The Significance of Implementing Reading Techniques in the Curriculum of Second Year Students of English at L'Ecole Normale Supérieure in Constantine, Algeria

Dr. Esma FETSI

Doctor in Language Sciences,

University Frères Mentouri,

Constantine 1, Algeria

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between written achievement and the incorporation of reading as a subject (Reading Techniques) in the curriculum of second year English language future teachers in the ENS (Ecole Normale Supérieure) of Constantine. The guaranteed place of reading in the ENS has brought some benefits to the students in improving their reading skills as well as their writing abilities because reading is said to inform writing as both skills are interrelated. The major aim of this study is to investigate this relationship and the extent to which reading affects writing in the teaching of English as a foreign language. The students' scores in Reading Techniques and Written Expression are analyzed and compared to determine the nature of relationship.

Key words: Reading Techniques; written

achievement; incorporation; improving the reading skills

<u>Résumé</u>

Cette étude examine la relation entre la production écrite et l'incorporation d'un module consacré pour la lecture (Techniques de la lecture) dans le programme d'études des futurs enseignants d'anglais en deuxième année à l'ENS (Ecole Normale Supérieure) de Constantine. Le fait que la lecture a une place garantie dans le programme de l'ENS a apporté quelques avantages aux étudiants en améliorant leurs compétences en lecture ainsi que leurs capacités d'écriture parce que la lecture est censée influencer l'écriture car les deux compétences sont interdépendantes. L'objectif principal de cette étude est d'étudier cette relation et a quel point la lecture affecte l'écriture dans l'enseignement de l'anglais en tant que langue étrangère. Les notes des étudiants dans les techniques de la lecture et l'expression écrite sont analysées et comparées a fin d'apercevoir la nature de la relation.

<u>Mots-clés</u>: Techniques de lecture; production écrite; incorporation; améliorer les compétences en lecture

Introduction

Writing in a second language is considered as a vital phase of the learning process. Teachers and instructors are in a constant search for new activities

which provide input and practice to the writing class not only focusing on sentence structure, organization, or grammar rules. Naturally, many questions were raised about the nature of input needed to inform learners written texts. The first and foremost element of the language that was recommended was reading. Providing reading models in the writing classroom is widely understood as input for the acquisition of writing skills. Through these reading models, learners can learn and infer the writing skills, techniques, and strategies for any type of writing.

Reading and writing are fundamental skills to the building of language comprehension. However, reading has received less interest in the nineteenth century where writing dominated the language classes. It was until the turn of the century that both skills were connected in the curriculum in different universities like Harvard which declared that reading was critical to learning to write.

Throughout this paper, the researcher tries to determine the correspondence between the teaching of Reading Techniques together with Written Expression and students' achievement in writing through the comparison of exam scores amongst ENS students by associating their scores in Reading Techniques with their corresponding ones in Written Expression. Initially, the results of the descriptive statistics in terms of general tendency and dispersion are displayed and analyzed to show the students' overall behavior in the Written Expression exam.

Before introducing the statistical data, an emphasis on the importance of both reading and writing and their interaction in the curriculum is summarized below since the major aim behind this step in the methodological design is to clarify the effect of teaching reading along with writing on the writing proficiency of second year students.

1. The Nature of the Reading-Writing Overlap

The first published work related to reading writing connections, according to Tierney (1992), dates back to 1929. It was until the 80's and the 90's that the relation between the reader and writer was investigated and no attempt at linking reading to writing was made before due to the belief that reading is a receptive skill while writing is a productive one. Hence, both skills were commonly taught as independent subjects (Nelson and Calfee, 1988) in terms of the methods of teaching and assessment. Reading performance, according to Tierney and Leys (1986), was scored with MCQ's (mainly true or false), while written performance was scored using qualitative comparison (norm-referenced).

Reading and writing were considered as simply behavioral responses and separate acts before theories of causal relationships were studied. The question was: which leads to the other, reading or writing? Until recently, the movement of 'reading and writing are related activities' showed with many studies that each may help the other (VanDeGrift, 2005). This implies that both skills are interrelated and each one informs

the other. In this chapter, we will focus on one direction; how reading influences writing.

Advocates of the idea that reading influences writing claim the aspect of inspiring and introducing students to new ideas, and even give them something to write about. They believe that both skills are to give better results when one informs the other. Much empirical work has been studied with respect to the relationship between reading comprehension processes and written texts production from the same cognitive perspective (Eisterhold, 1990; Parodi, 2007).

Emam and Farahzad (2010) maintain that the way reading and writing might reinforce or accelerate the learning of content, the development of literacy skills, as well as the acquisition of language abilities has attracted researchers interest and reading-writing interactions has then become a topic of interest in both L1 and L2 settings. Essentially, and historically speaking, the relationships between reading and writing have been conceptualized by a complex set of theories and approaches. Traditionally, reading and writing were regarded as individual skills, each taught within its own independent skills and strategies.

In a comprehensive review, Stotsky (1983) described early correlational studies which, at that time, revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship between reading ability and writing quality. These studies were categorized under three groups: (1) studies dealing with the correlation of measures of reading achievement with measures of writing ability; (2) others with the correlation of

measures of reading experience with measures of writing ability; and (3) those with the correlation of measures of reading ability with measures of syntactic complexity in students' compositions. The premise of all these studies is that reading and writing are parallel processes which need thorough investigation to draw conclusions about their interactive effects.

Despite the fact that the integration of reading and writing is critical to academic success and that empirical evidence suggests that both skills are "parallel processes", interrelationships between them are still a relatively underexplored area of research (Tierney, 1992; Hirvela, 2004; Parodi, 2007; Emam & Farahzad, 2010; Grabe & Zhang, 2013). However, there emerged a set of hypotheses about the reading-writing relation in both L1 and L2 settings. An illustration of the different hypotheses is provided bellow.

2.   Reading-writing Relationship in Second Language Research

Originally, L1 and L2 research has proven that there exists transfer from L1 to L2 since all languages share similar elements and some languages are more similar to each other than they are to others. In fact, L2 learners come with relatively developed language skills in their L1. If this is achieved in reading in L1 with learners having easier time learning to read in L2, then positive transfer is said to take place. If they find difficulties in learning to read in L2 than L1 learners, then we can say that there is negative transfer. Similarly, the language interdependence principle

claims that transfer of universal, conceptual aspects of language proficiency occur automatically after linguistic surface features of the L2 are acquired (Bernhardt and Kamil, 2006).

In this line, after L2 learners have developed a certain proficiency in the two interrelated language skills, transfer between comprehension and production can naturally occur. Evidence showed that there is a cognitive/academic proficiency that is common to all languages and that it allows for across languages transfer of literacy-related skills (Eisterhold et al, 1990). However, for transfer capability to occur, Cummins' (1981) *interdependence hypothesis* suggests that literacy transfers from L1 to L2 at the time when learners start an intensive exposure to L2. This will allow for development of similar literacy ability in L2. In fact, transfer and non-transfer of literacy skills from L1 to L2 literacy activities have been a concept of interest of many other studies based on Cummins' hypothesis (Raimes, 1987; Eisterhold et al., 1990; Carrell, 1991; Eisterhold, 1990; Emam & Farahzad, 2010).

Not all studies, however, support Cummins's claim. There emerged another hypothesis emphasizing that students should attain a certain threshold level of L2 proficiency to permit cognitively demanding language use, i.e., to transfer literacy from L1 to L2. Koda (2005, 2007, 2016)'s view of *the Language Threshold Hypothesis* implies that exposing students to adequate amount of reading in L2 results in reading more strategically and transferring L1 strategic reading to L2 reading settings. He conceptualizes transfer as

the automatic activation of well-established L1 competences set off by L2 input. He further states:

> In all studies, L2 variables were found to have a stronger impact, overriding the variance attributable to L1 experience. Thus, although L2 print information processing is guided by insights stemming from literacy experiences in the two languages, L2 print input appears to be the dominant force in shaping reading subskills in that language (Koda, 2007: 29).

The *Language Threshold Hypothesis* requires from L2 readers to have enough L2 knowledge in terms of vocabulary and structure in order to allow for effective use of L1 reading strategies and skills to achieve comprehension of the L2 reading texts. Considering that not all L2 readers have the same L2 knowledge, topic knowledge, and L2 reading experience, we can say that the threshold will vary according to the reader, the level of difficulty of the text, the topic, and, sometimes, the task (Grabe, 2009). Hence, individual and experiential differences between L1 and L2 readers play an important role in the process of transfer. Students come with different levels of L1 reading proficiency, different motives for reading in the L2, not the same amount of exposure to L2 reading, besides there are different kinds of texts in L2 contexts, and this may influence L2 reading comprehension.

The nature of the relationship between reading and writing has been investigated in many directions and many hypotheses have been raised across languages (transfer from L1 to L2) and across modalities (reading-to-writing and writing-to-reading).

Tierney and Leys (1986) address the most popular issue in correlational studies; whether improvement in reading performance results in improvement in writing ability and vice versa. They argue that it is impossible to separate these processes because they are interrelated and working together to achieve information storage and retrieval, discovery and logical thought, communication, and self-indulgence.

Petrosky (1982: 34) summarizes the relationships and states that:

> One of the most interesting results of connecting reading, literary, and composition theory and pedagogy is that they yield similar explanations of human understanding as a process rooted in the individual's knowledge and feelings and characterized by the fundamental act of making meaning, whether it be through reading, responding, or writing. When we read, we comprehend by putting together impressions of the text with our personal, cultural, and contextual models of reality. When we write, we compose by making meaning from available information, our personal knowledge, and the cultural and contextual frames we happen to find ourselves in.

In sum, the reading-writing relationship has been addressed with two points of interest; the interlingual (transfer across languages L1 to L2) and intralingual (transfer across modalities) aspects of the issue in addition to the directionality of transfer between reading and writing. These issues have been subjects of discussions of reading-writing relations. Consequently, relating theory and pedagogy in the field of reading-writing relationships may lead teachers and

practitioners to draw conclusions about interactive effects and use them effectively in their classrooms.

2. The Importance of Teaching Reading and Writing Together

Reading is a complex process of meaning making and re-creation of a written text in a reader's mind (Walter, 1982). It consists of a number of component skills subdivided by Rayner and Pollatsek (1989) and Grabe (1991). This complexity is mainly cognitive and what happens in the reader's mind during and after reading is said to affect his/her writing ability. Moreover, models of reading texts are widely advised in the writing classroom as comprehensible input for the acquisition of writing skills.

Second language learners come with a certain proficiency of reading and writing in their L1. This, according to Cummins' (1981) interdependence hypothesis suggesting literacy transfer from L1 to L2, will allow for development of reading and writing in L2. After the transfer of literacies between the languages, and as soon as the learners reach a certain threshold level of reading in the L2, they can transfer their knowledge gained from reading to writing. In fact, knowledge and strategies transfer from one skill to the other has taken a large portion in the studies investigating the connection between both literacies. However, many studies (Eisterhold, 1990; Kroll, 1993) have reported that more transfer occurs from reading to

writing since reading texts are the primary comprehensible input taken as models for writing.

Reading is said to be at the heart of writing (Hirvela, 2004). Consequently, many studies have investigated the effect of incorporating reading with writing either as an independent subject in the curriculum or integrated in the writing classroom. Both orientations seek the benefits of both skills on each other. In his book "Techniques in Teaching Writing", Raimes (1983) devoted a whole chapter talking about using readings in writing classes as an instructional technique for teaching writing. She stresses the importance of written forms of the target language as a source of language input in contexts where students have limited access to the spoken language. In addition, by using reading, students become more familiar with different language features like vocabulary, idiomatic expressions in their meaningful contexts, paragraph organization, and the cultural assumptions of the target language native speakers. Similarly, Cobine (1995) asserts that writing about previous readings results in fulfilling a large set of learning styles; that is, synthesizing ideas along with critical assessment of these ideas enables university students to read texts and skillfully write about them.

Nonetheless, Silberstein (1994) draws teachers' attention to the pitfall to avoid when teaching reading which is using reading as 'grist for a writing mill', i.e., using reading activities as mere information sources to use in writing. According to her, this would be not be motivating as the students would neglect the primary aim behind reading, which is comprehension, and

focus only on what to take from reading to use in writing. Yet, when designing any curriculum, reading components should focus on how to help students become better readers first.

Furthermore, early studies by Birnbaum (1981, 1982 cited in Tierney and Leys, 1986) concluded that students' ability to comprehend the reading materials can enable them to write more organized, connected, and of higher content quality compared to those with a less ability to comprehend. Correspondingly, the researcher in the current study decided to compare the performance of second year students in the ENS both in Reading Techniques and Written Expression to find out any possible correspondence between both subject matters.

3. The Importance of Reading Instruction in the Curriculum

Since reading is recognized as a complex information processing skill where interaction between the reader and the text occurs and aims at (re)creating meaningful discourse, and as the reader is known to be an active, problem-solving entity who uses a range of skills and strategies for the purpose of achieving comprehension (Silberstein, 1994), teaching this skill becomes compulsory to guide EFL/ESL learners to strategic improvement of their reading abilities. Besides, reading instruction needs to be emphasized in any reading program by setting the goal of developing fluent and independent readers able to use their own strategies to fulfill the reading process successfully. Here comes the role of the teacher of reading which is

that of a facilitator and guide. The teacher introduces the learners to the techniques of good and effective reading without putting much emphasis on the theoretical terminology, but on practicing the techniques and strategies through texts.

Clearly, for teaching any language skill, there must be a well designed and appropriate plan with specific activities related to the teaching goals of each lesson. Reading Techniques activities focus on the usage of different techniques and strategies which help students comprehend and become independent users of the language. Hence, a range of reading tasks is required to guarantee thorough practice. *Skimming*, or quick reading, is the first strategy generally used to obtain the general sense of the text content. Students read quickly (not necessarily every word) and let their eyes run over the text to get the gist without any of the details. Moreover, *reading for thorough comprehension*, or detailed reading, allows students to manipulate the authors' ideas, paraphrase them, and answer comprehension questions. For tasks that require extracting specific information from the text, *scanning* is the strategy to be used. There are different ways for meaning inference; word analysis, contextual clues, semantic information, and so on. This can be done through *critical reading* where students draw inferences and recognize implicit relationships between the text's features to create meaningful discourse.

However, not all text types lend themselves to the same types of tasks with the same techniques and strategies needed for comprehension. Silberstein (1994) maintains that to encourage students to use

reading strategies effectively, teachers should vary the activities for the reading passages. She emphasizes that "Individual texts will suggest particular teaching activities. […] one would not encourage students to undertake a careful syntactic analysis of a passage that merited only rapid scanning for a single piece of information" Silberstein (1994: 11). Therefore, appropriate reading activities for teaching reading techniques are suggested by the reader's goals and the text's characteristics.

In terms of the value of reading, students can learn very much from the written text; the author's methods of dealing with the problem and introducing the content, the organization of the ideas, and choice of phrases and expressions. In order for the students to get these benefits, Raimes (1983) suggests two types of reading activities; extensive reading and close reading. Extensive reading activities require reading for global understanding of the context and the meaning whereas close reading activities, usually with short reading passages, entail close attention to both intrasentential features (word choice, grammatical structures, and so) and suprasentential features (like content and the organization of the text).

4. The Place of Reading Techniques in the ENS Program

In the ENS, Reading Techniques is taught right from the first year by introducing students to the theoretical concepts and terms concerning the techniques and strategies to be used when reading a text besides practicing them in appropriate contexts. In

the second year, more practice is carried out. Through texts' analysis, and with the teacher's guidance, students learn and memorize the different techniques and strategies; they are encouraged to use their own strategies and the appropriate techniques for every reading task.

As for second year writing program which deals with expository prose, it is particularly worthwhile to work with the rhetorical patterns of different types of expository reading passages. For example, in the comparison and contrast type of organization, students are to examine the passage and find the items being compared and the areas of contrast. A possible task can require from the students to separate the similarities from the differences in an accompanying table. The same thing can be done with cause and effect texts besides the evaluation of the degree of conviction of the author's claims. In fact, students can better interpret English expository prose, as claimed by Silberstein (1994), when they are exposed to the conventions that govern these texts. Moreover, by practicing these patterns, they will understand the relationship of ideas within the text after fulfilling related activities such as filling in diagrams, creating semantic maps, understanding parts of the text, or recreating a process they have read about (for instance, how to manipulate a given digital device).

In conclusion, the primary aim behind reading a text is to gain information. This information is to be used as background knowledge in writing. By recognizing conventions of the texts, students get to understand the meaning and to reproduce it in their

writings as well. Likewise, by being critical towards others' writings, students learn to evaluate their own writings.

5. Methodology

For the purpose of understanding the relation between developed reading skills and students' written performance, the researcher decided to compare ENS students' performance in both reading and writing. The descriptive method has been chosen to analyze and compare the students' scores in Reading Techniques and Written Expression.

We opted for an analysis of students' scores in terms of general tendency and dispersion, then we scrutinized them in terms of score ranges from 0 to 5, 6 to 10, 11 to 15, and 16 to 20 is demonstrated and discussed. The data obtained from the comparison of students' scores allow for possible interpretations concerning the direction of transfer from reading to writing; and thus, drawing conclusions about the efficacy of teaching writing through reading. In other words, the comparative analysis seeks to identify the possible reflection of the teachings of reading in writing.

6. Sample and setting

The study took place in the English departments of the ENS of Constantine during the second semester of the academic year 2014/2015. The sample was of 70 students whose scores were subjects of the comparison. The collection of scores was after the fourth semester

exam for the reason that in that semester students are exposed to expository writing and essay writing requirements are introduced. There was a random selection of the Written Expression scores, and then the same scores of the students were associated with their corresponding scores in Reading Techniques (regardless of the names of the students, the lists of the students' scores were alphabetically organized and were the same for all the modules).

7. Comparing ENS Students Overall Performance in Reading Techniques and Written Expression

This part of the research consists of gathering the ENS students' scores in Written Expression and comparing them to their corresponding scores in Reading Techniques as follows:

	General tendency		Dispersion			
	Mean	Mode	Low	Frequency	High	Frequency
Reading Techniques	11.24	11.5	4	1	15.75	2
Written Expression	11.01	13	6	2	15	1

Table 1. ENS students' overall behavior in Reading and Writing

The table above illustrates that there is almost no difference in the mean score of the ENS students' overall performance in Reading Techniques and

Written Expression exams. The mode of Reading Techniques shows that the most frequent score is (11.5) while that of Written Expression is somehow higher (13). The dispersion factors indicate that the lowest score in Reading Techniques was (4) obtained by only one student whereas in Written Expression it was (6) and got by two students. As for the highest scores, they were 15.75 obtained by two students and 15 by only one student in Reading Techniques and Written Expression respectively.

Although the comparison of the central tendency and dispersion aspects may indicate a wide range in Reading Techniques scores (from 4 to 15.75) more than Written Expression scores (from 6 to 15) with different modes for each subject matter, a thorough analysis of scores is required to fully understand the relation between students' performance in both Reading and Writing.

7.1. Corresponding Score Range between Reading Techniques and Written Expression in the ENS Students

In the table below, the scores were grouped under four categories; from 00 to 05, from 06 to 10, from 11 to 15, and from 16 to 20. For the purpose of investigating whether students who ranked in a given group of Reading Techniques were ranked in the same or different group of Written Expression, this type of analysis is opted for. To say it differently, the researcher wants to check if the level of students in Reading Techniques is the same in Written Expression and whether students got similar scores in both

subjects. It is worth noting here that different methods of evaluation may lead to different results and the present study does not focus on the methods of assessing each subject, it rather examines the general performance which is scored by different teachers. Other researches may also bring about different results, but since both subjects were taught by two teachers for each in the ENS, the researcher assumed that there would be cooperation between teachers of the same subject in terms of criteria of evaluation. However, one limitation of this aspect of comparison is that the type of assessment of Reading Techniques in the ENS is not the same as Written Expression since the latter is often scored holistically while the former entails specific responses.

Reading Techniques Score Range	Percentage of Students in Wri Range			
	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
0-5	0%	1.43%	0%	0%
6-10	0%	24.28%	7.14%	0%
11-15	0%	8.57%	55.72%	0%
16-20	0%	0%	2.86%	0%
Grand Total	0%	34.28%	65.72%	0%

Table 2. Corresponding Score Range between Reading Techniques and Written Expression

The analysis of the students' scores as displayed in table (2) has been made according to equal score ranges from the weakest to the highest. Every line of the previous table is to be analyzed and discussed alone in separate tables to fully understand the correspondence of the scores between Reading techniques and Written Expression.

7.2. Findings and Discussion

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Total
0-5	0%	1.43%	0%	0%	**1.43%**

Table 3. (0-5) Range in Reading Techniques

Table (3) shows that none of the ENS students is ranked in the (0-5) range both in Reading Techniques and Written Expression. Likewise, both ranges (11-15) and (16-20) reveal that there is no chance for students who got scores between (00) and (05) in Reading Techniques to get good marks in Written Expression. That is to say, there is no room for accidental success in writing for students who failed in reading. However, the table also shows that (1.43%) of the same students ranking in the first category obtained scores between (06) and (10) in Written Expression. Yet, this ratio refers to only one student who got (04) in Reading Techniques and (07) in Written Expression

From the values obtained, we can say that Reading Techniques scores correspond logically to Written Expression scores and reveal that the level of students in both subject matters is closely related. These results are relatively significant and somehow

prove the claim that poor readers are seldom good writers.

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Total
6-10	0%	24.28%	7.14%	0%	**31.42%**

Table 4. (6-10) Range in Reading Techniques

Table (4) exhibits a clear and logical correspondence between students' scores ranked in the (6-10) range in Reading Techniques and Written Expression with more than (24%) of the students. That is to say, these students achieved nearly the same level in both Reading Techniques and Written Expression. Only (7.14%) of the sample who were ranked in that range could perform better in writing; they scored between (11) and (15). However, this ratio does not imply that students who got less than the average in Reading Techniques could get good marks in Written Expression since the majority had close scores in both exams. For example a student who got (09) in Reading Techniques, had (10) in Written Expression, another one scored (9.5) in Reading Techniques and (12) in Written Expression. None of the students from this range could score more than (12) as displayed in the table of comparison in Appendix F. Moreover, the table above shows that there was no chance for students who got between (06) and (10) in Reading Techniques to score between (16) and (20) in Written Expression which implies that bad readers in the ENS could not be good writers. Likewise, the second column of the table indicates that mediocre readers are often mediocre writers and seldom good writers.

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	**Total**
11-15	0%	8.58%	55.72%	0%	**64.30%**

Table 5. 11-15 Range in Reading Techniques

When we observe the rank of students belonging to the same category of (11-15) in Reading Techniques and Written Expression, we notice a logical correspondence between the percentages. More than half of the students (55.72) obtained similar or close scores in both subject matters while only (8.58%) could rank in the intermediate row of Written Expression and got the average or less as displayed in table (5). However, a deeper observation of the scores revealed that the (6-10) scores obtained in Written Expression are closer to (10) than to (06). On the same table, we notice that no student was ranked on both extremes of the same line since the lowest score in writing is (06) and the highest is (15).

In general, a total of (64.30%) of the sample could achieve a good level in both reading and writing together which proves the claim that good readers are good writers because they develop the ability of using previous readings in their writings in addition to the techniques and strategies they have learnt in Reading Techniques.

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
16-20	0%	0%	2.86%	0%

Table 6. 16-20 Range in Reading Techniques

Again, the same logical correspondence occurs here in table (6) which reveals that (2.86%) of the sample who ranked in the (16-20) category of Reading Techniques could score between (11) and (15) in Written Expression. To be more precise, this percentage refers to two students who both got (15.75) in Reading Techniques and scored (13) and (13.5) in Written Expression exam. Yet again, same as the results observed till now, no student from the (16-20) category of Reading Techniques scored between (00) to (10) in writing which may indicate that good readers are rarely bad writers. Equally, the fact that the best mark in Written Expression was (15) reduced students' chances to be ranked in the same category of reading and writing.

However, one may say that accidents do happen and good readers may face obstacles the day of the exam or some external factors which may affect their performance. Although we did not notice such results, it is worthwhile to mention this point for other researches under some other circumstances may reveal different results.

7.3.   Interpretation of the Results Obtained from the Scores' Comparison

A detailed analysis of the score ranges in Reading Techniques and Written Expression made it clear that most students who ranked in the intermediate or upper-intermediate levels of Reading Techniques were correspondingly in the same levels of Written Expression. About 74% of the ENS students tend to transfer literature items from the readings and activities

of Reading Techniques classes into their writings. The results are not surprising and the logical correspondence we observed in the overall score ranges is confirmed in every raw. Although writing is a creative act, unlike reading, and as creativity tasks cannot be evaluated as objectively as comprehension tasks, the results we obtained from the comparison of students scores were ideally supporting the claim of many researchers, like Stotsky (1983) and Grabe (1991), that good readers are good writers and bad readers are bad writers focusing on reading and writing as 'mutually reinforcing interactive processes'. Yet again, this point is still controversial since some researchers voiced against this assumption.

8. Instructional Principles for Teaching Reading-Writing Connection

In considering reading-writing connection, a large body of literature has focused on their relation in students' L1 giving slight interest to L2 settings. Yet, though L2 reading-writing connection research is relatively at its infancy comparing to L1, Krashen's (1981) theory of comprehensible input has been the foundation of most research conducted in the field of L2 reading-writing connection. Over the past 30 years, there has been an upsurge in the number of journal article and survey studies investigating types of reading/writing tasks. Grabe and Zhang (2013: 12) synthesized the findings of these studies and listed some of the integrated reading/writing tasks in the university settings:

1. Taking notes from a text (both at home and in class).

2. Summarizing text information.

3. Paraphrasing textual resources.

4. Combining information from multiple text sources in a synthesis task.

5. Comparing multiple points of view from written texts and producing a critical synthesis.

6. Answering essay exam questions in writing (both at home and in class).

7. Writing an extended research paper or literature review.

8. Responding to assigned texts (summary and then critique).

In the same vein, Shanahan (1988) proposed seven instructional principles explaining the best way of combining reading and writing in the classroom to enhance literacy learning. These principles are very helpful, if applied in our EFL classes, to raise our students' awareness about the importance of working on both skills together.

Principle 1: Teach both reading and writing; both skills are so closely related and their integration in the curriculum would have positive impacts both on achievement or instructional efficacy.

Principle 2: Introduce reading and writing from the earliest grades; children are introduced to reading and writing even before they start going to school or kindergarten. They meet print in daily life (parents reading bed stories and environmental print). Though the premise good writers must be good readers seems

to be incorrect in the case of children since they can learn to write with limited knowledge of reading, yet research has demonstrated that reading and writing are related since their earliest stages and any delay in the introduction of one skill reduces the possibility of transfer between both modalities.

Principle 3: Instruction should reflect the developmental nature of the reading-writing relationship; reading and writing are developmental processes, i.e. learnt over time, and knowledge gained at one point can differ in nature from what is learnt at another as confirms the study of Shanahan (1984) on second and fifth graders.

Principle 4: Make the reading-writing connection explicit; instruction should clarify the need for the connection and encourage students to think about both skills simultaneously. Teachers should explain how specific skills and information could be used in both skills.

Principle 5: Instruction should emphasize content and process relations; product knowledge relations (including phonemic awareness, word structures, word meanings, sentence structures, cohesion, and passage organization) needs to be distinguished from process knowledge (including strategies and procedures for problem solving or for carrying out complex activities such as revising their own writings and discussing the process of their writing from planning to editing).

Principle 6: Emphasize communications; reading and writing are communication processes, writers communicate with readers through their texts and consider their audience's potential points of views. Equally, a good reader is a critical reader who considers the author's intentions as well as the accuracy and quality of a text. A simple activity to do achieve this principle is to raise classroom discussion about authors' purposes and the delivered messages through the texts.

Principle 7: Teach reading and writing in meaningful contexts; selected topics should be related to various real subjects reflecting various situations and purposes. For example, having students write for the school magazine will provide them with a meaningful context for writing and searching information (through reading) in addition to involving them in the conception, drafting, revising, illustration, and publication of their works. It is then necessary for teachers to introduce their students to a wide range of literacy uses to experience the reading-writing relation in as much areas as possible.

9.   Instructional Applications for Successful Reading-Writing Tasks

To help EAP students overcome any potential difficulties and succeed in the acquisition of reading and writing together, it is the teacher's role to provide support through raising their awareness about the usefulness of learning and linking both skills together and motivating them to engage in integration tasks. To achieve this, instruction plays a crucial role. Below are

some suggested reading support activities to encourage students read for comprehension, as well as reading-writing support activities to help them fuel their writing through reading. These practices are inferred from the study of Grabe and Zhang (2013) and other research implications (Stotsky, 1983; Grabe and Stoller, 2001; Johns, 1997).

- Well written course readings are the primary opportunity for students to analyze the reading models and they should be discussed thoroughly in terms of what makes the writing good, how the arguments are constructed, how the ideas are connected and organized in the specified pattern of paragraphs related to the text's genre (for instance, they will have to differentiate between the paragraph patterns of argumentative compositions and those in the comparison/contrast essays).

- Students' self and peer-evaluations may serve as a remedial for their own problems when they look at their work and their peer's from a reader's view. In addition, analyzing model writing assignments (Grabe and Zhang, 2013), preferably anonymous, may help students spot the error and get the correction rightly after.

- A reading journal where students write freely about what they have been reading, reflect on text's issues, and write overall comments, is another tool to engage students in the writing process to expand their comprehension of the reading material.

- Response papers to short passages (better to be chosen by the students themselves in order to give them more freedom in the task) persuade students to express themselves about what they have read and understood. These responses can be used in classroom discussions and teachers may mention some interesting observations on the text or stylish expressions in the students' writings. Johns (1997: 19) maintains: "We should encourage the investigation and critique of the literacy practices of others, particularly of more advanced students and faculty."

- Free-writing assignments call for students' previous readings; that is, they go back to their topics' repertoire which they gathered from their readings and according to their background knowledge, they will write their own essays based on others' writings. Hence, reading will be informing writing.

- Choosing carefully reading texts and crafted writing assignments to engage students in different contexts and practice writing for a variety of audiences.

- Encourage in-class and at-home extensive readings with topics of interest to the students and related to the course themes and later ask students to write summaries or short reports.

These practices and others are required in the integration classroom along with teachers' creativity in choosing the materials and adapting them to the

curriculum. Moreover, practicing both reading and writing has been emphasized in most research addressing the issue of integration, yet it is worth noting that neither extensive exposure to reading texts, nor high number of assigned writing tasks given alone is sufficient; they have to accompany each other. A review of the literature on developing reading-writing relationships suggest a practical approach to instruction which entails launching instruction on reading-writing tasks "much earlier, much more explicitly, and with much more iterative practice." (Grabe and Zhang, 2013: 19).

Conclusion

Recently, there has been a remarkable upsurge in the volume of instructional research addressing both reading and writing. After the connection between both modalities has proven its efficacy in developing students' thinking as well as their proficiency in the second language literacy, research orientations have gone deeper in analyzing the results of transfer between modalities in the second language as well as from students' L1 to L2. Accordingly, the results of comparison done in this study revealed that the majority of ENS students (about 74%) tend to transfer literature items from the readings of the literature or Reading Techniques classes into their writings. One immediate conclusion we can draw from this brief comparison suggests a logical correspondence between students' performance in both subjects and that Reading Techniques and Written Expression go hand in hand. This may also suggest that both skills inform each other. However, conclusions such as these are not

without their limitations. A more thorough analysis of the correlation between specific aspects of reading and writing, or even the impact of age, gender, or the measures of comparison employed may reveal some fluctuations in the extent of the correlation.

Bibliography

BERNHARDT, ELIZABETH. & KAMIL, MICHAEL. 2006. *Second Language Reading*. CA: Elsevier Ltd.

CARRELL, PATRICIA L. 1991. Second language reading: Reading ability or language proficiency? *Applied Linguistics* 12, 159-179.

EISTERHOLD, JOAN; CARRELL, PATRICIA L; SILBERSTEIN, SANDRA; KROLL, BARBARA & KUEHN, PHYLLIS A.. 1990. Reading-writing relationships in first and second language. *TESOL Quarterly* 24: 2, 245-266. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586901

COBINE, GARY. 1995. Writing as a response to reading. *ERIC Digest* (*ED386734 1995-00-00*). Retrieved from: http://www.eric.ed.gov

CUMMINS, JIM. 1981. The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. Los Angeles: California State University Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, 3-49.

EISTERHOLD, JOAN. 1990. Reading-writing connections: Toward a description for second language learners. KROLL, BARBARA. (ed.). *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 88-101.

EMAM, ABBAS. & FARAHZAD, FARZANEH. 2010. Reading-writing connections in EAP courses: implications and applications. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1: 5, 596-604.

GRABE, WILLIAM. & ZHANG, CUI. 2013. Reading and writing together: A critical component of English for academic purposes teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal* 4: 1, 9-24.

GRABE, WILLIAM. 1991. Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly* 25: 3, 375-406.

GRABE, WILLIAM. 2009. *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

GRABE, WILLIAM. & STOLLER, FREDERICKA. 2001. Reading for academic purposes: Guidelines for the ESL/EFL teacher. CELCE-MURCIA, MARIANNE (ed.). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language.* Boston: Heinle/Thomson Learning, 187-203

HIRVELA, ALAN. 2004. *Connecting Reading and Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

JOHNS, ANN M. 1997. *Text, Role, and Context: Developing Academic Literacies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

KODA, KEIKO. 2005. *Insights into Second Language Reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

KODA, KEIKO. 2007. Reading and language learning: Crosslinguistic constraints on second language reading development, *Language Learning*, 1-44.

KODA, KEIKO. 2016. Reading in a second language: Cognitive and psycholinguistic issues. CHEN XI, DRONJIC VEDRAN, & HELMS-PARK RENA (eds.). *Development of word recognition in a second language.* New York: Taylor and Francis, 70-99

KRASHEN, STEPHEN. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

KROLL, BARBARA. 1993. Teaching writing IS teaching reading: Training the new teacher of ESL composition. CARSON JOAN. & LEKI ILONA. (eds.). *Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives*. Boston: Heinle, 61-81

NELSON, NANCY. & CALFEE, ROBERT. 1998. The reading-writing connection viewed historically. NELSON, NANCY. & CALFEE, ROBERT (eds.). *The Reading-Writing Connection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1-52

PARODI, GIOVANNI. 2007. Reading-writing connections: Discourse-oriented research. *Reading and Writing* 20, 225-250.

PETROSKY, ANTHONY. 1982. From story to essay: Reading and writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33: 1, 19-35.

RAIMES, ANN. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press

RAYNER, KEITH, & POLLATSEK, ALEXANDER. 1989. *The Psychology of Reading*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

SHANAHAN, TIMOTHY. 1984. Nature of the reading-writing relation: An exploratory multivariate analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 76, 466-77.

SHANAHAN, TIMOTHY. 1988. The reading-writing relationship: Seven instructional principles. *The Reading Teacher*, 636-47.

SILBERSTEIN, SANDRA. 1994. *Techniques and Resources in Teaching Reading*. New York: Oxford University Press.

STOTSKY, SANDRA. 1983. Research on reading/writing relationships: a synthesis and suggested directions. *Language Arts* 60, 627-642.

TIERNEY, ROBERT. & LEYS, MARGIE. 1986. What is the value of connecting reading and writing? BRUCE, PETERSEN (ed.), *Convergences: Transactions in*

Reading and Writing. Urbana, Illinois: National council of Teachers of English, 15-29.

TIERNEY, ROBERT. 1992. Ongoing research and new directions. IRWIN, JUDITH & DOYLE, MALACHY (eds.), *Reading/Writing Connections: Learning from Research*. Newark, DE: IRA, 246–259.

VANDEGRIFT, TAMMY. 2005. Reading before writing: Can students read and understand code and documentation? *SIGCSE*.

WALTER, CATHERINE. 1982.   *Authentic Reading*. Australia: Cambridge University Press.