more important?
          1.One-sided essay (provide arguments of one's stance only) ☐
          2.Two-sided essay (arguments of one's stance and others' stance on
          the same issue /counterarguments)   ☐
          3.Both ☐
8. How do you rate your students' argumentative writing?
Excellent ☐   Good ☐   Average ☐ Weak   ☐
9. The good quality of students argumentative writing is based on:
      1. Variety and complexity of arguments   ☐
      2. Vocabulary   ☐
      3. Grammar   ☐
      4. Organization   ☐
      5. Audience consideration   ☐

10. What are the misconception (s) students may have about an argument?
      1. An argument as a mere opinion (an opinion is a statement of preference
whose   foundations are entirely personal)   ☐
      2. An argument is a statement of fact.   ☐
      3. An argument is a controversy   ☐
      4. An argument is a verbal fight   ☐
11. Which of the following create (s) difficulties for your students'
argumentative writing?

1. Organization ☐
2. Generating arguments ☐
3. Stating a position ☐
4. Providing counterargument ☐
5. Refuting the counterarguments ☐
6. Audience consideration ☐

Section Three: Teaching Reading and Argumentative Text: From Theory to Practice

12. Among the following, which stance do you take for teaching the reading and writing skills?

1. Reading and writing should be taught separately in two separate modules ☐
2.. Reading and writing should be taught together within one module ☐
3. Reading, writing, and reading and writing (both of them together), should be taught in 3 different modules ☐

13. In your opinion, which type of relationship do reading and writing have?
    1. Unidirectional (reading influences writing, but that writing knowledge is not particularly useful in reading.) ☐
    2. Non directional (both skills can transfer in either direction as in an interactive model.) ☐
    3. Bidirectional (interactive but interdependent. In other words, what is learned at a certain stage of development can be qualitatively different from what is learned later) ☐

14. Do you use reading in your writing class?
Yes ☐   no ☐
15. If yes, how often?
    1. Always ☐
    2. Often ☐
    3. Sometimes ☐
    4. Rarely ☐
    5. Never ☐

16. Why do you use reading in your writing class? Select one of the following reasons.
    1. To model the organization and the structure of the essay ☐
    2. To enrich students' vocabulary ☐
    3. To expose students to various ideas and contents ☐
    4. Others please specify. ☐

17. Do you use argumentative texts to teach argumentative writing?
yes ☐   no ☐
18. If yes, why?

1. To model the type of argumentative essay (one sided or two sided) ☐
2. To model the pattern of organization (block pattern (arguments and counterarguments plus refutation are discussed in separate paragraphs) /point by point (counterarguments and refutations are discussed in the same paragraph) ☐
3. To raise students' awareness of audience consideration ☐
4. To expose them to different types of reasoning (inductive: deductive) ☐
5. To enable students to state a position ☐
6. Others: please specify ……………….… ☐

19. In selecting the argumentative reading text (sample), your focus is on:
    1. The topic of the debatable issue (interesting to students) ☐
    2. The quality of arguments ☐
    3. The level of language (needs to correspond to students' language proficiency) ☐
    4. The existence of writer-reader interaction ☐
    5. Others ☐

20. Which, among the following, need (s) to be present in the argumentative reading sample?
    1. Writer's pronouns (I, me) ☐
    2. Readers' pronouns (you, your) ☐
    3. Inclusive pronouns (we, our) ☐
    4. Rhetorical questions ☐
    5. Imperative ☐
    6. All ☐
    7. None ☐

21. Which, among the following, students use in their argumentative writing?
    1. Writer's pronouns (I, me) ☐
    2. Readers' pronouns (you, your) ☐
    3. Inclusive pronouns (we, our) ☐
    4. Rhetorical questions ☐
    5. Imperative ☐
    6. All ☐
    7. None ☐

22. How do you use argumentative text?
    1. As explanatory element (to explain the different characteristics of the argumentative essay) ☐
    2. As prompt to writing assignments (the topic of the text is the topic of the assignment) ☐
    3. Both ☐

23. Is the reading followed by a discussion?

1. Yes   ☐
2. No   ☐

24. If yes, the discussion relies mainly on?
    1. The organizational aspects of the text   ☐
    2. Assessing, interpreting, critiquing arguments and claims   ☐
    3. Assessing the writer-reader interaction in the text   ☐
    4. Reflecting on the writer's assumptions beliefs and values   ☐
    5. Others, please specify   ☐

25. If no, why?
    1. Time constraint (time devoted to reading will crowd out the writing instruction)   ☐
    2. The focus is on writing not reading ☐
    3. Reading samples is sufficient   ☐
    4. Others   ☐

26. Which of the following aspects reflects the positive influence of reading argumentative essay on students' argumentative essay?
    1. Words   ☐
    2. Structure   ☐
    3. Pattern of organization   ☐
    4. Arguments   ☐
    5. Support   ☐
    6. Writer-reader conversation ☐
    7. Others: please specify.

27. If you have any suggestions and /or comments, please provide them in the following space.

………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………

Thank you