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This study describes ESL college students’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences, about the issue of reading-to-write during an introductory college writing course. Particularly, the study aims at exploring and hearing their beliefs and attitudes regarding the effects of the reading activities on their writing in the light of connections covered in the scholarly literature. The significance of this study rests on the opportunity it gives to the participants to have their voices heard regarding their attitudes and experiences during a course designed to link reading and writing activities.

Multiple research methods of qualitative research design, including interviews, observation, and document analysis have been employed in this study. Specifically, this study uses one unstructured interview, two semistructured interviews, and one mid-interview. Observation and writing samples will be used during the course. The research questions that the study will answer relate to the following areas: the participants’ beliefs about the reading-writing connection at the beginning and at the end of the course; their strategies in using reading texts for writing, the difficulties that they might experience during the course when dealing with reading texts; their opinions about their progress in
using the rhetorical structures and organizational features covered in the course; and their opinions regarding whether they will pursue the reading-writing connection in the future.

The findings of this study indicate that the students engaged in reading-writing activities for the first time. The findings also show that the students have positive attitudes toward reading-to write. The findings also reveal that explicit instruction of rhetorical structures has helped them improve their writing competence. Specifically, they reported that using models along with instruction has resulted in various benefits concerning writing and writing structures, including rhetorical modes, text organization, specific use of words, sentence patterns, parallelism, run-on sentence, revision, wordiness, content information, and motivation to use reading-writing related activities in the future. Moreover, the findings show that the participants experienced some writing problems during the course. Finally, the study shows that the participants developed more understanding about the reading-writing connection through their advice to future students and their metaphors about reading and writing.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Reading and writing can be used as tools for learning or thinking. They can fire our imaginations or permit us to conduct a number of practical activities. They can be used to obtain what we want, to create our personalities, or to extend the power of our individual or collective memories. Either reading or writing can be used to accomplish these things, but reading and writing together can accomplish them even more effectively. (Shanahan, 1990, p. 5)

The reading-writing connection has received considerable attention from theorists, researchers, and practitioners (Meyer, 1982; Tierney & Pearson, 1983; Shanahan, 1990). The connection between reading and writing has often been viewed in straightforward terms: those who read well write well. Although this relationship has been long recognized, researchers have often been more interested in understanding the sources of the relationship. Different studies have investigated this issue. The results of these studies showed multiple realities for this relationship. For example, Tierney and Pearson (1983) view reading and writing as two skills that share similar processes. They argue that readers and writers go through similar processes to either comprehend or create meaning. These processes will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two. Eisterhold (1990) came up with three possible hypotheses for the reading-writing relationship. These hypotheses are directionality, nondirectionality, and bidirectionality. Furthermore, Rubin and Hansen (1986) and Tierney and Shanahan (1991) summed up the sources of the reading-writing relationship and provided common features that reading and writing share. The present study assumes
that all the sources mentioned above provide insights into the issue; further investigation may be warranted. However, the current study focuses on the views of students enrolled in a writing course where reading will be involved throughout the course. Thus, this study differs from earlier studies focusing in the effectiveness of such instruction.

Most studies to date focus on sustained reading and its influence on writing. Fader (1976) designed a program called “Hooked on Books,” in which pupils were required to engage in a prolonged reading and were asked to write journals. Heys (1962) conducted another one-year study in which he related two separate groups of pupils, a sustained reading group and a sustained writing group. Although the two groups improved their writing, the reading group scored higher than the writing practice group, who did not engage in substantial reading.

Another aspect of this relationship is reading-to-write. Flower (1990) considers reading-to-write a tool that includes different activities that enhance writing instruction. Besides sustained reading, the reading-writing relationship can be viewed as one that uses reading activities directly aimed at motivating students to improve their writing. The present study focuses on the students’ beliefs about using reading activities and group discussion inside the writing classroom.

The reading-writing relationship is most often viewed from one direction: the influence of reading on writing. In other words, reading is said to affect writing more than writing affects reading. This direction of relationship may be substantially important for ESL students, who have fewer opportunities to engage in reading activities, as will be shown in Chapter Two. Thus, this study will focus on this direction of the relationship.
Statement of the Problem

It has long been established that writing is a very complex task. Likewise, it has long been assumed that extensive reading can enhance writing. In fact, it is a common understanding that good writers are good readers. This assertion assumes that students, especially ESL (English second language) and EFL (English foreign language) learners, practice pleasure reading. Also, the underlying assumption of this claim is that students read extensively. However, this is not necessarily applicable to ESL/EFL students for three reasons: (1) ESL/EFL learners are not exposed to L2 literacy as early and extensively as their L1 counterparts; (2) ESL/EFL students approach L2 literacy with fully developed literacy in L1 (Eisterhold, 1990); and (3) programs that offer extensive reading for ESL students are very few (Ashamrani, 2003), and such courses are typically unavailable to EFL students (Micek, 1994).

Based on the significance of the reading-writing relationship on one hand, and based on this relative lack of ESL reading experience on the other hand, one way to overcome this problem and improve writing through reading might be to directly introduce the reading-writing relationship to students. This kind of direct instruction may be particularly important for EFL students who are admitted to American universities and have to take a writing course to meet the academic requirements. Therefore, this study will take place in a university context. The participating students will be freshmen ESL students who will arrive in the U.S.A. just a few days before the class will start. These students will take an introductory ESL college writing course. The study will describe the students’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences throughout a four-month writing course where the reading-writing connection and reading models will be among the primary features of the course.
Significance of the Study

Writing constitutes what many people report as the most frustrating skill in language (Dixon & Nessel, 1983). Unlike speaking, for instance, writing does not come naturally to human beings (Dobrovolsky & O’Grady, 2001). Dixon and Nessel (1983) explain the difficulty of writing by stating that writing requires more effort than recognizing meaning through listening and reading. Writing in a second language is all the more complex, as it is not just a matter of transferring new codes into the second language. Rather, it involves the mastering of several skills (Omaggio, 2001). In either case, contrary to oral language skills, academic language skills require professional teaching and training (Coady, 1993). Rivers (1968) states that “writing is a skill that must be taught” (p. 258). Kroll (2001) agrees with Rivers and states that teaching writing, even with native speakers of English, is a challenging task.

However, writing is not viewed as a skill or set of skills in itself (Hirvela, 2001). Writing has been viewed recently as intimately interwoven with other language skills. One language skill that is obviously related to writing is reading. Carson and Leki (1993) have made this relationship clear as they state that “reading can be, and in academic settings nearly always is, the basis for writing” (p. 1). Similarly, Spack (1988) has pointed out, “perhaps the most important skill English teachers can engage students in is the complex ability to write from other texts” (p. 42).

Integrating reading with writing is based on the assumption that language is viewed as a unified phenomenon. The Whole Language Approach argues that learning becomes easier when writing and reading are taught together. Rigg (1991) claims that, “if language is not kept whole, it is not language anymore” (p. 522). Although Whole Language is a theory for young children, it has been extended to the field of ESL. According to the Whole Language approach, reading and writing
complement each other. In other words, language modalities should be taught simultaneously (Ramirez, 1995). This means that students need to treat language as a continuum. Thus, students are likely to apply what they read to what they write and vice versa. As a result, different research studies show that those who read more tend to write better.

The idea of integrating reading and writing has been established early in L1. Many researchers believe that sustained reading results in writing competence. This belief was extended by Krashen (1982) to L2 in his “reading input hypothesis,” which is directly related to his “comprehensible input” hypothesis. Krashen’s “reading input hypothesis” posits that extensive self-directed pleasure reading in the target language will influence writing proficiency and improve writing style (Flahive & Bailey, 1993). This hypothesis implies that good readers have an important skill that can help them become good writers. However, this hypothesis is hardly applicable to EFL learners of English simply because their chances to read extensively are minimized due to the natural settings of these students.

Composition courses based on the connection between reading and writing were first developed for native English writers. There are numerous writing textbooks in L1 that use reading models or pieces of sentences and paragraphs to illustrate a specific structure. However, the number of ESL (English as a Second Language) writing textbooks of this nature is comparably small (Shih, 1986). Recently, the ESL reading-writing connection has become a buzz phrase in ESL composition pedagogy. A growing number of ESL materials are designed to integrate the literacy skills of reading and writing (Gillie, Ingle & Mumford, 1997; O’Donnell & Paivea, 1993; Oshima & Hogue, 1998; Spack, 1990). Flahive and Bailey (1993) view these books as different from traditional rhetorical readers and writing books that treat reading and
writing as separate decoding and encoding skills. They state that integrated books of reading and writing designed for L2 learners are obviously different from separate reading and writing texts. For example, Gillie, Ingle and Mumford’s book provides step-by-step instructions for nonnative writers of English with the use of reading sections that illustrate specific rhetorical structures.

Reading-to-write in L2 needs more empirical research studies to examine the impact of the explicit relationship between reading and writing in ESL/EFL classroom composition. According to Flahive and Bailey (1993), most studies of the L2 reading-writing relationships were conducted to examine Krashen’s hypothesis about reading as input. For example, Janopoulos (1986) and Kwah’s (1988) studies were trying to examine the relationship between large amounts of pleasure reading and writing proficiency in L2. Their findings show that those who spent more hours per week on extensive pleasure reading were good writers.

As will be shown in the literature review in Chapter Two, the design of reading-writing relationship’s studies have mostly been either experimental or correlational. In experimental studies, groups of students are assigned to extensive reading plans for a period of time, whereas control groups proceed with their normal literacy activities. In correlational studies, on the other hand, reading scores or amounts of reading are used as predictors for writing proficiency.

Very few qualitative studies have been conducted on this topic. Moreover, these existing studies focused either on the L1 reading-writing relationship or on extensive L2 reading and its influence in L2 writing. None of them, to the knowledge of the researcher, has been conducted to explore the nature of the effect of L2 reading on writing. Moreover, none of these studies have tried to describe how ESL/EFL students view this direct relationship. Therefore, this study will take a further step
toward gaining a comprehensive understanding of the reading-writing relationship and its effects on students’ performance, by allowing students’ voices to be heard. In other words, this study will endeavor to investigate this topic from the students’ perspective. It will explore how EFL students deal with this connection between reading and writing in a composition classroom as a means to enhance L2 writing.

On another level, this study is a reaction to my eleven-year experience of learning English in my junior high and high school, in general, and in college, in particular. In these courses, the role of reading was very limited to the vocabulary level and grammatical exercises. In other words, reading was viewed as only a means for building vocabulary without examining stylistic patterns or rhetorical organization. Furthermore, the two language skills were totally separated and taught by two different teachers.

The primary significance of this study is that it describes how reading contributes to writing by investigating the students’ beliefs and attitudes about some issues related to their experiences of the connection between reading and writing. This study examines the experiences of students enrolling in a semester-long course, in which readings are paired with awareness-raising attitudes and explicitly linked to writing. The four-month duration of the study will give validity to the students’ descriptions of their attitudes and beliefs.

Pedagogically speaking, this study is significant because it will provide language educators and teachers of writing with new insights as it will examine this topic from the students’ point of view. Equally important, this study will be insightful to me, as I will teach writing and I hope to gain useful ideas from this study for my future career.
Topic Selection

I have decided to conduct this current research because of my special interest in the areas of reading and writing as two interrelated skills. I began to develop this topic during my MA graduate studies at IUP. I wrote two papers on this issue; one was “reading-to-write: an ESL/EFL Strategy to Write a Composition.” Another paper was entitled “ESL/EFL Reading-to-Write: An Issue to Explore.” These two pieces of work inspired me to pursue this topic in more detail. Since then, this topic has become of great interest to me as an EFL teacher.

Despite the general acceptance among researchers of the relationship between reading and writing, it is rare to see this relationship practiced in second language composition classrooms. One possible explanation is that research has not provided a clear-cut implementation of this relationship. Another reason is that research has focused on L1 students, either young or adult. Moreover, the teaching materials have been slow to develop.

No single study that used qualitative methods, at least to the researcher’s knowledge, has focused on either the students’ beliefs about the relationship between reading and writing or the nature of the relationship between reading and writing in ESL/EFL contexts, especially when the feature of text are explicitly emphasized. Most studies, as will be shown in the literature review, have focused on the correlation between amounts of reading and writing quality. Other studies have examined Krashen’s theory of comprehensible input. None of these studies has focused on the students themselves and their experiences of reading-to-write. In particular, no research has examined the beliefs and attitudes of ESL/EFL students regarding this topic. Thus, the present study will contribute to previous research. It
will employ qualitative methods to answer a set of questions about students’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences toward this issue.

Research Questions

This study attempts to answer one primary question:

1. How are students' beliefs and attitudes impacted by engaging in a college composition course focused on the rhetorical structures of assigned reading?

Responses to this question will be used to describe the students’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences about this course that will use reading activities in a way that directly relates the writing assignments. Their responses will be collected at the beginning of the course and again at the end as a means to examine whether or not changes in the students' beliefs, attitudes, and experiences took place. This description will include a set of specific questions that will lead to more exploration of the students’ experiences. These specific questions are:

1. What are ESL students’ beliefs and attitudes about reading-to-write at the end of the writing course?
2. What strategies do ESL students utilize when engaging in reading and writing activities when the two activities are linked in their classroom experiences?
3. What obstacles and difficulties do ESL students experience when engaging in such activities?
4. What are ESL students’ beliefs about the effects of reading on text organizations and rhetorical structures?
5. Judging from ESL students' perceptions, how does the reading-to-write approach impact the students to seek out reading as a way to improve their writing?

6. How does students' writing develop over the course of the term, and what impact do the students feel the explicit rhetorical instruction had on their writing?

Limitation of the Study

Like other studies, the present study has certain limitations. The study is exclusively limited to describing the participants’ beliefs on the issue of reading-to-write. Therefore, the pedagogical implications of this study are limited to those which can be based on the participants’ opinions and responses. Furthermore, this study focuses on the students taking one particular introductory ESL college writing course. Due to the fact that the participants represent different language backgrounds, the study does not make any attempt to generalize the findings beyond the participants in the course or similar participants in similar courses. Finally, this study does not aim to evaluate personal beliefs about the reading-writing relationship, nor does it aim at evaluating either student performance or the teaching methods used by the instructor of the course.

Summary

The reading-writing connection has been most often viewed in the long term literacy, where the reading-writing connection is made implicit. A number of studies have shown that sustained reading has effects on writing on different levels. Therefore, it has been strongly believed that good readers are good writers. However, few studies have investigated this belief from an ESL perspective. Moreover, none of the previous studies have examined the explicit reading-writing relationship, where
students engage in reading activities for writing purposes. The present study will render a holistic picture about the reading-writing connection from this point of view.

Although reading and writing are viewed as two reciprocal skills, research has focused more extensively on the influence of reading on writing. Likewise, the present study investigates this issue from this direction. However, unlike other studies, this study describes the effects of reading on writing from the students’ perspectives. However, before these effects can be understood, a review of the related literature studies must be covered. Chapter Two will discuss these literature studies.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Research shows that reading and writing have been viewed as interrelated areas of language. However, the strength of the connection between reading and writing is different according to several periodical movements (Nelson and Calfee, 1998) and language approaches (Reid, 1993) that have appeared. The reading-writing connection is not at all new; however, according to Nelson and Robert (1998), “the two components of literacy have been largely disconnected in education” (p.1).

Although studies conducted on the reading-writing relationship overlap, they can be divided into three major categories: studies that examine the impact of reading on writing, studies that examine correlations between reading and writing, and studies that examine different perspectives on the relationship between reading and writing or explain the theoretical bases of the relationship. Research on the relationship between L2 reading and writing has been, and to the knowledge of the researcher, still is focused on these three concerns. However, none of these categories examined this relationship from the students’ perspective. Therefore, in this study, students’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences related to the reading-writing relationship will be explored. This chapter will start with a review of literature on different aspects of the L1 reading and writing relationship. The second section will then discuss this relationship from a second language perspective. The third section will discuss beliefs and attitudes.

First Language Reading-Writing Relationship

The Impact of L1 Reading on L1 Writing

Empirical research findings have led researchers to recognize that reading has a positive impact on writing. A strong and long-held belief that good readers are good
writers correlates with these findings. Unequivocally, Krashen puts it this way “reading exposure is the primary means of developing language skills” (1985, p. 109).

Many research studies support this assertion. Eckhoff (1983) conducted a study on children’s reading texts and writing samples from second grade classes. Each grade used different basal readers; seventeen children read primary children’s literature (Basal “A”) and twenty children read simplified style (Basal “B”). Eckhoff explained that the two kinds of texts contained different linguistic structures, style, and format. In all the cases, Basal A was more complex, as it features longer sentences, more complex verbs, subordinate clauses, and infinitives. She analyzed samples of their writings and found that students who read Basal A tended to use more elaborate structures than Basal B readers. These sentences used by Basal A readers contained structures such as subordinate clauses, participial phrases and longer T-unit sentences. Basal B readers, on the other hand, used simpler sentences. Furthermore, Basal A readers tended to use more “complex verbs” (verb + auxiliaries), such as “might run.” However, Basal B students used “simpler verbs” (present or past tense), such as “climbs” or “gave.” Eckhoff concluded her study by stating that students picked up the format and stylistic structures they encountered in their readings. For example, basal B used “and” at the beginning of sentences more often than A readers did. Additionally, Basal B readers used the word “too” at the end of sentences more frequently than A readers.

Glazer (1973) explored the effect of exposure to literature and discussion of text styles on fourth and sixth grade pupils. She assigned fourth and sixth graders into three groups. The first group did not have any planned literature program; the second group listened to some selected books and read aloud; and the third group listened to some selected books, read aloud and discussed with the teacher features related to the
stories, such as plot, character, and “general emotional quality” (p. 1). She found that the fourth graders in the group that listened and discussed the reading books achieved higher grades in their writing scores than either of the other two groups. Although the pupils in the group that did not have a planned literature program were exposed to literature, they were not instructed to read well-selected books in terms of their literary merits, nor was the amount of assigned reading monitored or planned. Glazer concludes her study with some potential explanation for the significant differences pertaining to the third group: (1) they “were more open to the ideas,” (2) they were in a “more formative state,” and (3) they spent time discussing the reading materials (p. 22).

Some research indicates that reading may more significantly enhance writing than the practice of writing. Heys (1962) conducted an experimental study with high school L1 student writers. The students were divided into two groups: a reading group and a writing group. The two groups used the normal class time for either reading or writing activities. Throughout the year, the writing group wrote three times the number of essays produced by the reading group. However, at the end of the year, the experimental outcomes showed both groups showed improvement. Moreover, surprisingly, the reading group achieved higher scores than the writing group. Hays put it this way “if either class could be said to have made the greater improvement, it was the class that had done little or no writing” (P. 320).

DeVries (1970) conducted a similar experimental study in which she compared assigned reading and writing practice. She divided fifth grade L1 students into two groups. One group practiced conventional essay writing in class. The other group was excused from writing for nine weeks but focused on extensive reading in and out of class. DeVries found out that the reading group produced more competent
writing samples than the writing group did. The samples of the reading group were more developed than those of the writing groups in terms of content, mechanics, organization, grammar, and sentence structure.

McNeil (1976) observed the changes that happened to boys in a correctional institution. McNeil’s study is different from the previous studies mentioned in this chapter because he focuses on the students’ personal development and not on the students’ writing samples. His study took place in a two-year correctional program called “Hooked on Books.” The boys were heavily exposed to paperbound books, newspapers, and magazines. The concept of literacy was emphasized throughout the program period through a literacy campaign entitled “English in Every Classroom.” The boys kept writing weekly journals. McNeil observed some positive changes in the students relative to the pre-treatment test. These changes included self-esteem, improvement in the boys’ attitudes and feelings about literacy, development in the ability to generate ideas, and a twenty percent increase in the number of words used. McNeil also stated that these changes led to changes in the “methods and material employed in the teaching of English” (p. 190).

*Correlation between L1 Reading and L1 Writing*

One group of empirical studies focuses on the correlations and interdependent connection between reading ability (e.g., comprehension, and speed) and writing proficiency. Early L1 studies (Zeman, 1969, Evanechko, Ollila, & Armstrong 1974) support the assertion that good writers are believed to spend much time reading and that reading comprehension is correlated with writing ability. Earlier, Loban (1963) noticed the same correlation between reading and writing. He observed 338 children coming from different socio-economic classes. The subjects were all enrolled in the same school class for 7 years, from kindergarten to the sixth grade. The number of
subjects that were present to the end of the study was 237 students. Loban concluded his study with a strong correlation based on statistical measures: “those who read well also write well; those who read poorly also write poorly” (p. 75).

Grobe and Grobe (1977) offered support for these findings. They used a standardized test to measure the correlation between writing ability and reading ability. The students participating in this study were freshmen enrolled in composition courses. Students were divided into three groups depending on their scores on a placement Test. In this test, students’ writings were evaluated by two raters, with a third consulted when needed. Grobe and Grobe used the McGraw-Hill Basic Skills System Reading Test (1970) for measuring reading comprehension. The correlational result yielded a positive correlation coefficient of 0.50., which was found to be statistically significant at 0.01 confidence level.

Evanechko, Ollila, and Armstrong (1974) interdependently reported a similar connection between reading and composing for 118 children in the sixth grade in one school in Victoria, British Colombia. Again, the reading ability of these subjects correlated with the syntactic complexity in their writing samples. Evanechko, Ollila, and Armstrong depended on Transformational Grammar Theory to measure the degree of syntactic complexity of the written work.

Clark (1935) had conducted an earlier study in a similar vein. However, her study took a different direction in which she replaced one variable, grammar study, with another one, reading, and kept the dependent variable, writing, unchanged. Clark followed the students throughout their four-year study at North Carolina State College from 1930-1933. Based on the Iowa Placement Examination, the students were divided into three sections: A, B, and C. All the students in the three sections did their regular assignments. However, A and B students did informal reading once a week,
whereas C students took a grammar course for the first two years. In 1932 and 1933 the students in section C were switched to reading work instead of grammar. Meanwhile, the students in section A and B kept doing informal reading; however, the reading work was increased to twice a week instead of once a week. The study compared the students’ writings in section C in 1930-1931 to their writing assignments in 1932-1933. The comparison showed greater improvement in the students’ writing ability in the last two years than in 1930 and 1931. Likewise, the students in sections A and B showed more gains in their writing as compared to the first two years with one week informal reading.

This positive relationship between reading and writing leads to the question of “what makes this relationship?” The next section discusses theoretical perspectives on the reading-writing connection.

Understanding the Connection between Reading and Writing

As the previous sections have stated, reading seems to have a considerable effect on writing and reading and writing significantly correlate with each other. Krashen (1984) says “It is the reading that gives the writer the ‘feel’ for the look and texture of reader-base prose” (p.20). This has challenged researchers to understand this relationship between reading and writing. This understanding of this relationship is important, so that teachers can exploit this relationship in effective teaching methods. Carson (1993) believes that the connection between reading and writing is much more complex than Krashen suggests. Carson uses the plural name, “connections” to indicate that different factors make up this connection. Eisterhold (1990) supports Carson; he states that the reading-writing relationship is complex because it includes multiple relations and these relations change with language development.
The complexity of the reading/writing relationship is reflected in the different specialties of the researchers who have investigated reading and writing. These areas include reading theory, cognitive psychology, linguistics, pragmatics, literacy theory, communication studies, and rhetoric (Carson, 1993). Goodman (1967), a psycholinguist, when he brought reading and writing together, posited that reading was a “psycholinguistic game”. He explained his assertion by stating that readers predict meaning from what they have already read, then confirm their guesses, as they reconstruct “a message which has been encoded by a writer” (cited in Reid, 1993, p. 37). Leki (1993) reflects another perspective of this complexity when he states that reading and writing share common social aspects. He posits that readers and writers of the texts are members of a given discourse community who might approach the main point of the text similarly because they share social dimensions that help them negotiate the text and thus arrive at the meaning they construct for themselves. Furthermore, Reid (1993) addresses the complexity of the relationship as he points out that reading is present in several approaches to language teaching. Specifically, he suggests that reading is an integral part of the writing process as writers become the readers of their own texts. Additionally, Eisterhold (1990) emphasizes this complexity of the reading/writing connection. He states that reading and writing are bidirectional domains, in which reading and writing are interactive, yet interdependent. This will be explained in more detail shortly.

Meaning Creation

The previous review suggests how complex the connection between reading and writing is. However, several researchers (Tierney & Pearson, 1983, Rubin & Hansen, 1986, & Savage, 1998) have been interested in pursuing this issue. According to Tierney and Pearson (1983), readers and writers employ similar processes to create
meaning. In this view, readers bring their background knowledge to bear as they use the writers’ cues to understand the writers’ intentions and to create their own understanding from the text. Similarly, writers use their background knowledge to generate ideas, put these ideas in a form that they can accept, and in a form that matches the readers’ needs. In this case, readers and writers work together and negotiate the meaning of a text until they understand each other. According to Tierney and Pearson, “there is no meaning on the page until a reader decides there is” (p. 569).

Tierney and Pearson (1983) further this view by exploring the processes that reading and writing share. They state that these processes include planning, drafting, aligning, revising, and monitoring. A reader and a writer plan and set purposes for the reading or writing task depending on their current knowledge and goals regarding the topic at hand. Both the reader and the writer might change their plan, delete goals, or redefine them as they read and write. Similarly, drafting is an integral part in both reading and writing. Tierney and Pearson posit that this process is present as the readers and writers reconstruct the meaning when rereading or rewriting the text. Furthermore, Tierney and Pearson suggest that readers and writers collaboratively align themselves with the author and the audience respectively. By alignment, they refer to the stances reader and writer take towards themselves. These stances might be sympathetic, critical or passive. According to sympathetic, critical or passive, this alignment is necessary for the reader and the writer to establish a foundation for negotiation; readers and writers share relatively similar discourse yet, the participate in a process that allows for critical reading and writing stances. Also, revising, as seen by Tierney and Pearson, interplays between reading and writing, although it more explicitly applies to writing. A reader is predisposed to engage in similar activities to that of a writer when revising. For example, a writer rereads, reshapes, and considers
his or her product. Similarly, a reader rereads, rethinks, and approaches the text from different perspectives as time passes. Finally, Tierney and Pearson argue that monitoring represents an essential part in reading and writing. Its essence stems from the principle that readers and writers monitor and distance themselves to objectively evaluate the text. Devine (1993) refers to “monitoring” as “knowledge” or “metacognition” that enables readers and writers to understand each other.

**Directional Perspectives**

The Directional hypothesis: Eisterhold (1990) offers a different perspective for exploring the reading-writing relationship. Convinced of this relationship supported by research evidence, he suggests three hypotheses, which he sometimes refers to them as “models.” These models are the directional hypothesis, the nondirectional hypothesis, and the bidirectional hypothesis. These labels explain the reading-writing relationship in terms of the direction in which input is understood as transferring from one domain to another.

The directional hypothesis: According to Eisterhold, states that since reading and writing share structural components, whatever is acquired in one domain can be applied in the other. For example, the ability to recognize rhetorical structure in reading entails the ability to produce this structure in writing. This hypothesis, or model, is called directional because this transfer of structure occurs in one direction: from reading to writing. Eisterhold argues that this direction, reading-to-write, is the most common directional model. The argument here is that reading affects writing and that writing does not necessarily enhance reading. However, Eisterhold does not ignore other studies that show that writing activities can enhance reading comprehension and retention of information. But he argues that the reading-to-write directional model is well supported by research evidence. Yet, he claims that this
transfer in this model is not automatic. Therefore, he assumes that instruction in reading can be effective in writing ability when it considers the common structures of reading and writing.

The nondirectional hypothesis: Eisterhold claims that the reading-writing link in this model is nondirectional. By this, he means that transfer in the nondirectional model can occur at either direction e.g., from reading to writing or from writing to reading. This model, according to Eisterhold, derives from the claim that reading and writing are constrained by some underlying competence and proficiency. For him, the common underlying link that makes this relationship is “the cognitive process of constructing meaning” (p. 90) that reading and writing share. Thus any cognitive proficiency underlying reading and writing is likely to improve reading and writing alike. Although most empirical research studies support the directional hypothesis, Eisterhold cites some studies that show the nondirectionality of the reading-writing relationship. For example, he cites a study conducted by Gordon and Braun (1982) in which they examined the effects of story schema training on fifth graders. They found that students in the experimental group applied story schema to both related reading and writing tasks. For example, the students recalled and produced more text structures when using such a schema. Eisterhold emphasizes that explicit instruction is necessary in order for nondirectional model to occur.

The bidirectional hypothesis: Eisterhold (1990) believes that this model is the most complex one because it posits that reading and writing are interactive and interdependent as well. Shanahan and Lomax (1986) support Eisterhold’s view of the complexity of this model. They state that the reading-writing relationship is best considered as a “constellation of interrelated processes that utilize a number of
knowledge bases” (cited in Eisterhold, 1990, p. 92). Briefly, his model focuses on the multiple processes and relations that make up the reading-writing relationship.

Due to the interactivity between reading and writing, Eisterhold holds the view that the developmental relationship between reading and writing qualitatively changes with language proficiency. Shanahan (1984) found out that second and fifth graders’ reading and writing were significantly related. He also found that “as students become more proficient, the nature of the reading-writing relationship changes” (cited in Eisterhold, 1990, p. 92). This view of the reading-writing relationship supports the claim earlier made by several researchers in this section about the complexity of the relationship between reading and writing.

**Common Features of both Reading and Writing**

Rubin and Hansen (1986) propose a similar explanation for the reading-writing relationship. They identify five common areas of knowledge shared by reading and writing. Their explanation is similar to what Tierney and Pearson and Eisterhold propose because they assume that knowledge gained in one domain is expected to enhance knowledge in the other. These areas are:

1. *Information knowledge*, including topical knowledge, grammatical background, and vocabulary. They suggest that information gained in reading might be used as a source for writing.

2. *Structural knowledge*, including the organizational patterns of the text (paragraph forms and conventional genres) that readers and writers recognize to either comprehend or construct meaning.

3. *Transactional knowledge*, indicating that writing is used as a means of communication between writers and readers. In this case, readers consider the writers’ purpose in constructing the text and writers consider readers’ needs.
4. *Aesthetic knowledge*, indicating the common devices, such as style or topics, favored by readers and writers. “A certain alliterative style, the way a single interjection focuses an entire paragraph, or the relative length and stress patterns of consecutive words all echo in readers’ and writers’ ears and affect their choices” (pp. 167-168).

5. *Process knowledge*, referring to the common elements of processes that readers and writers use to arrive at the meaning. This was discussed in detail above.

Similarly Tierney and Shanahan (1991) suggest three general categories underlying the reading/writing relationship. They believe that evidence of correlations between reading and writing ability and achievement indicate shared features. These include:

1. Reading and writing as shared knowledge and shared process: Tierney and Shanahan assume that knowledge that improves reading is likely to improve writing. They also assume that the processes readers use to comprehend text are most likely similar to the processes writers use to compose text.

2. Reading and writing as transactions among readers, writers, and texts: This is similar to what Rubin and Hansen have proposed above. However, Tierney and Shanahan emphasize that there is no ideal text. Rather readers and writers have an obligation to each other when comprehending or constructing texts.

3. Reading and writing as collaborative events: This notion supports the view of reading-to-writing as ongoing activity with the use of the source text. Spivey (1990) emphasize this by stating (cited in Carson, 1993)
“it would be inaccurate to portray intentional acts of
composing from sources as a linear, two-step procedure in
which a person reads a source text simply for comprehension
in a text-driven way before beginning the process of writing.
Acts of composing from sources are hybrid acts of literacy in
which writing influences reading and reading influences
writing” (p.89).

Other researchers propose relatively similar views of the reading-writing
relationship. For example Savage (1998) suggests three areas for the reading-writing
connection. His areas are not different from the literature discussed above. His areas
include: meaning connection, language connection, and instructional connection. The
first two areas of relationship have been mentioned before by other researchers
instructional connection has also been proposed by Shanahan (1988) in which he
suggested seven instructional principles for teaching reading and writing together in
the classroom. Briefly these principles are:

1. Both reading and writing need to be taught.
2. Both should be introduced from the earliest years.
3. The relationships between reading and writing need to be emphasized
   in different ways considering the developmental stages of the students.
4. The reading-writing relationship must be taught explicitly.
5. The process relationships should be emphasized.
6. Meaning making between reading and writing should be stressed.
7. Reading and writing should be made purposeful through teaching them
   in context.
The aforementioned research explained the different aspects that make up relationship between reading and writing. Other researchers went further and explored how reading and writing can be integrated in different ways. Spaulding (1992), admitting this relationship, investigates the idea of using similar motivational techniques for reading and writing. Langer (1992) traces the developmental stages that learners can go through in their reading and writing of different genres of exposition texts. Shanahan (1990) discusses readers’ developing awareness of authors by reading their texts.

This work in L1 leads to a major question about what has been done to study the L2 reading-writing relationship. The next section will review research on ESL reading-writing relationships.

Second Language Reading-Writing Relationship

*L1 Versus L2 Reading-Writing Relationship*

As noted in the previous section, the current view of the L1 reading-writing relationship indicates that the relationship between reading and writing has been studied in many ways in L1. Fewer studies, however, examine this relationship in second language (L2). For example, an ERIC search from 1982-1992 shows 1000 entries for “reading and writing relationship.” However, a similar search for ESL shows only 30 entries (Micek, 1994).

Thus, with regard to the abovementioned research in the reading-writing relationship in L1, one might wonder if the same relationship exists in L2. Carson (1993) believes that although there is undeniably great value to L2 from studies of L1, “we should be cautious about applying L1 findings to L2 situations” (p.86). He also claims that there is much to be considered about the reading-writing relationship from the second language perspective. Eisterhold (1990) supports Carson’s view. He
believes that evidence from the L1 reading-writing relationship does not account for the complexity of this relationship for adult second language learners who have already developed potentially full literacy in their L1. Flahive and Bailey (1993) believe that generalizations derived from L1 into the L2 reading-writing relationship are likely to be tentative, and that more and more work needs to be done in the area of the reading-writing relationship with regard to L2.

Eisterhold also differentiates between language proficiency and literacy acquisition. He claims that learners can acquire a second language (or a first language) without becoming literate in that language. Furthermore, language proficiency is crucial to literacy acquisition, he claims, but it is not the only requirement. Carson and Leki (1993) point out that contrastive research in the L1 and L2 reading-writing relationship is relatively absent. Thus we can not claim to know the similarities and differences between the L1 and the L2 reading-writing relationship. Rather, in addition to the little research on the second language reading-writing relationship, most studies on that topic (Kwah, 1988, Micek, 1994) were largely attempts to test Krashen’s theory of second language acquisition (1982) as a theoretical background to explain the L2 reading-writing relationship (Krashen’s theory will be discussed later in this section).

**Research on the Second Language Reading-Writing Relationship**

According to the researcher, only two correlational studies were found on ESL students, conducted by Janopoulos (1986) and Carson, Carrell, Silberstein, Kroll, and Kuhn (1990). Kwah (1988) found only two published correlational studies on ESL. Micek (1994) found only one correlational study.

Janopoulos conducted a survey to determine if there is a relationship between pleasure reading in L1 or L2 and English writing proficiency in adult ESL. The
subjects of this study were 79 new graduate students taking a written placement exam for writing. They were given the choice to write on one of three open-ended composition topics. Writing samples were evaluated holistically on a 4-point scale by a pair of trained raters. If an agreement upon any composition could not be reached, a third rater was asked to evaluate it. Students’ writing proficiency was divided into two levels: yes (placed directly into the regular university curriculum) and no (placed into the ESL composition course sequence).

Janopoulos used a questionnaire to measure pleasure reading. The students were asked to estimate the time they spent each week reading for pleasure reading in their native language and in English. Pleasure reading was identified to them as what they read for enjoyment and not for school. The result of the study showed that those who reported frequent pleasure reading in English tended to be better writers in English. However, subjects who reported being heavy readers in their native language did not show this tendency. Also, no significant correlation was found between total pleasure reading (L1 plus L2) and L2 writing proficiency.

Another similar study, was conducted by Carson, Carrell, Silberstein, Kroll, and Kuhn (1990), who were interested in examining the relationship between reading and writing both across languages and across modalities of L2 (reading and writing). In other words, they investigated four relationships: (1) the relationship between first and second language reading abilities; (2) the relationship between first and second language writing abilities; (3) the relationship between reading and writing in the learner’s first language, and (4) the relationship between reading and writing in the learner’s second language. A total of 48 native speakers of Chinese and 57 native speakers of Japanese participated in this study. The researchers used 6-point scales to evaluate the students’ writing samples. Both first language essays (Japanese and
Chinese) and second language essays (English) were evaluated by native speakers of those languages. Carson et al. found four patterns:

1. Week to modest correlation between first language (L1) and second language (L2) reading scores for both Japanese and Chinese subjects
2. Week positive correlations between the L1 and L2 writing scores of the Japanese subjects. No such correlation was found for the Chinese subjects
3. Week to modest correlations for both groups between L1 reading and writing scores
4. Week to moderate correlations for both groups of learners between L2 reading and writing scores

The researcher concluded that “that L2 literacy development is a complex phenomenon for already literate adult L2 learners” (p.261).

Other researchers, although few, have studied the effects of controlled pleasure reading experiences and treatments, as opposed to unguided pleasure readings measured by questionnaires, on the writing performance of ESL learners. Tudor and Hafiz (1989) investigated the effects of extensive reading of simplified texts on the writing of ESL learners. They compared one class of 16 ESL Pakistani learners, aged 10-11, with other ESL classes, one from the same school and the other from a different school in the area. The students in the experimental group participated in a daily reading program held after school for one hour, five days a week, for twelve weeks. The control groups in the two schools did not receive any treatment other than the pre- and post tests. The participants in the experimental group were given the choice to select from 104 different simplified readers on which they gave a brief oral report every week.
Tudor and Hafiz used four tasks to measure the effects of the treatment: using simple sentences to describe a picture, completing sentences whose first words were provided, completing a sentence whose first words involve more complex sentence (words that involve using clauses), and writing an essay about one of three topics. The subjects in the experimental group showed improvement in their writing compared to their pre-test. They appeared to be using simple sentence structures. However, the subjects produced more grammatically correct sentences. For example, their syntactically acceptable T-units increased 25 % and their semantically acceptable T-units increased 41 %. Another finding of the study showed that they tended to use fewer vocabulary items and that they seemed to repeat words more than in their pre-test. They concluded that the treatment “does not appear to have expanded subjects’ expressive resources to any marked degree” (p.692). This suggests that the simplified readers were used as models, in that students used them to consolidate their existing grammar and vocabulary.

One of the leading studies on the relationship between L2 reading and writing is offered by Elley and Mangubhai (1983). They examined the influence of systematic extensive L2 reading in the development of overall language proficiency for Fiji Island elementary school children. 380 pupils, aged 9-11, from a total of 8 rural elementary schools participated in a twenty-month program, called “Book Flood,” in which 250 high-interest story books were given to each class. The researchers used two different methods to encourage the pupils to read the books: The Shared Book Experience, in which the pupils discussed the books that they found of high interest, and Sustained Silent Reading, in which students read books without doing any activities. The students in the control group attended their normal classes. However, the pre-test and post-test were administered to both groups.
After 8 months, a post-test was administered, which showed that the pupils in
the “Book Flood” program made far greater gains as compared to their counterparts in
the control group in reading comprehension and listening comprehension. Later, after
20 months, another post-test was administered in which students in the reading
program were reported to have developed much more language proficiency in
different areas: reading comprehension, grammar, listening comprehension, word
recognition, and writing. However, Janopoulos (1986) claims that, although the
researchers concluded that writing was among these areas of development, it was not
the focus of the study because “the main emphasis of their study was more upon
general language proficiency than writing proficiency per se” and thus “they make
little passing reference to L2 writing proficiency” (p. 764).

It seems obvious that most of the studies done on the L2 reading-writing
relationship were limited to test Krashen’s “reading input hypothesis,” an extension to
his theory of “comprehensible input” (1982). This hypothesis is briefly discussed
below.

Krashen’s Theory of Comprehensible Input

Krashen (1984) believes that “writing competence, or the abstract knowledge
the proficient writer, has about writing, comes only from large amounts of self-
motivated reading for interest and /or pleasure” (p.20). This implies that writing
competence is acquired subconsciously through reading activities during which
readers are unaware of the acquisition of writing competence. The claims of
Krashen’s Theory, second language acquisition, are constrained by three principles
hypotheses (Krashen, 1982): (1) the acquisition/learning hypothesis (2) the input
hypothesis, and (3) the affective filter hypothesis.
The first hypothesis, the acquisition/learning hypothesis, claims that there is a distinction between “language acquisition” and “language learning.” in developing competence in second language (SL) or foreign language (FL). According to Krashen, “language acquisition” refers to an unconscious process of language development similar to children’s acquisition of L1. Acquisition in this case occurs through understanding language that is used for communicative purposes. “Language learning,” on the other hand, refers to a conscious process of developing rules about a language. Such knowledge of rules is explicitly as well as formally presented to learners.

The second hypothesis, the input hypothesis, includes the concept of Krashen’s comprehensible input. This hypothesis claims that people understand language that is slightly beyond their current level of language proficiency. Krashen also emphasizes the importance of “context or extra-linguistic information” (21) as it helps the acquirer understand the message that is tuned to the learner’s level of competence. Krashen also believes that the ability to speak is not taught. Rather, it is the result of comprehensible input and understanding of that input. However, Krashen believes that comprehensible input is essential for second language acquisition, yet acquisition might not take place due to the affective filter hypothesis.

The third hypothesis, the affective filter hypothesis, claims that there are features that can positively or negatively affect the acquisition of the comprehensible input. These include motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety. These affective variables might enhance, impede, or block input necessary for acquisition depending on the level of the affective filter. According to this hypothesis, acquirers with a low affective filter are said to receive more input and thus acquisition is likely to take place.
According to Krashen, as speech results from comprehensible input, writing is believed to result from extensive reading. Thus he believes that writing is not learned but is acquired through comprehensible input through reading where “all the necessary grammatical structures and discourse rules for writing will be automatically presented to the writer in sufficient quantity” (p. 23). This occurs, according to Krashen, if the reader is “open” to the input, if the affective filter and the anxiety of the reader are low, and if the reader entirely focuses on the message he is reading. These constraints lead the discussion of this research to highlight some studies that failed to find positive relationship between reading and writing.

Studies Failing to Show Relationship

Although the previous studies mentioned above showed significant correlation between reading and writing, other studies, yet few, failed to find a positive correlation. Christiansen (1965) conducted a study in which he compared two groups of freshmen during a semester-long writing course. One group was required to write 8 themes and read prose selections; the other group was required to write 24 themes throughout the whole semester without engaging in reading activities. The findings of this study showed improvement in two groups’ writing. However, no significant differences were reported.

Michener (1985) was interested in investigating the impact of reading aloud on third graders’ writing. The pupils were from low and middle socioeconomic backgrounds. The subjects participating in this study were 47 children, who were divided into two groups. The pupils in the experimental group were listening to teachers reading aloud from a number of selections of children’s’ literature. Each session of reading aloud lasted for 15 minutes throughout a twelve-week semester. The pupils in the control group proceeded with their class activities without engaging
in reading aloud protocol. At the end of the course, writing samples were collected from the participants in the two groups. The result of this study did not show significant effects between the two groups.

A more recent study was conducted by Flahive and Bailey (1993) to examine the hypothesis that ESL readers who read more are better writers. The subjects were 40 ESL students representing 12 different language backgrounds. The subjects were either students taking college composition for foreign students or students attending an ESL program. Flahive and Bailey administered a set of instruments to measure the subjects’ reading and writing. They distributed a questionnaire that aimed at measuring the subjects’ reading practices in L1 and L2. They also administered another questionnaire to measure reading achievement. The subjects were also administered the CELT, a widely used test of L2 grammar, to test their grammatical ability. Furthermore, the subjects were asked to write an argumentative essay on one topic of their choice from a number of issues. Two experienced judges holistic evaluated the essays using a method of 1-9 scale.

The findings of the study showed that there was no relationship between the quantity of reading that the subjects did and the quality of their writing. They also reported what they called a modest correlation between reading comprehension and holistic writing scores. Although unrelated to writing scores, they reported that the amount of pleasure reading did not show positive correlation with the subjects’ scores on CELT.

The studies mentioned above that did not find strong relationship between reading and writing are quantitative in nature. It is impossible to determine what caused this failure as we are only dealing with numbers. In fact, Flahive and Bailey cautioned their research readers about the limitations of qualitative data. Thus, the
present study focuses on the students’ experiences of reading-to-write and seeks to understand what helps or obstructs them throughout the course. The present study does not assume that the participants develop a strong relationship between reading and writing. Rather, it explores the participants’ beliefs and attitudes through their experiences of reading-to-write. It focuses on the positive and negative sides alike. The section below will discuss the distinction between L1 and L2 literacy.

L1 Literacy Versus L2 Literacy

The complexity of the relationship between L2 reading and writing has been mentioned earlier. However, a similar level of complexity applies when comparing ESL learners with their counterparts, the native speakers of the language who, according to Berghoff (1997), are “awash in a cosmic soup of language, numbers, images, music, and drama” (cited in Jalongo, Fennimore, and Stamp, 2004, p. 65). This experience clearly amounts to a considerable gap between L1 and L2 learners in terms of their literacy development even before they start their schooling (Heller, 1991). These varieties of experiences that native speakers have in their language explain why most research conducted on the L1 reading-writing relationship, be correlative or experimental, has yielded positive results.

According to Eisterhold (1990), native speakers (NSs) develop a relatively full oral language system, an important factor for literacy growth; nonnative speakers of English do not have this ability, and they do not develop a full range of literacy practices in their early learning stages of L2. Eisterhold adds that literacy emerges from the system of oral language that children develop through their practice in the first language. These experiences, made up of numerous authentic conversations and materials, surpass the opportunities that nonnative speakers of English might have.
This lack of exposure and practice in L2 literacy results in a lack of background knowledge, which leads to another major difference between NSs and ESL learners. Thus in order to read with comprehension and write with confidence, one has to have an access to background knowledge of the topic at hand. This background knowledge is partially, yet indispensably, derived from literacy. Jalongo, Fennimore, and Stamp (2004) believe that the definition of literacy is complex and always debatable because it is “bound together with culture and the hierarchical power of structures of society” (p. 66). Without such complicated background knowledge, readers and writers often find it difficult to comprehend or construct meaning from a text.

L1 and L2 speakers of English are also significantly different with regard to literacy in school. Native speakers have more background in literature than their counterpart nonnative speakers. For example, native speakers read more literature works and are required to write about them. Alghonaim (2002) observed a regular writing class in a high school of native speakers where the students were required to read a play and answer several questions with reference to the play. This kind of link between reading and writing and exposure to literacy, even much earlier in kindergarten and preschool or according to (Micek, 1994) “during the long summers between school years” (p. 31), is likely to promote literacy in the first language. This early extensive exposure to literacy explains the different status of nonnative speakers of English. Also the status of extensive literacy in the first language eases establishing the connection between reading and writing. Eisterhold (1990) argues that ESL learners do not sufficiently develop such language competence in their L2 to allow them to perform a full range of literacy practices. Therefore, several researchers recommend that the reading-writing relationship is explicitly made.
Teaching the Relationship between Reading and Writing

As mentioned earlier, most of the studies on L2 reading-writing relationship, although few, were designed to test Krashen’s theory of extensive reading and its relationship to writing (Flahive, 1993). Krashen’s theory of comprehensible input was based on L1 research on the reading-writing connection. However, Krashen himself (1984) points out that there is little evidence to support the assumption that a similar relationship between reading and writing exists in the second language (cited in Janopoulos, 1986). Furthermore, Krashen stated, “reading is necessary but not sufficient for acquisition of writing competence” (p. 25). This is not to disregard the importance of extensive reading; however, although some studies report positive relationships when extensive reading is conducted, this relationship is constrained by long-term commitment to reading in L2. Asraf and Ahmed (2003) organized an extensive reading program in three rural secondary or middle schools in Malaysia. The program aimed at motivating and developing the participants’ proficiency in general language modalities through extensive reading. They concluded that the program changed the students’ attitudes towards reading in English. However, Asraf and Ahmed could not determine the improvement of the students’ language proficiency because the study was “conducted over a period of four months and … the effects of extensive reading on the students' language proficiency can best be seen in the long term” (p.99). This conclusion of Asraf and Ahmed is supported by Krashen (1993) who found that studies conducted on free reading show better results if they last for as long as one year or more. Moreover, Leki (1993) considers that explicit instruction is necessary for the reading-writing connection to emerge from the extensive reading experiences. He also states that reading extensively is “too difficult” for ESL learners who might depend on skimming, guessing, and scanning (p.15).
Additionally, several studies recommend that the relationship that occurs through extensive reading should be reinforced by making it explicit through text analysis and group discussion of reading texts (Micek, 1994; Glazer, 1973). For example, Micek (1994) points out that reading and writing are not strictly connected in education. He also states that a body of empirical research supports making this connection. Also, Glazer (1973), whose study is mentioned above, conducted a study in which she found that pupils who engaged in reading discussion made significant advancement in their writings. Shanahan (1988) provides seven instructional principles for teaching reading and writing. One of these calls for making the connection between reading and writing explicit because, as he states, the transfer between reading and writing is not automatic.

Austin (1983) was interested in examining the impact of text analysis of rhetorical structures on the writing of college freshmen. The students were divided into two groups: a control and an experimental group. The students in the experimental group were given essays to read and were required to analyze their rhetorical techniques. The students in the control group received no such instruction. The result showed that the students in the experimental group reported significant gains on the composition post-test at the .01 level. Austin concludes that reading is helpful, but it is more helpful if analysis of rhetorical features is integrated with reading.

Most of the studies conducted on the effects of reading on writing were done in either reading projects or reading classrooms. However, the researcher did not find any study that implemented reading in writing classrooms, although such a recommendation is highly emphasized by researchers (Shanahan, 1990; Kroll, 1993). Reid (1993) refers to reading-to-write as a strategy that students use when engaging in
writing. He emphasizes that this strategy is likely to motivate free and future reading. Flower (1990) considers reading to write as “a tool used to learn, to test learning, and to push students to build beyond their sources” (p. 4). Kroll (1993) supports increasing the students’ awareness about the relationship between reading and writing. As Kroll puts it “we must at least initially ask our ESL students to engage in this kind of reading consciously in order to alert them to ways of reading that they might not otherwise engage in” (p.72).

So far reading has been shown to be an effective factor in writing success, be it extensive reading or controlled reading. Some researchers, while supporting the effectiveness of extensive reading on writing, have argued that reading can be more influential if it is integrated in writing classrooms where students’ attention is brought to the reading texts, or if discussion of rhetorical structures is included with reading to motivate the students to overcome the problems of dealing with texts. Yet, this relationship seems to be neglected in ESL environments. Kroll (1993) provides a reason for this separation. He doubts that ESL programs offer special courses on writing for MA or Ph.D. student teachers who will teach ESL students. Kroll means that it is not enough to offer courses in writing instruction for prospective teachers. Rather, he emphasizes that such programs should take into account teaching writing from a second language perspective.

A major factor that, according to Reid (1993), has supported the separation between reading and writing is the domination of the “process writing” approach since the 1980s. A brief review of this approach, provided below, will explain the impact of this approach on the reading-writing relationship.
L1 Process of Writing

Among the aspects that make up the reading-writing relationship is the meaning construction by readers and writers. Likewise, the writing process approach, which first appeared in Emig’s (1971) landmark L1 research, *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*, aims at discovering meaning through the writing process. Emig used a case study approach to examine how eight twelfth-graders write. She employed a number of techniques to gather her data. She used composing aloud protocol (audiotaped), observation, interviews, and written products. Emig met with the subjects four times and asked them to give autobiographical accounts of their writing processes. She found that, although exhibiting a variety of writing behaviors, students’ overall writing seemed to be non-linear. In other words, students were focusing on how to say what they should say and not having preconceived ideas. Emig concluded that students were constantly trying to discover the meaning that conveys their thoughts.

Flower and Hayes (1981) developed a cognitive theory of writing. They came up with their theory of writing process after five years of observation. Flower and Hayes’ theory of writing process “represents a major departure from the traditional paradigm of stages” (p. 367). This shows a focus shift from the “product” of the writing to the “process” of the writing itself. This shift is represented in the way they put it “planning is not a unitary stage, but a distinctive thinking process which writers use over and over again during composing” (p.375). Flower and Hays’ model identifies three major processes: planning, translating, and reviewing. Several researchers attempted to further study the cognitive process of composing in L1
The next section will discuss the influence of L1 process of writing on L2 writing.

*L2 Process of Writing*

Several researchers investigated the process of writing in L2 (Zamel, 1983; Raimes, 1985; Chelala, 1981; Jones, 1982; Arndt, 1987). Most of these studies replicated early studies conducted on L1 writing processes. Arndt argues that L1 and L2 writing processes share similar strategies. Jones (1982) and Hirose and Sasaki (1994) found similar writing processes in L1 and L2 writing. They pointed out that L1 writing strategies are transferable; expert L1 writers who use different strategies are likely to transfer these strategies when composing in a second language.

Accepting this notion, Zamel emphasizes that L2 writers follow the same processes of L1 writers. Zamel mainly focuses on giving students opportunities to discover meaning and generate ideas, as opposed to focusing on language factors, through enhancing composing processes. Although Flower and Hayes’ model of cognitive process of writing theory is broader than what just Zamel suggests, Zamel focuses mainly on the discovery of meaning through the writing processes that students use when composing. She inserts that composition is informed by what actually writing entails. Hairston (1982) points out that

> We cannot teach students to write by looking only at what they have written. We must also understand how that product came into being, and why it assumed the form that it did. We have to try to understand what goes on during the act of writing . . . if we want to affect its outcome. We have to do the hard thing, examine the intangible process, rather than the easy thing, evaluate the tangible product. (cited in Zamel, 1982, pp. 185-186)
Zamel was interested to answer questions similar to the questions raised by proponents of process-centered studies. These questions include: how do ESL writers generate ideas? What do they do after they have their ideas generated? To what extend during the process of writing do ESL students deal with language matters? Does the lack of lexical items halt writing?

Therefore, Zamel was interested to compare the composing processes that skilled writers of L1 use with the composing processes used by ESL writers. She employed two methodological techniques: observation and interviews. Her subjects were advanced ESL students studying in her composition classroom in an American university. The participants were 6 students representing five linguistic backgrounds (Chinese, Spanish, Portuguese, Hebrew, and Persian). Among the six, there were both skilled and unskilled writers.

Zamel found that all the students, be they skilled or unskilled, seemed to go through similar stages of composing processes, usually identified as pre-writing (planning), writing, and revising. She reported that the students may start with some informal notes or ideas, which upon writing they may discard. She also pointed out that revising was evident throughout the study where they students seemed to rewrite what they had already written. This revision reflected in clarifying previously stated ideas or revising entire chunks of discourse. Zamel considered this as a major findings of her study; students “understood that composing involves the constant interplay of thinking, writing, and rewriting” (p.172). For example, Zamel mentioned one example of her participant students who started writing only after writing down some notes and ideas that, he thought, they would make a fine conclusion. As for revising, the students seemed to delete or add new sentences until they feel they expressed their thoughts. Also, changes included paragraph levels. For example, one student thought
that one paragraph in the third page would more appropriately fit as an introduction for his paper.

Regarding one of the other major questions that Zamel was interested to answer, the extent to which language matters affect the composing processes, she found that this issue represented a minor problem for the students. Most of the students, especially the skilled one, pursue the development of their ideas and thoughts with being distracted by lexical difficulties. In several cases, the students resorted to their own language to write the words that they did not know in English. This did so because they were focused more in ideas than in errors; however, Zamel pointed out that students’ papers were not error-free.

Zamel also stated some accounts of the students’ experiences with the writing process. One student, an unskilled one, reported a problem with constructing a plan on which to base her paper. This student also viewed writing as one-time job. For example, she asked Zamel, “can I add something later?” (p.176). Zamel, on the other hand, provided another experience of skilled writers who believed that writing can be “half-finished” thoughts, in which they can return to them later. Furthermore, the skilled writers were frequently adherent to revision as a main part of the composing processes. Zamel reported that these students reread their papers to arrive at the appropriate meaning that they did not state correctly in the first drafts.

This overview of Zamel’s study shows that the focus is on generating ideas. One student put it this way, “If I have an idea, but I don’t have the words, I write it in Chinese so I don’t lose it. Language is not the big problem. Most of the difficulty is how to put the ideas together” (179). However, Zamel reported some issues that represented major frustrations to the students. For example, one student expressed his anger for not having the words to appropriately express his ideas. Another student had
a problem with spelling that he could not reread what he wrote in the revision process. Grammatical errors did not constitute major concerns for the students. Yet, according to Zamel, their papers were not devoid of language problems but, she claimed, these problems did not interrupt the writing processes.

Zamel summarized her study as follow: the skilled writers seemed to understand that writing is a process of discovering meaning and exploring ideas. She also concluded that this process is creative and generative is not based on explicit plan. Rather, it is a task that requires further discovering, constructing, and reconstructing of thoughts. She, furthermore, stated that these students understand that writing entails purposeful processes making and accommodating meaning that appropriately fits the writer’s thoughts.

Finally, at the end of her study, Zamel provided a set of pedagogical implications that generally focus on the teaching of writing as a process that allows students to generate and explore ideas that best communicate their purposes of writing. She, then, provided an overview of how this process can be implemented in classrooms. However, Zamel admitted that this is not an easy job for both ESL teachers and students, especially those who are at the stages of developing language competencies. Yet, she strongly expressed her disagreement about pinpointing errors in the first draft on the expense of ideas and thoughts.

Zamel’s view of the second language process of writing is supported by Raimes (1985). Eight unskilled ESL students were the subjects in Raimes’ study. Convinced that skilled ESL writers follow the same processes that experienced L1 writers do, and that little has been done regarding unskilled ESL writers, Zamel was interested in examining the similarities and differences between unskilled ESL writers and unskilled L1 writers. Raimes used a think-aloud protocol to collect her data. Most
of Raimes findings conform to the findings of Zamel. Raimes, for instance, found that these students, although unskilled, seemed not preoccupied with error and with editing. They also seemed to go back and read in order to generate more ideas. Furthermore, she found that the students needed time to brainstorm and generate ideas. She emphasized that this time would allow students to approach writing as an act of processes and not just an act of “product.” Raimes, additionally, stated that the time given for writing processes should prioritize the time to complete the syllabus of the course.

Clearly, this study by Raimes and the previous studies by Jones (1982), Zamel (1985), and Hirose and Sasaki (1994) showed the need for new trends in teaching writing, as Selva (1990) has pointed out. Reid (1993) claims that the “writing process” has dominated the literature and the classrooms of ESL writing since 1980s. Basically, this approach puts an emphasis on generating ideas and thoughts through writing processes and, it focuses on the writers to create meaning. However, throughout the review of research studies on L2 writing process, it seems that little or no emphasis was paid to the importance of reading although considerable research emphasized the effects of reading to writing in both L1 and L2 (Micek, 1994). Most of the readings involved in these studies were only cases of the students rereading their papers. Raimes showed the pattern of the students’ activities or reading and writing according to this approach of writing process. This pattern includes: “create text—read—create text—read—edit—read—create text—read—create text, and so on” (248). Nevertheless, Raimes reported that some students read only two or three sentences of their drafts. She attributed this behavior to the nature of narrative or expressive writings.
The need to adopt reading in writing classrooms does not by any means decrease or conflict with the importance of the composition processes that writers go through. Rather, this emphasis on discovering meaning reflects an important aspect of the relationship between reading and writing, i.e., constructing meaning (see teaching the reading-writing relationship). However, as Zamel (1983) pointed out, writing by its nature entails the existence of composition processes (planning, writing, and revising). Therefore, these processes need to be reinforced by providing students with more opportunities and resources that help them effectively use these processes when composing. Zamel reported that her unskilled students failed to form an equivalent understanding of the composition processes as did her skilled counterparts. This student, considered a striking case by Zamel, expressed her worries about writing throughout the study. Also, Raimes stated that one unskilled student did not go back and edit as opposed to the unskilled native speakers. If writing, as viewed by Zamel, is a problem-solving task, Brock (1990) claims that by using reading in the writing classrooms, we provide students with cultural knowledge, rich linguistic storehouse, extensive reading, and a basis for conversational group work and problem-solving activities. These factors, if utilized, are likely to enhance the writing process rather than just recording feelings about the topic (Spack, 1985), especially for ESL students who, as mentioned earlier, seem not to have developed earlier extensive background knowledge about L2. Furthermore, Cumming (1989) and Lay (1982) disagree with other researchers who claim that L2 writers make extensive use of their L1 writing strategies. They argue that, in addition to writing processes, L2 writers resort to L1 to gain specific words as a result of their L2 insufficient cultural knowledge.

Another issue regarding the impact of this approach of writing on the reading-writing relationship is the fact that it entails narrative or expressive writing tasks.
Bazeman (1980) claims that teachers, who do not employ reading in their writing classrooms, seem to assign expressive assignments, such as journals, because, according to this approach, students rely heavily on their experiences of previous knowledge to generate ideas. For this to happen, as Zamel pointed out, the assigned topics should truly reflect the students’ personal experiences. However, Horowitz (1986) believes that this is unrealistic. He argues that students rarely choose their topics by their own. Furthermore, Gajdusek and VanDommelen (1993) claim that personal writings entail some problems for ESL students. They state that such assignments of personal writings stress the idea that these students are foreigners, as they are required to write about their own cultural experiences. Also, personal writing is very difficult for inexperienced writers for the very reason of being personal. In addition, they show that such topics might be considered taboo or at least uncomfortable in other cultures. Finally, they argue that personal writings require experienced and wise writers who can articulate and translate the nonverbal sensation and emotion.

In a faculty survey, Johns (1981) showed that, although this form of writing is useful, it is not academically required from students by instructors in higher education. Reid (1993) totally agrees with Johns and adds that ESL students are “neither familiar nor comfortable with the conventions and expectations of narrative and/or expressive writing” (p. 42). Horowitz (1986) questioned this approach with regard to academic requirements. He argues, “The process-oriented approach fails to prepare students for at least one essential type of academic writing” (p. 141).

This approach of writing process lacks an essential part of the reading-writing relationship. Writing processes, according to Raimes, turned not to account for the readers’ perspectives. Raimes stated that her student participants focused mainly on
textual rather than on discoursal matters. Unlike her ESL writers, whose first concern was to get their ideas written down, unskilled L1 writers take into account their readers’ understanding. Contrary to what Zamel reported, Raimes pointed out that this extensive focus on meaning made the students deviate from communicating and negotiating their ideas with the readers. According to Gajdusek and VanDommelen (1993), the forms of writings done in this approach are best described as writer-based prose, as opposed to reader-based prose. They consider the term write-based a failure to attain to the reader’s need because the writers are totally “insiders” (p.198). Moreover, they argue that interaction between readers and writers helps writers choose the effective composing strategies that encourage them meet the challenges of writing.

Additionally, throughout the study of Zamel and Raimes, we have been told about the processes and activities the students did. But nothing much has been mentioned about the quality of their writing. In other words, the two aforementioned studies have been conducted to see if the students apply the same processes of writing that their counterparts of L1 do. Zamel stated that “perhaps too much attention to meaning alone kept these students from carefully examining certain surface features of writing” (p. 176). Raimes considered that such total emphasis on ideas might affect the students’ ability to consider structural features of writing. She puts it, “our students should be taught not only heuristic devices to focus on meaning, but also heuristic devices to focus on rhetorical and linguistic features after the ideas have found some form” (pp. 247-248).

Comparing her students to unskilled L1 writers, Raimes claims that, although the students in her study seem to attend to writing the same way as unskilled L1 writers do, we should not either use the same pedagogical strategies of composition
processes nor should we treat writing as a language drill. She suggests that we look for “middle grounds” (p. 250). What ESL writers need, Raimes (1985) writes:

is more of everything: more time; more opportunity to talk, listen, read, and write in order to marshal the vocabulary they need to make their own background knowledge accessible to them in their L2; more instruction and practice in generating, organizing, and revising ideas; more attention to the rhetorical options available to them; and more emphasis on editing for linguistic form and style. Attention to process is thus necessary but not sufficient. (p. 250)

As stated above, this is not to reject the valuable implications and pedagogies that this process of writing brought to writing teachings. Rather writing process fulfills one important aspect of the reading-writing relationship (see the first section of this chapter). The more drafts writers employ the better product they produce. This process should be one complementary, yet indispensable, part of the reading-writing relationship. However, too much emphasis on only one kind of relationship is likely to ignore the other aspects of the reading-writing relationship. In a process-oriented pedagogy, reading seems to be ignored and students are not constantly encouraged to integrate new knowledge with already existing knowledge and, thus, are not called upon to internalize new information in writing tasks (Leki, 1993). Raimes (1985) and Reid (1993) call for a view of writing that creates a balance between product and process that gives writers to opportunities to discover ideas, identify audience, purposes, analyze rhetorical structures, and account for social factors. The later, social factors, is an additional challenge to the writing process resulting from the advent of post-process. The post-process is briefly discussed next.
Post-Process Writing Approach

The notion of process has been challenged through the advent of the so-called ‘post-process’ movement in the 1990s (Matsuda, 2003). Crowley (1998) argues that the rise of the process approach is a reaction to the dominance of the product-centered approach. While the writing process focuses on the different stages that writers go through, the post-process approach implies that some factors exist in real-world writing that are ignored in the theorized writing process. For example, Kent (1999) argues that post-process theory considers writing to be a public act, entailing public interchange. He also argues that writing is interpretive, so readers create a relationship of understanding with writers, within which interaction and interpretation take place.

The process movement has come under serious criticism in composition studies. Although composition theorists still acknowledge the pedagogical practices of process writing, they simultaneously argue against its limitation and dominance. For example, Faigley (1986) acknowledges that process writing is necessary, but insufficient to help readers and writers discover the meaning of being in the world. Similarly, while Tobin (1994) admits that process writing has enriched the field of composition with a "powerful legacy" (p. 4), he also claims it underestimates the complexity of what writers do.

Other researchers have proposed other theories for writing that account for multiple perspectives on writing beyond the composing process, to explain the meaning of writing in a larger context. These theorists seem to look beyond the composing process and self-expressive writing. They emphatically argue that the social perspectives that make writing more interactive are crucial (Spellmeyer, 1993). Trimbur (1994) considers this a shift in focus from the writing process to the "social turn", which he defines as "a post-process, post-cognitivist theory and pedagogy that
represents literacy as an ideological arena and composition as a cultural activity by which writers position and reposition themselves in relation to their own and others’ subjectivities, discourses, practices, and institutions" (p. 109).

Matsuda (2003) argues that the writing process does not constitute a paradigm, since process pedagogy was not universally accepted, substantially incorporated in writing curricula, or solely dominant in the field of composition. For example, Matsuda mentions that there were other theories resisting process pedagogy in the midst of the process era, such as "current-traditional rhetoric" (Young, 1987). Young focused on the composed product as opposed to the composing process.

Throughout my research, I did not find any researcher who rejected the insights of the process approach to writing. In fact, all acknowledge the role that the process of writing has occupied in both L1 and L2 composition. Their only objection to process writing relates to the dominance of this approach at the expense of other factors that surpass the writing process in importance (Matsuda, 2003). These factors include focus on the composing process as a whole, the text, the reader, and the discourse of second language writing.

The aim of the aforementioned brief review on post-process view of writing is to shed light on the position of the writing process, poised between previous research on the reading-writing connection and current and future trends pointing toward post-process theories of writing. The current study does not underestimate the value of the process approach. Rather, it assumes that the process of writing is one essential factor among many other perspectives that account for the complexity of writing. This study also assumes that the process approach to writing does not teach rhetorical structures to ESL/ EFL learners who, according to researchers, lack sufficient exposure to these L2 features of literacy. I agree with other researchers (Raimes, 1985 and Reid, 1993)
that integrating reading and writing along with utilizing the writing process in ESL/EFL writing classes is needed.

This balance between using reading to teach writing and attention to the process of writing has been supported by other researchers and authors. Benesch (1993) described the student-as-author approach in an ESL college composition course who completed an “authoring cycle” that initiated from reading, writing multi-drafts, editing, and publishing. The students were assigned to an extensive reading and writing that were linked to one topic throughout the course. Benesch showed that students who are committed to a long-term assignment through reading and writing are more adherent to revision that those who complete short-term assignments. Goldstein (1993) offered a paired of content and adjunct course for MA students, in which reading and writing were represented in these two courses respectively. The content course was about second language acquisition (SLA); the adjunct course was a writing course in which students used the informational content from the SLA course to be the subject matter of the writing assignments. The teacher of the course also focused more generally on process of writing after the students spent sometime on reading and rhetorical discussion of audience, purpose, unity support, and organization. Goldstein reported that the students were very excited working back and forth with reading and writing. She also stated that the students developed an understanding of the reading-writing relationship.

Using Model Essays

According to Smagorinsky (1992), the use of exemplary models extends back to Greek academies, where students learned to write by reading and memorizing rhetorical texts. Corbett (1995) states that the quality of professional writers and outstanding texts have long persuaded people to imitate such powerful texts, even if
written centuries ago. The imitation of these texts has persisted in modern instructional approaches to teaching writing. Watson (1982) claims that the rationale behind using models refers to the notion that people learn to use language effectively by simply imitating others. Although this notion has been abandoned, or at least neglected in recent decades due to the dominance of the process approach to composition, many researchers still assume that novice writers can learn writing by imitating others. Others, disillusioned with the lack of models in many process writing course designs, have begun to reintegrate readings into their composition syllabi.

Alghonaim (2003) observed a composition class at a university in the US, in which the instructor, Soliman (2003), focused on models as a means of teaching writing. The textbook used was *Models for Writers: Short Essays for Composition* by Alfred Rosa and Paul Eschholz (2001). In his written reflections about teaching with model essays, Soliman says that, in his opinion, combining models with discussion was effective in his class. He noted that the students participated actively when discussing texts. Furthermore, he claimed that the use of models and discussion moved students in the direction of more dynamic writing. He also stated that he had felt satisfied with the results in a previous term when he had used this method when teaching the course. The main assumption behind using models in writing courses is that students can see how good texts are organized and developed. Eschholz (1980) has provided a justification for teaching writing through the use of models:

Professional writers have long acknowledged the value of reading; they know that what they read is important to how they eventually write. In reading, writers see the printed word; they develop an eye and an ear for language, the shape and order of sentences, and the texture of paragraphs. The prose models approach to the teaching of writing holds that writers can develop and improve
their writing skills through directed reading. Teachers who use this approach believe that one of the best ways to learn to write is to analyze and imitate models of good writers systematically. Such study, they feel, exposes students to important new ideas and to the basic patterns of organization in non-fiction prose as well as to other specific strategies or techniques that all good writers use. (p. 28)

Eschholz discusses two elements essential to this method of instruction: directed reading and analysis. He emphasizes that by concentrating on traditional rhetorical modes, learners become better readers and writers.

Dale (1980) discusses several methods of incorporating models into the teaching of writing. He believes that teachers need to be careful when teaching writing through models because models can be misleading if not appropriately approached. Therefore, Dale offers an outline describing his use of models in teaching writing for students at two-year colleges. He assigns paragraphs to be read and cautions that the class should discuss these thoroughly to ensure comprehension. Dale additionally suggests that examples of student texts based on the models be provided to show practical understanding of the original model. Dale proposes four steps to guide teachers and students in developing writing assignments: (1) assigning outside reading texts that reflect the style of the model, (2) discussing the outside reading in class along with any other texts used for the same assignments, (3) sharing the assignment in class, and (4) discussing the assignment and presenting acceptable and unacceptable structures. Dale provides four advantages to using this technique when teaching writing with model texts. These advantages resemble the reasons that Watson (1982) provides to explain the continued use of model texts in teaching writing.
Watson (1982) explains that models are still in use in ESL/EFL contexts for three reasons: (1) students can experience lexical items, structural patterns, and writing conventions of the target language beyond the sentence level; (2) students can experience various modes of rhetorical organization; and (3) students can gain background knowledge about the target language, if these models are authentic.

Smagorinsky (1992) reviewed the read-analyze-write method suggested by Eschholz (1980), which depends heavily on student analysis and the study of models to extract knowledge. Smagorinsky believes that other methods of instruction must be combined with the use of model texts. He conducted a study in which he compared three instructional treatments, each of which employed textual models. The first treatment included extensive study of model definitions without giving directions to the students in class. The only focus was on labeling elements of model definitions. The second and the third treatments also included a study of model essays, but with a focus on explicit instruction of particular types of composing procedures. The first of these instructional treatments included instruction on general procedures of writing (freewriting and brainstorming); the second included instruction in procedures specific to the model to produce a definition. For example, students were asked to provide a definition for the phrase "freedom of speech." Along with the phrase, students were given a number of examples related to the phrase in which they generate criteria from each example.

Smagorinsky formed three groups with six students in each group. He conducted a pretest and posttest think-aloud protocol. Students were required to think aloud as they composed. Smagorinsky found that the treatments affected the students in two main areas: ‘critical thinking’ (the ability to provide precise characteristics for elements) and ‘purposeful composing’ (the ability to associate generalizations and
elements (criteria and attributes) to supporting evidence (examples and contrasting examples). Smagorinsky pointed out that the protocol analysis has revealed that the students in the instructional model groups improved more on critical thinking measures and purposeful composing than their counterpart in the models-only group. Using the t-test, he found that students in the two instructional model groups, the general procedures and the task-specific procedures, scored significantly higher than students in the model group in both the critical thinking and the purposeful composing categories. Smagorinsky concludes by emphasizing that models are a powerful tool if they are accompanied by explicit instruction. Watson, similarly, arrived at the same conclusion that models are "indispensable" if they are used effectively. These studies by Dale (1980), Smagorinsky (1992), and Watson (1982), although they emphasized the value of reading models, did not investigate the effects of models from the student's point of view.

The current study seeks to remedy this omission by focusing on explicit instruction of rhetorical structures in conjunction with the use of model essays. This study is significant because it focuses mainly on the L2 reading-writing relationship as an area that has not yet been fully investigated. Additionally, this study is significant because it seems from the previous research of literature that this area received considerable attention from researchers, but no one study, at least to the knowledge of the researcher, explored students’ experiences about the reading-writing relationship and use of models. Equally important, this study is valuable because it takes place in a class where the instructor focuses on the reading-writing connection and simultaneously requires that students go through writing processes. Finally, this study explores this issue from ESL students’ perspectives. Specifically, it describes
their beliefs, attitudes, and experiences. The next section discusses research on beliefs and attitudes.

Students’ Beliefs and Attitudes

Research on the Significance of Students' Voices

Research on students’ attitudes and beliefs has seemed to receive considerable attention in education. Studies on students’ beliefs and attitudes imply listening to students’ experiences on whatever concern is under study. These beliefs and attitudes are significant for students in one hand, and for teachers, educators, and textbook designers in the other hand. They are beneficial for students because when students articulate their beliefs and attitudes, they develop more cognitive awareness about their achievement (Hasan, 1985). Similarly, students’ beliefs and attitudes are important for teachers, educators and textbook designers because they can understand what help or obstruct learners during their education.

In order to elicit students’ beliefs, attitudes, and experiences, one must give students a chance to speak out their voices that reflect their experiences, be they good or bad. Looking back at the aforementioned studies in this chapter, one can easily notice that students’ voices did not influence the results of the studies. This is so because as Leki (2001) pointed out that most studies were conducted on the “public transcript.” (p. 17). By public transcript, Leki refers to the easily observable behavior. He claims that public transcripts are always available to researchers. “Hidden transcripts,” on the other hand, represent the offstage behavior that can describe the problems and success of students. Leki emphasizes that we should not be limited to what and how students do in a given activity. Rather, we should seek to know how students perceive and reflect on what they do. Algonaim (2004) conducted a study in which six ESL college students were assigned to write an argumentative essay about
one of three topics. Afterward, the students were assigned to read three short argumentative passages and to examine rhetorical structures and how argumentative were presented in these passages. Then, they were asked to write a second draft of their topic. Alghonaim was interested in examining the changes the students might do to their second drafts. He found that all the students did not do any major changes to their second draft. However, Alghonaim did not seek why changes did not occur although the students’ first drafts did not reflect the major argumentative structural features. Out of public record of the study, one student, nevertheless, expressed his admiration of such an activity, but he stated that he did not know how to critically read for rhetorical structures although he, and the rest of the participants, completed 101 college writing course. This study shows that further investigations would enhance research if the students’ voices were included in order to go beyond what just they did.

Leki (2001), although admitting the significance of public transcript that talk only about the students or the students’ work, argues that researchers should also spend time talking to the students about their perceptions and experiences of the study. He also claims that “a great deal occurs in the hidden transcript” (20). Such studies are significant because they are likely to reveal to us about the students’ understandings of the underway study. This understanding helps researchers view what obstructs or assist the students to carry out the activity at hand.

Other researchers (Thesen, 1997; Ruddock, 1993) consider students’ voices as channels to bridge the gap between individuals’ expectations and institutional structures. Ruddock puts it, “voices remind us of the individuality that lies beneath the institutional structures” (p. 8). Thesen also considers students the center of the change in any pedagogical construction. Kress (1989) writes:
What is important is to think of language always as a complex system, in movement, sometimes contradictory and sometimes in a single direction. In all these processes the individual is crucial and instrumental. Education is the social institution that is about the change and progression of its client members in the direction of mainstream culture, and its classifications. The institution of education depends on a theory in which notions of change and progression are at the centre. (cited in Thesen, 1997, p. 494)

Recently, students’ voices, through hearing their beliefs and attitudes, received increasing attention from teachers and researchers. Alshamrani (2003) conducted a qualitative study about ESL attitudes and beliefs about extensive reading of authentic texts. He explored how these students perceived extensive reading with regard to vocabulary development, strategies of dealing with unfamiliar vocabulary items, difficulties and benefits that they experienced when reading extensively. Another study conducted by Fageeh (2003) aimed at exploring Saudi EFL students’ beliefs concerning their writing difficulties, linguistic difficulties, writing strategies when composing, and their awareness of rhetorical difference between English and Arabic. These two studies focus mainly and exclusively on the students as the source of data. To the knowledge of the researcher of this study, no study has been found that exclusively investigates ESL students’ beliefs and attitudes about reading-to-write.

Research on Beliefs and Attitudes

The significance of this study rests on its contribution to empirical research based on the effectiveness of students’ recognition of their own beliefs towards the reading-writing relationship. Again, this belief is based on the extensive body of research into the reading-writing relationship that stresses the significance of this issue. Thus, his recognition of beliefs and attitudes towards this area of research is
likely to increase students’ awareness of the importance of reading to write. This section will briefly discuss definitions of beliefs and attitudes and their influence on students’ conceptions and performance.

Definitions of Beliefs and Attitudes

Attitudes and beliefs have been defined by different researchers and psychologists. Yet, most of these definitions are complementary. Lampert (1984) explored how beliefs shape practice and came up with his definition; he defines beliefs as intuitive knowledge that is subjective and based on personal experiences. Nespor (1987) defines beliefs as feelings, emotions, and subjective evaluations. Pajares (1992) argues that these various definitions resulted from different conceptualizations of beliefs and attitudes by different researchers and educators. He claims that beliefs and attitudes maybe be used to refer to values, judgments, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action, strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertoires of understandings, and social strategies” (p.309). However, Pajares believes that these conceptualizations are not different but make up a personal belief system. Lewis (1990) even argues that beliefs and attitudes are equivalent.

The focus of this research, however, is not to differentiate between these terms of attitudes and beliefs. Other sources can be useful for such an issue (Lewis, 1990; Nespor, 1987; Salomon & Perkins, 1998). Rather, this research assumes that beliefs and attitudes are subject to change due to exposure to different experiences. Thompson (1992) argues that beliefs and attitudes are not static. Thus, this study focuses on the participants’ beliefs and attitudes toward the reading-writing relationship before and after the course. It tries to explore what kind of ideas students
have about this issue and if these ideas change throughout the course. Therefore, beliefs and attitudes in this study are referred to as Horwitz (1989) puts it, “preconceived ideas about the nature of the language learning task” (p.54). Furthermore, it aims to explore what happens to these ideas during, and after students are involved in reading-writing activities.

The Relationship between Attitudes and Educational Experiences

Researchers and educators have been interested in exploring students’ beliefs and attitudes toward education. This interest stems from several research studies that show correlation between attitudes resulting from previous experiences and achievement. Kloosterman (1996) argues that some beliefs encourage students to learn; others diminish motivation to learn. Kagan (1992) claims that beliefs and attitudes may play the role of “facilitators” for new information. According to Kagan, acquisition of new knowledge occurs when beliefs determine that new information is consistent with peoples’ attitudes and beliefs. However, beliefs might play the role “barriers” to the acquisition if they decide that new information is not consistent with peoples’ attitudes and beliefs. Likewise, Fader (1976) argues that “the chief problem in teaching reading and writing is not intellect but motivation” (p. 78).

Cleary (1990) examined the effects of previous experiences on secondary students when engage in writing tasks that require potential satisfaction. Forty-eleventh-grade students participated in this study. Cleary found that the students’ past experiences negatively interacted with their attitudes and willingness to write. She pointed out that previous experiences such as, competence and self-determination are likely to affect students’ attitudes toward implementing relative tasks. She also pointed out that students’ attitudes should be enhanced by considering extrinsic and intrinsic motivations.
Regardless of the effect of students’ previous attitudes on their perception of new tasks, students may develop attitudes that are not influenced by previous experiences. Similarly, according to Lewis (2003), these new revolving attitudes may affect students’ perception of new experience. Lewis (2003) conducted a correlational study to examine students’ attitudes and perception toward their new learning environment related to an introduction to instructional technology. The subjects were 171 students taking instructional technology courses. Lewis administered a 40-item survey to measure the students’ attitudes with regard to the introduction course of instructional technology. Findings showed positive correlation between students’ attitudes and feelings and their acceptance of introducing instructional technology to them. However, Ritchie (1989) claims that newly developed attitudes might have negative effects on students if they experience frustration and confusion at the beginning. Ritchie emphasizes sensitivity to individual histories and experiences in order to improve their attitudes.

Kuhlthau (1988) investigated her students’ experiences and attitudes about library research prior to the beginning of the course. Six students were asked some questions related to (1) research assignments, (2) students’ procedures of previous research assignments, and (3) students’ problems of previous research assignments. Kuhlthau’s found two major issues. First, although students’ past experiences were not positive, these experiences did not necessarily match their new experiences and attitudes. Second, although Kuhlthau found that students’ attitudes about library research process seemed to be interfered with their negative prior experiences of previous assignments, this investigation helped the students developed awareness about research process and thus improved their attitudes about their library research course.
Research on Attitudes and the Reading-Writing Relationship

As mentioned before, there is an extensive body of research on the reading-writing relationship. Most of these studies, if not all, were focusing on the effects of reading on writing by measuring students’ performance. Several studies show that some students’ writings did not improve after exposure to reading (Flahive, 1993). This implies that these students may have some problems and that they have not benefited much, or as expected, from reading. Also, regardless of students’ improvement, their views and opinions were still ignored. As mentioned before in this section, students’ understanding and recognition of their beliefs and attitudes about this relationship between reading and writing are likely to motivate them if these beliefs and attitudes are uncovered. Spaulding (1992) argues that the existence of this gap in research concerning the reading-writing relationship is an extended gap of educators and practitioners’ unawareness of the importance of motivation in the field of literacy. Therefore, this study tries not only to explore students’ preconceived beliefs and attitudes about the reading-writing relationship, but also endeavors to examine if any changes of these beliefs occur throughout the course of ESL 101 college Writing. Additionally, this present study tries to describe their difficulties, experiences and strategies of dealing with reading texts towards their writing activities. Furthermore, this research explores the students’ views of the reading-writing relationship in their future studies and academic activities.

Although no study was found to be exclusively dealing with students’ perceptions, experiences, and beliefs towards the reading-writing relationship, some studies that used students’ samples as major indicators of the effects of reading on writing and that somewhat reported about students’ opinions are the probable literature available so far.
Fader (1976) designed a program called “Hooked on Books” or sometimes called, “English in Every Classroom.” This program is an approach to learning reading and writing. This program was based on two basic concepts: **Saturation** and **Diffusion**. Saturation referred to the availability of materials in every classroom; whereas diffusion referred to the responsibility of every teacher to teach English in every classroom. The reading materials consisted of customary texts, workbooks, newspapers, magazine, and paperbound books. For writing, students were only required to write journals in which quantity was the only criterion for judgment. Fader argued that this program received researcher’s interest in various spectrums of literacy. Yet, “almost no work at all has been done in the vast area of testing attitudes toward reading and writing” (p. 78).

Therefore, McNeil (1976) was interested to test Faders’ idea about his program that children “could learn to like to read and write.” (p. 148). Unlike other researchers and psychologists who tested fade’s idea by using traditional measures of intelligence to measure attitudes, McNeil, was primarily concerned with measures and techniques that directly assess literacy and find out what was happening to the boys exposed to *English in Every Classroom*. McNeil argued, the answers provided by psychologists were imperfect because the research techniques, such as intellectual tests, e. g., I. Q., were inadequate to measure changes in attitudes. He also believed that the tested research question, mentioned above, needed to be reinvestigated in away that researchers could “discover who got hooked, where the hook found its mark, and the depth to which it penetrated” (p. 151). He further assumed that such research methods that provide too objective information may not reveal about young people’s attitudes regardless of what their test scores are, be them good or bad. In
other words, young people might learn from pleasure reading despite the difficulties they may experience.

Thus, McNeil used two groups to assess boys’ attitudes regarding Faders’ program. He believed using two contrastive groups dictated a necessity to assess boys’ gains and attitudes toward reading and writing. The two groups were control group (CG) and experimental group. The subjects in the experimental groups were young people attending Boys’ Training School (T. B. S.); whereas, their control group (CG) were boys attending another training school. The populations in both schools were similar in terms of their social histories and their willingness to read and write. The boys at B. T. S. aged 15 years and 7 months while their counterparts in the CG ranged from 12 to 17 years.

McNeil believed that intelligence test, such as I. Q., can be used to measure the basic intellectual capacity of child mentality. Therefore, McNeil adapted, altered, and modified traditional instrument to assess pupils’ attitudes toward the teaching of reading and writing in the schools. Thus, he developed a combination of research instruments based on psychological and behavioral phenomena. One of these instruments was a teacher’s behavior rating sheets, in which teachers describe students’ frustration, degree of self control, and self-esteem. These sheets included: Teachers’ Behavior Rating Sheet, Teacher’s Evaluation Form, “How Much Do You Like” Form, and Behavior Rating Form. Basically, these forms were filled in by teachers. Other research techniques were used to seek information from the students’ point of view. These techniques included forms such as, “How Do You Fell About Things in Class?” and The Verbal Proficiency Test. These two techniques were used to compare what happened to the students’ attitudes in the experimental group with their peers in the control group.
The findings of this research showed that the self-esteem of the pupils at T. B. S. was not statistically different from those in the CG at the beginning of the experiment. However, by the end of the school year, students at T. B. S. had higher self-esteem than those in the CG. Furthermore, students in the experimental group had more positive attitudes toward their self-images than did their counterparts. As long as literacy is concerned, McNeil stated that the boys’ attitudes toward literacy were not distinguishable. Though, after just a period of exposure, the attitudes of the boys at T. B. S. surpassed the boys in the CG. McNeil attributed these changes to “a change in feeling generated by in methods and materials employed in the teaching of English” (p. 190). Although the described attitudes were positive, one might not predict exactly the same situation for ESL students for there reasons: (1) this research was done on a complete and exclusive literary program, (2) the boys’ attitudes were revealed throughout the whole program that lasted for two years, and (3) the students were native speakers of English.

Alshamrani (2003) conducted a qualitative study, in which he described 9 ESL students’ beliefs and attitudes about extensive reading of authentic texts. The participants in this study, taking an extensive course in a three-month ESL program, called Reading Club, were labeled as “low advanced” and “advanced.” Accordingly, these students were divided into two groups: group one and group two. Alshamrani described the students’ beliefs and experiences of extensive reading focusing mainly on their attitudes about authentic materials, extensive reading difficulties and gains, reading strategies, vocabulary development, attitudes and motivation towards future extensive reading, and over all language proficiency. Although this study is valuable in that it describes the students’ experiences in these areas, it did not include the students’ perceptions regarding extensive reading and writing. However, little has
been mentioned about the students’ attitudes toward writing; Alshamrani found that
the students noticed some improvement in their writing. One student mentioned that
she started to use new phrases in her writing. Ali, a participant in group one,
explained his feeling of extensive reading impact on writing with reference to
vocabulary use. He stated,

When writing, I love to use the new word because I now know its meaning.
This thing has happened to me especially with conjunction words like
furthermore, moreover, however. This has helped me to connect paragraphs,
sentences, and thoughts with each other. I saw how the author uses some
words in this book, and then I tried to use them when I write. (p. 170)

Alshamrani also stated, under overall English development, that students
believed that they were familiar with grammatical rules, stylistic forms, and new
vocabulary. Accordingly, they believed that this familiarity influenced their writing.

Apparently, these findings show that students’ beliefs and attitudes about the
impact of extensive reading on their writing were just generally described. The focus
on writing in Alshamrani’s study is similar to Tudo and Hafiz’s (1989) study in which
the focus was on the effects of extensive reading on general language development. In
Alshamrani’s study, for instance, the students would explain how they generally and
briefly felt about a writing issue but they were not asked to provide detailed
information on how they worked and manipulated this issue in their actual writing. In
other words, this study does not explain how students used the reading for writing
purposes and what strategies they employed in their reading for writing activities.
Additionally, this study, although insightful, does not detail about the students’ beliefs
about their writing competence in terms of using rhetorical structures and textual
organizations. Furthermore, a very short description has been mentioned about the
students’ attitudes regarding the effects of group discussion of reading activities on their writing. Although this issue is important, little has been mentioned about this area. For instance, John’s statement about his attitudes toward this activity did not go beyond this: “I think just to read is not good. We need to discuss” (p. 204). As a matter of fact, this is so because this study is limited to describing the participant’s beliefs and attitudes toward other areas. These areas were fully described as they represented the scope and the focus of the study. Their beliefs and attitudes of extensive reading about writing, however, was a minor question.

Thus the purpose of this descriptive study is to take another step toward gaining more understanding about this issue of the reading-writing relationship from the students’ point of views. It seeks to collect data from the hidden transcripts (Leki, 2001) that and experiences. Specifically, it aims at answering a set of questions. Primarily, it tries to explore the participant students’ beliefs and attitudes about the relationship between reading and writing at the beginning and at the end of the course. It seeks to examine any changes that may occur to their beliefs with regard to this relationship. This research focuses on the students’ strategies of using reading materials into writing purposes. It also seeks to uncover their attitudes bout their rhetorical advances in their writing regarding the reading tasks. Additionally, this study aims at describing the effects of their awareness of this relationship on their motivation to activate the reading-writing relationship in their academic work. The next chapter will discuss the research methods that the researcher will use to answer these questions.
CHAPTER THREE  
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY  

Rationale for a Qualitative Study  

Whereas most studies on the relationship between reading and writing have used quantitative methods, as shown in Chapter Two, this study used a qualitative approach. While previous quantitative and qualitative studies measured the effects of sustained reading on writing ability, correlations between amounts of reading and writing proficiency, and the potential effects of reading on writing process, this present study used qualitative methods to answer primary and secondary questions regarding student writers’ beliefs and experiences of using reading for writing person. The utilization of qualitative methods was justified by the nature of the research questions mentioned earlier in Chapter One, which required that the researcher approach human or human-related resources to answer these questions. Newman and Benz (1998) emphasize that research questions should determine what research methods are used. Glossner (1990) believes that “[the] richness and complexity of students’ attitudes toward learning might be better understood through qualitative research techniques than quantitative research techniques” (p. 16). Glossner further states that quantitative research often renders static scales, whereas qualitative research can yield dynamic personal attitudes.

I aim at providing a holistic picture of the students’ beliefs and attitudes about their experiences while engaging in a course that is based on the reading-writing connection and reading models as two major goals of the course (see course design in appendix E). Thus, the use of qualitative research in this study was appropriate since it took place in a natural setting and depended on data collection methods that were based on words rather than on numbers. These methods are interviews, observation, and documents (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).
This study sought to gain in-depth insights about the research questions, which eventually entailed that the use of qualitative methods was the best for this study. Patton (1990) considers thick description in qualitative research as an advantage because the emphasis is on people, events, and texts. Similarly, Gay (1996) states that qualitative methods go beyond just mere descriptions of events and provide in-depth understanding of the situation being studied. In his words:

Qualitative researchers are not just concerned with describing the way things are, but also with gaining insights into how things got to be the way they are, how people feel about the way things are, what they believe, what meanings they attach to various activities, and so forth. (p. 13)

This study aims at describing as much as possible of what was happening when students engaged in the activities being studied, so that any implications or recommendations were amply rooted in the findings of the study. Therefore, this study needed to take place in a natural setting. Lincoln and Guba (1985) assert that:

Naturalistic inquiry demands a natural setting, we should not be understood as making a play on the word “natural,” nor of espousing philosophic naturalism, nor of equating the natural with good, nor of regressing to the prepositivist position ... Rather, we suggest that inquiry must be carried out in a “natural” setting because phenomena of study . . . take their meaning as much from their contexts as they do from themselves. (p. 189)

Actually, the present study conformed to Silverman’s (1993) call for the need to utilize a “natural” setting. I depended heavily on natural resources to collect data that help give valid descriptions of the activities being studied and reliable answers to the research questions. I conducted the study in connection with a real classroom during a regular academic term, and with students taking the writing course as a
requirement, which did not in any way obligate them to participate in this study. Unlike the artificial and constrained settings utilized in quantitative research that influence behavior (Marshall & Rossman, 1989), the present study focused on student attitudes toward authentic activities in an authentic classroom involving the writing experiences of ESL students.

In the following sections, I provide a brief discussion of the research methods. These sections include the setting of the study, the course design, the participants and the concept of purposive sampling. Following these sections, I discuss the research methods in detail.

**Setting of the Study**

This study was conducted at a university located in Western Pennsylvania. Specifically, the study took place in the Department of English. The English Department offers a number of 101 college writing sections. Two of them are ESL sections. These courses are offered for students who need to develop their writing ability in order to meet academic requirements. This course is normally taken the first semester. In the course, students work to develop their own writing style as they use readings to examine and discuss semantic and linguistic features of texts and rhetorical structures.

I first contacted the instructor of the class and asked her for permission to observe her class and ask the students to volunteer in this study. The instructor gave her full permission for me to attend the class at any time. She also provided me with the syllabus for the course. Since the design of the course is an important factor in my study, I will review the syllabus in some detail here.
The Course Design

The class met twice a week throughout a four-month semester. The course was based on the thinking-writing process by emphasizing the reading-writing connection. In this course, the instructor provided an understanding of the reading-writing relationship. She also provided models of reading texts, and engaged students in analyzing and editing class papers, group discussion and peer review, and writing for specific audiences. The course depended on giving students opportunities to read from different topics.

Students were required to complete assigned readings before each class meets. They were also required to write five papers in five different modes and to prepare drafts of their papers and post them on the "WebCT" online bulletin board. Each student was required to read and respond to two students’ papers on the bulletin board (for more details, see the copy of the syllabus in appendix C).

Participants

The participants in this study were ESL undergraduate students enrolled in the composition course (ESL 101 college writing) discussed in the previous section. International undergraduate students at this university are required to take ESL 101 college writing. The participants were simultaneously taking other courses to satisfy university requirements and the needs of their majors. More demographic information about the participants and their majors are provided next. The information was taken from the study site and with the participants’ consent.

The students enrolled in ESL 101 college writing were asked to voluntarily participate in this study, which aims at describing their beliefs, attitudes, and experiences related to the use of readings and rhetorical discussion in their writing course.
**Purposive Sampling**

The number of students enrolled in each ESL 101 class usually ranges from 18 to 25. I asked all the students taking this class to voluntarily participate in this study. Although the participants represented different cultural backgrounds, the purpose of this study was not to generalize the findings. It mainly focuses on describing their experiences throughout this writing course, which was based on the reading-writing connection and which uses reading models. The study focuses on providing an appropriately thick description in the context described above.

According to Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993), the researcher’s main goal is to obtain purposive and directed sampling that renders a large amount of information. They also mention two essential criterions for purposive sampling: selection of who and what to study, and choosing who and what not to study. In my study, I have decided to select the participants taking this course, since they can best help answer my research questions. I also decided not to investigate the teachers’ views about the course, because the emphasis of the study is on the students’ beliefs and attitudes. However, the instructor's approach was one that uses explicit instruction linking the readings to writing skills. Merriam (1988) emphasizes this issue of selecting participants who “can express thoughts’ feelings, opinions . . . on the topic being studied” (p. 76).

Additionally, I decided not to investigate the connection between reading and listening, for instance, as this investigation will not provide relative information to answer my research questions about the students' beliefs and attitudes of reading-to-write. Finally, I did not contact students who had taken this course in previous terms because they followed a different syllabus, and it cannot be ascertained that such students experienced instruction that focused on the reading-writing relationship.
Background Information

The participants were all students who had just arrived in the United States and enrolled in their undergraduate studies. Due to the results of their writing placement tests, the participants were placed in an ESL section of the college writing course required for all students. This course aims at developing their writing ability to meet the requirements of their academic course of study. Although the participants came from different background countries, they shared similar background information about their L2 learning experiences, in general, and about their writing experiences, in particular. This section highlights the participants' background information based on the first interview.

The participants' ages ranged from 19 to 23. They had all come to the US for the first time. They arrived two weeks before school started. Seven participants had just finished high school in their countries before coming to the U.S. Three had taken one or two courses in college before arriving in the US. One participant had been in the States since the fifth grade. All but this one participant had started learning English in intermediate school where English was not the instructional language. Their English learning experiences were limited to school. The English courses in intermediate and high school were confined to basic language skills, such as spelling and grammar. Their L2 reading experiences were also very much limited to school. They read simple books and the classes on these readings were centered on grammar. They did not have any writing experiences except for school requirements, which were limited to completing exercises or doing homework, again largely focused on grammar. The participants' free reading activities varied from one hour a week to a few hours (see Table 1 below).
Eight participants (Fatimah, Taiki, Hafiz, Jefri, Radziah, Arif, Weng Hong, and Ji Sung) had taken one or two college English writing courses before coming to the US. These courses did not include any type of reading. Additionally, most of the readings they had done in other college courses was limited to their majors and did not reflect style expected in academic essays. Two participants (Hiroshi & Nadia) had started their college studies in the US. Their writing experiences were limited to writing different kinds of letters or pieces of paragraphs. They took private English courses after high school. None of these courses included writing; they were mainly language courses that focused on grammar and listening. Only one participant (Kim Yun) had taken writing courses in American schools starting from the fifth grade.

All the participants were enrolled in departments other than English in the US. This course, ESL College Writing, was their first and only language course. Table one shows some background information about the participants:

Table 1- Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Age &amp; Gender</th>
<th>Home Country</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>College Writing Courses</th>
<th>Free L2 Reading Hours per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>19/F</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatimah</td>
<td>21/F</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Dietetics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiki</td>
<td>20/M</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafiz</td>
<td>20/M</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weng Hong</td>
<td>22/M</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Yun</td>
<td>20/F</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefri</td>
<td>21/M</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection Methods

Research Tasks

The participants of this study performed the normal tasks required by the instructor of the class. The students were not asked to perform any additional writing tasks for the study. As a researcher, I took a passive role with regards to the planning and conduct of classroom activities. My main concern was to collect data through observing the class, conducting interviews, and collecting writing samples from the regular assigned pieces for the course. I did not observe any activity that was not related to the study’s purpose. In other words, the main emphasis was on reading-to-write related activities.

Research Methods

In this study, I used a number of qualitative research methods. These methods included interviews, observations, and document analysis. Tape recording is used for the interviews. These multiple methods of data collection were interactively used to obtain an optimum amount of information local to the context of the study. Denizn (1997) reflects on his use of interactive resources of data collection for a study of self-perceived identity among alcoholics:

I weave life stories of self throughout my analysis, presenting alcoholics to the readers as they present themselves to fellow alcoholics. I also combine, in a variety of triangulated forms, a multiplicity of materials and methods.
including interviewing, observation, participation, archival analysis, textual criticism, semiotics, and the study of fictional and autobiographical accounts of alcoholism. (cited in Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen, 1993, p. 24)

**Interviews**

I approached interviews with the participants according to Dexter’s definition (1970) of the interviews as “a conversation with a purpose” (as cited in Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 268). The purpose of the interview was to gather information from human sources. Maxwell (1996) asserts the value of interviews as they allow the interviewer and the interviewees to work back and forth, reconstruct the past, analyze the present, and predict the future.

Since this study was conducted to investigate the students’ beliefs and attitudes about reading-to-write, interviewing can be one of the best ways to know about the participant’s feelings and thoughts, as Patton (1990) puts it:

> We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe

> . . . we cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions. We cannot observe behavior that took place at some previous point in time . . . we have to ask people questions about these things. The purpose of interviewing then is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective. (p. 195)

I used two types of interviews: individual interviews and focus group interviews. On one hand, the purpose of the individual interviews was to gather the participants’ personal feelings and attitudes about the research questions of the study. The purpose of the group interviews, on the other hand, was to explore the participants’ general experience and feelings regarding the issues at hand, and to gather information and to stimulate discussion in ways that went beyond the
individual interview. I believe that the combination of two kinds of interviews allowed for more in-depth exploration of beliefs and attitudes. Also, I believe that the use of two methods is likely to avoid the problem of using a single method, and thus it is likely to strengthen the validity of the study. The interviews were divided into four types: one unstructured interview, two semistructured interviews, mid-term interviews, and group focus interviews.

Unstructured interviews. To gain the participants’ trust in this meeting, I introduced myself and the purpose of study. I also explained to them the value of their participation to the academic research represented in this study. Additionally, I explained what they would be asked to do if they choose to participate in the complete study. I began unstructured interviews with questions about demographic information. My purpose in this introductory conversation was just to break the ice, introduce myself to the participants in a friendly way, and generally present my work with them. After that, because this is an unstructured interview, I suggested a topic or a question and gave the participants the opportunity to freely express their feelings about it. For example, I asked them to talk about what literacy meant to them. The overall goal of this interview was to gain some information about the participants’ demographic educational backgrounds and to establish a comfortable atmosphere for the semistructured interviews that took place the second time I met with the participants. The unstructured interviews lasted for about 20-30 minutes and were held in one of the graduate study carrels that I reserved. These carrels are available to graduate students throughout the whole academic year. Since this study sought to explore if there were any changes in the participants’ beliefs and attitudes about the reading-writing relationship as a result of the course, I conducted two semistructured interviews, one as the course started and one at the end of the course.
Semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews were the main focus for gathering information relative to the research questions. Contrary to the unstructured interview, the semistructured interview was more organized in that I prepared a set of preplanned questions that helped obtain in-depth information about the main research questions. Although I asked some questions for two unstructured interviews in order to obtain comparable data (Gay, 1996), I reviewed these questions between interviews for any emergent change, addition, editing, or elimination depending on the previous interviews. The interview questions moved from broader issues to more specific issues as the interviews progressed. I gave the interviewees the chance to talk freely, because as Lincoln and Guba point out, “the interviewer rarely learns anything when he or she is talking” (p. 270). Fetterman (1989) provides a view that is similar to Lincoln’s and Guba’s. He states that in this context the interviewee is more expert than the interviewer, who should only focus on obtaining the fullest description from the interviewee’s relevant constructions of reality (cited in Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993).

The interviews covered eight areas. These areas reflected the research questions of this study. Each group contained a set of questions that aimed at providing in-depth information about the issue being discussed with the participants. Students’ responses to these questions represented the data sought from the interviews. The purpose of this technique was to make it insightful for the study to reasonably guide the interviews and arrange the questions under a specific topic. Also, this technique helped me guide the data analysis. These categories are the following, assigned under the research question as headings:
• Students’ perceptions about their experiences about previous reading-writing relationships
• Students’ beliefs about the reading-writing relationships at the beginning of the course
• Students’ accounts of their strategies for relating their reading texts to their writing
• Students’ beliefs and attitudes about text organizations and rhetorical structures
• Students’ opinions about the difficulty of linking texts to their writing
• Students’ awareness about the reading-writing relationship for the future
• Students’ awareness of the reader-writer connection.
• Students’ beliefs about the reading-writing relationship at the end of the course.

Each group contained a set of questions. These questions are presented in detail in Appendixes A, B, and C. The two unstructured interviews addressed somewhat similar questions regarding the students’ beliefs and attitudes at the beginning and at the end of the course. However, the second one was longer, as it contained emergent questions related to their experiences and feelings about the course and its reading-writing-activities. In addition, I modified some the questions so that they addressed the students' beliefs and experiences at the end of the course. For example, a question like “What do you expect from the reading in this course towards your writing?” was replaced by “How did the readings used in the course meet your expectations toward your writing? Explain?” I eliminated any repetitive questions that do not provide additional information.
As suggested by Silverman (1993), the questions of the semistructured interviews were open-ended so that the participants had the chance to freely express their feelings. Sometimes I asked yes-no questions, as it was unacceptable to assume that the participants had encountered a particular experience. However, whenever I asked a yes-no question, I would seek more information from the participants by asking them to explain or elaborate on their responses. At the end of each interview, I wrapped up with a general question, “is there anything else you would like to add?”

Appendix A contains the interview questions of the research. The two semistructured interviews lasted at least 22-30 minutes. If this time was not enough, the interviews ran longer, depending on the participants’ willingness to talk and the issues they brought to the discussion. Again, these interviews were held in one of the graduate study carrels. For any contingency, I had access to the graduate study room that is available at any time during the library hours.

At the middle of the course, and before the second semistructured interviews, I conducted mid-term interviews. The next section discusses the purpose of this interview and its significance to the research.

*Mid-Term Interviews*

During the study, I conducted interviews at the middle of the course. The purpose of these interviews was limited to gathering specific information about the students’ current feelings, experiences while they were engaged in the course. The questions that I asked the students were about how they were doing so far with the course and what issues were on their minds regarding their experiences. Conducting mid-term interviews, I speculated that the participants would be able to provide reliable information and recall events accurately. I also believed that information
elicited from students during these interviews would help me triangulate my data with later interviews.

The questions focused on the students’ ongoing experiences and the processes connected with the reading-writing connection. The purpose of this interview was to record the students’ feelings, as they might go through different perceptions in the course of the term. The questions varied from open-ended questions to semistructured questions. For example, an open-ended question was “describe how the course is going so far.” For instance, I asked each student if he or she had tried to write in a similar way to what he or she had found in his or her readings, whether or not he or she was experiencing any kind of problems using readings within his or her writings with reading-to-write, and where he or she thought his or her writing had improved due to reading. At the end of the course, I conducted a group focus interview, in which I acted as a moderator. The purpose of this final meeting was to note common concerns and final thoughts regarding their beliefs and attitudes or any other issue they wanted to add. More information about this meeting is provided below.

Focus Group Interviews

The researcher dealt with the focus group interview as recommended by Bers (1987) who defines such interviewing as “a qualitative research technique in which a small number of respondents – generally eight to ten – and a moderator participate in an unstructured group discussion about selected subjects” (p. 19). My method of selecting focus group students depended mainly on the individual interviews. The focus group interview added weight to the other methods, helping to triangulate my data. I speculated that the students’ responses taken from the focus group interviews would verify and expand on data elicited from individual interviews. In Morgan’s
words, (1988), “focus groups are especially valuable in combination with other techniques” (p. 39).

I did not expect all the students participating in the individual interviews to participate in the focus group interview. According to Morgan (1988), 6 to 10 respondents are sufficient for the purpose of a focus group. As suggested by Moxley (1986), I selected the students who seemed to be talkative and willing to share information. I intended to select participants whose responses to the individual interviews might represent drastically different opinions, in order to promote group interaction. However, it was evident from the participants' responses that they reported somewhat similar experiences. Yet, the focus group rendered significant findings. More information about the focus group is provided in Chapter Five.

As mentioned above, the purpose of the focus group interview was to gain overall responses to the research questions. Therefore, I followed Mishler’s (1986) advice that I use the same prompts from the original interviews. However, my focus was not on how the individual students answered the assigned questions because, at that time, I had already interviewed them individually and gained their responses. Rather, my focus was on how students might respond to each other. Questions took the form of, “Do you agree with what he/she is saying?” “Did you have the same experience?” and ”Does anyone want to add something?"

I met with the students for the focus group interview after the third interview. I contacted the students who were willing to participate in the focus group interviews ahead of time so that I could be sure who would and who would not participate. Also, this early contact helped me arrange a time that did not conflict with their schedules; therefore, they felt comfortable when conducting the focus group interview. I invited them to dinner in a nearby restaurant, and after dinner we started our group. Engaging
in an activity such as dinner before the group interview helped establish a friendly and warm atmosphere in which participants were motivated to participate openly.

**Interview Techniques**

Interviewing represented an important source of data collection in my study; therefore, I adopted any good technique that was legitimate to assist me in gaining the maximum information necessary to answer the research questions. Thus, I used a number of techniques that were appropriate to my study.

Most of the techniques that I used were highly recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985); Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993); and Merriam and Simpson (1984). One of these techniques refers to the preparation of the interview. They assert that the preparation includes both the interviewer and the interviewees. For example, I reviewed the questions ahead of time, practiced the interview to help me develop an appropriate role as an interviewer, confirmed the time and the place with the respondent, and the like. As I was available on campus where the class was held, I let the respondents decide the time and the place that was convenient for them to conduct the interviews.

One technique that I used related to the time interval between the interviews. Since the students were available throughout the course, I scheduled each set of interviews over a range of days. This helped me process the interviews, listen to the tape recordings, roughly transcribe the tapes when possible, and eventually “shape the next day’s interview questions” on the basis of the responses received so far (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 272). Detailed information about transcription and data analysis of interviews is provided later in this chapter.
Also, I used probes—unplanned questions resulting from the interaction between the interviewer and the interviewees. These probes usually are not prepared ahead of time. Lincoln and Guba explain more about probes:

The skilled interviewer is adept in the use of probes-directed cues for more or extended information. Probes may take the form of silence, “pumps”- sounds such as “uh huh” or “umm”...simple calls for more (“Could you tell more about that?”); calls for examples...or simply questions specifically formulated by the interviewer to embellish or extend something the respondent has said.

(p. 271)

Although I had a set of prepared questions for the semistructured interviews, I was flexible to modifications that emerged in the course of the interviews. This was a reaction to Gay (1996) who recommends that interviewers should go beyond the scope of the researcher’s assigned questions. He emphasizes that the researcher should explore the participants’ beliefs and not just be limited to already prepared questions.

Finally, I tried not to overload the respondents with many repetitive questions. There are times when the interviewer needs to terminate the interview. For example, when some questions caused fatigue or redundancy, I closed the interview. Following Merriam and Simpson’ technique, when I terminated any interview, I summarized what had already been said (1984).

Tape Recording

I used audio taping during the interviews. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), data recording ensures fidelity. By “fidelity,” they refer to the ability of the researcher to reproduce the data previously obtained as they become important in providing insights. Gay (1996) agrees on this point: “we do not have to worry that we
have missed something” (p. 218). Erlandson et al. (1993) add that tape recording of data helps the researcher listen to the interviews and improve his or her strategies in dealing with the research questions.

However, experts all admit that tape recording is threatening to the respondents as they become self-conscious because of these devices. Therefore, I gave this issue my ultimate attention, as it represented a threat to my data collection. I used several techniques that helped me overcome this problem. For example, I used the tape recorder in my first unstructured interviews as a way to get the participants comfortable with its presence before conducting the semistructured interviews. Additionally, I ensured the respondents’ anonymity. For example, I did not record them when they talked about their personal identities. Finally, I used interview technologies that maximized accuracy and at the same time minimized self-consciousness. These are described in the next paragraph.

I used a multidirectional microphone. I understand the advantage of using a lavaliere microphone, with its dual cable that can be attached to both the interviewer and the interviewee, thus recording both voices. However, I believe that this device has a major disadvantage in that it may maximize the level of formality of the interview and thus increase the self-consciousness of the respondents. For this reason, I used a multidirectional microphone, sometimes called a table microphone. This microphone is sensitive enough and technically able to pick up more than one voice close to it. It was hooked up to the tape recorder that I used.

The tape recorder that I used was SONY TCS100DV CASS REC W/STEREO SND. This is a professional device. I put the tape recorder on a pad to prevent the recording of extraneous noise. This tape recorder has four features:
• Battery-level indicator to ensure the battery will not fail.
• Record level meter to ensure the tape recording is picking up the sound.
• Digital tape counter to monitor the duration of interviews.
• Cord for connection to wall socket as back up in the event of power loss.

I had another less feature-rich tape recorder present as a backup. In both of the tape recorders, I used C-60 (thirty minutes per side) cassette tapes. I did not use the C-120 (two hours) tapes because, from experience, I have learned they tend to stretch and break more easily. For any malfunction contingency, I had extra batteries and cassettes. Below are some guidelines that I took into consideration when tape recording.

• Using a separate tape for every interview.
• Punching out the tabs on the back of the cassette after the interview to protect any accidental recording over the original session.
• Storing tapes in a cool and dry place.
• Putting tapes back in their boxes after use.

I also used a “transcriber” machine to play back the tapes for transcriptions. From his experience, Al-Kahtani (2001) mentions that audiotapes may wear out due to the constant rewinding and forwarding processes. A transcriber machine slows the play of the tapes and thus allows the researcher to transcribe the interviews without repetitive rewinding. The transcriber that I used was the SONY Microcassette Transcribing Machine, Part #: m-2000.

Observation

Observation was the second source that I used for my data collection. Schwandt (1997) defines observation as “directed firsthand eye-witness accounts of everyday social action” (p. 106). Due to the nature of my study, observation was a
powerful way to provide data relevant to my research questions. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985):

Observation . . . maximizes the inquirer’s ability to grasp motives, beliefs, concerns, interest, unconscious behavior, custom, and the like; observation ...allows the inquirer to see the world as his subjects see it, to live in their time frames, to capture the phenomenon in and on its own terms, and to grasp the culture in its own natural, ongoing environment. (p. 273)

Contemporary methods include two types of observations: participatory observation and nonparticipatory observation. I took a nonparticipant role in this study. In other words, I took a passive role as I entered the class and observed the students. My purpose in choosing this method was two-fold: (1) I wanted to collect data that can not be gained except through observation; and (2) I wanted to triangulate my findings with the other methods used in this study. Lincoln and Guba prefer that observation be in “natural” settings as opposed to “contrived” settings. Therefore, I conducted my observations inside the classrooms. The principle of purposive sampling of my study was applied to my observations as well as to the interviews. In other words, in order to gain more in-depth information I observed only the participants of my study, those who were interviewed.

Observation in the study took two forms: (1) observing individual students when engaging in reading-writing tasks; and (2) observing the class in general and any salient incidents that came up in the classroom. Speculating that some students enrolled in the class might not participate in the study, I believe that videotaping might cause some ethical problems especially that the participants represent different cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, videotaping is likely to affect the students’ behavior due to their sensitivity toward the camera; thus it may affect the natural
setting of the study. Lincoln and Guba (1985) assert that videotaping might minimize the observer’s chances to take notes, as he or she is busy with videotaping or with camera-related problems. Therefore, they recommend other modes of recording other than videotaping, such as field notes. Note taking will be discussed later in this section.

I followed the checklist for observational elements that Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993) have provided. These elements are:

- The setting: This includes the physical environment of the ESL writing classroom, the context, and the behavior associated with writing tasks in the particular setting.
- The participants: This includes a description of who is the contextual site of the study, how many people, and their roles.
- Activities and interactions: This includes a description of what is going on in the writing classroom and how the activities are performed sequentially.
- Frequency and duration: This refers to the frequency of the observed activities that seem to relate to the reading-to-write issue.
- Subtle factors: These are less obvious but important to the observation. They include: informal and unplanned activities, symbolic connotative meaning of words, nonverbal communication, and unobtrusive measures.

Having the advantage of being present regularly, I utilized this advantage in any way that helped me observe naturalistic behaviors. For instance, in my first observation, I just documented general information about the class, such as the setting, equipment, number of students, and so on. At this stage, I was intending to
establish trustworthiness with the class members. Also, I took a passive role in the first classes I observed and made no attempt to gather data until several classes after the students and I became acquainted.

To ensure insightful observations, I followed some tips. First, I placed my seat at any angle that enabled me to observe the whole class. Second, I acted as a researcher but not as a detective. In other words, I did not take excessive notes in a way that might be disturbing to the participants. Third, I was as spontaneous as possible, yet attending to important and less important events. Fourth, I wore very informal clothes that did not attract attention. Finally, I attended the classes from the very beginning, sometimes arriving before the instructor; therefore, I had a chance to chat with them and help them feel comfortable with my presence.

Field notes. In addition to audiotaping, I utilized field notes as an instrument. Note-taking is a powerful technique that serves as an “information catcher.” Although the scene was audiotaped, note-taking was used to capture any idea that accounted for what was heard or what was seen. Instant and simultaneous recording of the phenomenon occurring at the time of data collection helped me not to depend merely on inference when analyzing the data. In other words, it is much easier and more accurate to account for any event at the time of its occurrence because the researcher can witness and document as many factors as possible. Thus, any delay in taking such notes might lead to inferences which are subject to bias. As Rubin and Rubin (1995) observe, note-taking “[is] extremely helpful as a clue to what kind of material is likely to be missing [and], as a warning of where bias may enter the analysis” (p. 120).
Lincoln and Guba (1985) mention several advantages of using field notes. Field notes:

- Are non-threatening to respondents.
- Keep the investigator alert and responsive.
- Avoid technical problems and provide easy access to data.
- Allow the researcher to record his or her own thoughts.

I used field notes during the interviews and the observation. Although the purpose of this study was to investigate the participants’ beliefs and attitudes about reading-to-write, I jotted down any idea that came to mind as a result of comments by the participants. This helped me find similarities and differences with data collected in the interviews and the observations.

Document Analysis

Best and Kahn (1993) consider documents to be significant sources for data collection that yield insightful information, helping to explain educational practices. Although I used interviews and observation as major sources for my data, document analysis, too, represented an insightful source of data for this study. My study partially, but crucially, relied on the participants’ pieces of writing that I collected at the onset of the course and at its conclusion. Erlandson et al. (1993) claim that documents include anything in existence before and during the investigation. As I mentioned in connection with observation, my purposes in using documents were multiple. I sought to gain more information that helped me establish my theory regarding the participants’ beliefs and attitudes about reading-to-write. I also sought to triangulate my findings with those resulting from the interviews and the observations. In other words, the samples that were collected served as backups for the interviews. Specifically, I used the students’ written samples to determine if they
paralleled or diverged from their interview responses. Finally, the samples were compared to what the students read and discussed.

All the writing samples that I used were limited to the site of the study. This helped me gain more in-depth information about the local situation with regard to the shaping influences that existed during the study. Particularly, the samples that I collected referred to the participants’ compositions that they wrote for the class. Furthermore, I examined the texts that the participants were required to read for the class.

I asked the participants to provide me with their documents when I saw them in the preliminary unstructured interviews. I assured the participants that these documents would remain confidential and the purpose of having them was just to carry out this research.

Data Analysis

Data analysis can be defined as the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the accumulating data (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The function of data analysis is to organize data in order to make sense of the great amount of information. Data analysis begins the first day the researcher starts his study (Erlandson at al., 1993). Therefore, Maxwell (1996) warns researchers against delaying transcribing data. He considers delay of data analysis as an act that might complicate manipulation and interpretation of data. He writes, “One of the commonest problems in qualitative research is letting your unanalyzed field-notes and transcripts pile up” (p. 77). In dealing with data, I followed the same strategy that I used with field-notes—instant documenting of events. In other words, I worked with the data obtained from the interviews immediately after I finished with each one. As I mentioned earlier, when starting the interviews, I had only one or two interviews per day; therefore, I managed
to analyze or at least listen to the interviews on the same day. Instantly dealing with data enabled me to do member checking (testing data with participants from whom data were obtained) with the participants before time elapsed, when they might not recall and elaborate on their responses. Additionally, this helped me reshape my next interviews and questions as I listened to the current interviews.

The transcribed data were saved in Word documents. I created separate folders for each interview. Each folder contained nine documents, which represented the interview areas. I named each document in a way that identified its area, taking into consideration that each document’s name included the participants’ pseudonym in order to refer to any participant's interview when needed. The interview documents were coded and categorized into different units according to the students’ beliefs and attitudes concerning the same major trends, concepts, and themes emerging from the data (see data coding procedures blow). More information about the mechanism of data coding are provided later in this chapter.

Following Maxwell’s (1996) recommendation, I transcribed interviews the same day that they took place. The transcription was totally literal (verbatim transcription). Although transcribing was an overwhelming task, listening to the interviews and transcribing them soon familiarized me with data presented in the interviews. Immediate data analysis helped me recall ambiguous segments or check back with the students for any verification when listening to the interviews. Also, such instantaneous work with data helped me minimize the chances of inferences and predictions which might not be accurate. This stage of data analysis did not necessarily include categorization of data. Rather, my goal here was to make sure that all data obtained from the students were understandable and clear before the students finished their course, since at that time I may not have been able to meet them due to
any contingency. Another goal of immediate transcribing of interviews related to the critical and analytical thinking that I came up with when listening and transcribing. I dealt with this by means of taking memos while transcribing. “Memos not only capture your analytical thinking about your data, they facilitate such thinking” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 78). I divided memos into two types: memos for me to use when analyzing the data and conducting future interviews, and memos to discuss with the participants for any verification and checking.

Data Coding Procedures

Taylor and Bogdan (1984) define coding as a systematic way used to develop and refine interpretations of data. As a qualitative inquirer, I could not predict the outcome trends or themes in this study before analyzing the data. Therefore, I was subjected to the data emerging from participants to build my categories. Merriam (1988) believes that data analysis includes three processes. She writes, “The analysis of qualitative data range from organizing a narrative description of the phenomenon, to constructing categories or themes that cut across the data, to building theory” (p. 196). Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest similar processes of data analysis. They propose that data analysis consist of three activities: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. The idea of data coding is to break data down into discrete pieces of insightful information. My data coding followed a set of steps as follows:

Unitizing

Unitizing is the process of reducing large information into small pieces as units. I wrote down these units on separate cards. This step in data coding served as a foundation for my subsequent processes. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), units are heuristic and interpretable. In other words, I made sure that the units
contained incidents relative to the study and that each unit represented a small piece of information that stood by itself. Furthermore, I made sure that the information was comprehensible to outside readers. These units were taken from interviews, observations (field-notes), written samples, memos, and any other emerging sources of information, such as follow-ups. The units that I came up with were saved in documents and were taken into the next step, categorization.

**Categorizing**

This phase of data processing represented my second step. I carefully read through the units and brought together ones with similar content. This process went through subprocesses, which are described below:

- The first unit resulting from unitizing represented my first category, although it was not named yet.
- The second unit went along with the first unit if it matched its content; if not, it represented another category, not named yet.
- This process proceeded accordingly with all units.
- If a unit did not fit any of the established categories, it went to a category named “miscellaneous.”
- Accumulated cards were named and put into a propositional statement according to their properties in order to do a rule for inclusion and exclusion.
- The units of each accumulated category were reviewed again to justify their inclusion on the basis of the rule.
- Units in the miscellaneous category were be reviewed to see if they fit into any category on the basis of the rule of the categories and not on the basis of matching the units therein.
• All units, rules, and categories were reviewed for overlap and to assure that nothing had been left aside.

From my experiences in conducting research studies, I understand that the process of coding is complex. Therefore, I gave it my utmost attention as it decided the essence of my study. I endeavored to use any valuable advice, recommendations, or suggestions from either my inquiry auditors or experts in the field of qualitative research. For example, I took Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) advice into account: making categories unambiguous. They observe, “categorization can be accomplished most cleanly when the categories are defined in such a way that they are internally as homogenous as possible and externally as heterogeneous as possible” (p. 349). So far, this research has shows that it had employed a number of research methods and techniques that added to the research’s strength. Below, I discuss some issues related the validity of the study.

Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim that four criteria account for trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry: “credibility,” “transferability,” “dependability,” and “confirmability.” (p. 43). According to Lincoln and Guba, three activities increase the production of validity and credibility: prolonged engagement, persistent observation, and triangulation. Firstly, this study utilized these three activities. In particular, I was concerned with prolonged engagement to gain trust during data collection inside and outside of the classroom. This was possible due to my regular presence on campus, where the class was held. Secondly, my regular presence helped me conduct persistent observations to detect less salient issues besides the salient influences. For example, conducting numerous observations enabled me to notice such incidents that were noticed from one visit or two. Thirdly, this study used triangulation, allowing me to
verify data through multiple methods of data collection. As Marshall and Rossman (1989) put it, “triangulation is the act of bringing more than one source of data to bear on a single point” (p. 146).

Transferability refers to the degree to which the results of qualitative research can be transferred to other contexts or settings. Lincoln and Guba (1985) believe that transferability is “in a strict sense, impossible” (p. 316). I realize that the purpose of this study is not to generalize findings. However, following Marshall and Rossman’s advice regarding transferability, I depended heavily on providing a thick description of the research context that enhanced transferability. Yet, it is the responsibility of the person dealing with the results of this study to be sensitive to the differences between this particular setting and any other.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), establishing dependability is a result of establishing credibility. They write, “If it is possible using the techniques . . . in relation to credibility . . . it ought not to be necessary to demonstrate dependability separately” (p. 317). Therefore, this research employed “overlap methods” of triangulation as a technique that increased validity and credibility. Also, I followed Lincoln and Guba’s technique of “inquiry audit,” according to which I made sure that the process of my study observe this technique. To apply this technique, I consulted my advisor, who is an expert in the field of second language research, to examine the process of the inquiry, the product, the findings, and the interpretation. I also checked with members of a committee. Furthermore, I assured that the recommendations and implications raised by this study were supported by the data collected. Marshall and Rossman state that these processes also establish the confirmability issue.

Although these four criteria were included in this study, Maxwell (1996) further notes that there are factors that threaten validity. These factors include:
description, bias, interpretation, and reactivity. The next section will discuss these factors.

Description

This study is based on my description of the incidents that took place during the study. Therefore, the description can be a major threat to the validity of the study as some data might not be accurate or complete, which might hinder me from providing a valid description. Therefore, I dealt with this threat by audiotaping all interviews. Paraphrasing Gay (1996), recording interviews allows the researcher to get a full record of what goes on. Convinced of this assertion, I used two tape recorders. As pointed out earlier, a sensitive microphone was used to ensure the quality of the sound. In addition to audiotaping, verbatim transcription was maintained to ensure completeness of data. As I mentioned throughout this chapter, I was available at the study site, which allowed me to contact the participants for any verification of information. The participants were contacted ahead of time and were interviewed at their convenience.

In my observation, I was exclusively limited to observe what took place with regards to the purpose of the study. I provided a thick description of whatever seemed relative to my research questions. The purpose of this thick description was to ensure verisimilitude which is so crucial to the validity of qualitative research (Denzin, 1997). Stake (1994) emphasizes that verisimilitude in qualitative research implies that the reader “comes to know things told, as if he or she had experienced them” (p. 240). As stated earlier in this chapter, my description was mainly based on the participants’ responses from the interviews. Thus the possibility of distortion is minimized.
Bias

The issue of bias in qualitative research is an important one and requires special attention. I decided to conduct this study for one major reason: interest. I have learnt English in an environment where it is not spoken as the first language. Since I started learning English, I was pushed by my desire to develop my proficiency, especially in my writing. I have noticed that reading and writing were treated as totally separate from one another. Perhaps worse, the concept of the reading-writing connection was absolutely absent in my school. I have gained interest in this topic only since I started my MA degree. Literature shows that this issue has received considerable attention from researchers, book designers, and educators. Therefore, I decided to take a step further; I investigated this issue and gathered students' opinions about it.

This short account of my beliefs and attitudes about this topic revealed my bias toward the study. Maxwell (1996) states that it is impossible to eliminate these preconceived values. The aforementioned documentation of my bias is essential for two reasons: the first reason refers to Mellon’s (1990) statement. He states, “Naturalistic researchers systematically acknowledge and document their biases rather than striving to rise above them” (p. 26). The second one refers to what Brown (1996) calls self discovery, where a researcher learns from his or her experience. Therefore, I hoped to gain great insights from this study regardless of its conclusion. Maxwell (1996) emphasizes that bias be viewed as background knowledge that should not affect research. Rather, researchers should exploit the knowledge they gain from research in order to improve their practices.

Having enthusiasm and beliefs about the importance of the reading-writing relationship, I realized that I should juxtapose this enthusiasm and belief to others’
beliefs and attitudes while conducting this study. In this study, I juxtaposed my attitudes with the participants' attitudes and experiences. This juxtaposition enhanced my knowledge about this issue, as some studies show the reading-writing relationship is not absolute. In other words, some studies have shown a connection between reading and writing; other studies failed to find this link. As a researcher, I was open to either conclusion. Finally, I realized that I was not totally involved in the classroom where the study took place, nor was I evaluating the students, the instructor, or the program.

**Reactivity**

Maxwell (1996) defines reactivity as the influence of the researcher on the participants or the context of the study. This study was subject to this threat as participants were interviewed and thus they may have thought they were limited to the questions I asked them. To minimize the chances of this threat, I first met with the participants in unstructured interviews, where I did not collect any major data. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, this interview served as an icebreaker. Also, I told the students that I was not the expert, but they were, since they knew more than I did about their own beliefs and experiences. I assumed that, after the unstructured interviews and classroom observations, the students were familiar with me as we worked together to bring this research into existence. I made sure that I ended every interview by giving the participants the floor to express their feelings about any issue they wanted to raise.

**Interpretation**

Maxwell (1996) considers interpretation a major threat to qualitative research. This threat of interpretation happens when the researcher imposes his own view on the participants. According to Maxwell, two strategies can be used to deal with this.
First, a researcher needs to hold onto his or her vision about the issue investigated and give the participants the chance to express their feelings. In doing so, the researcher is likely to appreciate others’ views. This issue was particularly important in my agenda when conducting interviews. I truly believed that the participants knew more than I did about their own beliefs, attitudes, and experiences. Therefore, listening to them was a key to dealing with this threat, as the participants had the chance to make themselves clear and understandable so that instances of misinterpretation were minimized. Second, a researcher should include member checking in his methodology. Member checking allows the researcher to check his data with the participants. I mentioned earlier that this strategy was included in this study. I contacted the participants for this purpose whenever it was convenient for them. My instant analysis of the data helped me carry out this strategy in a way that I got useful feedback from the participants. This was explained in detail in this chapter (See Data Analysis).

Triangulation

I used a number of methods so that I maximized the validity of this study. I do not claim that the use of these methods guarantees an absolute level of validity and credibility, but they were important to minimize the threats to validity. Maxwell (1996) defines triangulation as “collecting information from a diverse range of individuals, and settings, using a variety of methods” (p. 93). This study met these criteria. Actually, I interviewed and observed a number of students, collected written samples from the students, and examined the course syllabus, the textbooks, and handouts.
Ethical Issues

As I researched, I understood that the privacy of participants must be protected, even after receiving their permission to participate in the study. This study did not pose any psychological, physical, social, or economic threats to the participants. All the participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any point. Their names were kept confidential by the use of pseudonyms. Actually, the instructor did not know who was participating in the study. Furthermore, I assured the participants that the interviews and the tape recordings were used for the sole purpose of the study. I informed students that their participation did not affect their grades in anyway. In fact, I informed them that the instructor of the class did not have any access to the data of the research. Additionally, I collected the writing samples of the students after they were graded by the instructor. Above all, the volunteer participants were asked to sign the consent form before the study started. (See the consent form in Appendix D).

This chapter discussed the methods that were used to conduct this study. The study used a number of techniques in order to arrive at insightful conclusions. I was looking forward to implementing this study and enriching empirical research. The findings of the study are discusses in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION, PARTICIPANTS' BELIEFS, BENEFITS OF
ASSIGNED READING, AND MOTIVATION

Introduction
This chapter explores the participants' beliefs, attitudes, and experiences related to the issue of reading-to-writing activities. As shown in Chapter Two, although there has been extensive research concerning the connection between reading and writing, educators need more comprehensive insights into how the use of assigned readings that include specific rhetorical structures influences the students’ beliefs and attitudes toward writing. The present study falls in this area. It attempts to answer one main research question, by exploring the impact of a writing course using assigned reading on students' beliefs and attitudes about writing. It also attempts to answer a set of secondary research questions related to their writing experiences during the course.

I contacted all the students taking 101 ESL College Writing. There were 21 students in the class. Four students dropped the course in the first two weeks; 15 students voluntarily accepted to participate in the study. Two participating students were among the four students who dropped the course, and two participants withdrew from the study after the first interview; therefore, they were excluded from the findings of the study. The total number remaining in the study were 11 students. Five out of eleven participated in a group focus interview held after the individual interviews.

The findings of this study are presented according to the three steps outlined in the design of the study, data recording, data coding, and data analysis. The findings are presented in this chapter in themes that relate to the research questions of the study and are derived from the students' responses.
Since this study mainly depends on the students' responses, direct quotations from the interviews are used to render a more vivid sense of the students' responses. If their responses are paraphrased, they are carefully handled so that the original intention and focus of the students' words remain intact.

This chapter starts a brief description of the classroom based on regular observations. It then provides a report about the participants' attitudes about writing and about the relationship between reading and writing based on their experience of this relationship during the course. Next, it provides detailed description about participants' benefits that they have gained from the course. Following the benefits, a section discusses the findings of the interviews with reference to previous research about the reading-writing connection.

Class Setting

It is the goal of this section to describe the classroom environment based on my notes and observations of the class.

The chairs in the class were set in four rows, each of which included five or six seats. The class was provided with a white board and an overhead projector used to show samples of the students' writings for text analysis and class discussion. Computers were available, and each student had his or her own computer. The students used the computers to log in to WebCT, an online environment used for purposes such as delivering materials, exchanging emails about the course, online discussion (chatting), posting assignments, peer reading, etc. In this course, the students used WebCT for four main purposes. These purposes are posting papers, peer reading, giving feedback, and checking emails from the instructor.
Class Materials

The instructor assigned three books for the class and one online-material. These are:


3. Online materials such as checklists and guidelines for assignments (see Appendix C).

*Successful College Writing* presents rhetorical structure issues supported with readings. It provides examples of rhetorical structures, structural exercises, authentic texts of articles, and examples of essays written by students. *Developmental Exercises to Accompany a Writer's Reference* combines exercises with reading passages. It contains exercises featuring the writing issues that were discussed in the class. *A Writer's Reference* was not used in the class; it was a reference for the students.

Classroom Observation

This section discusses and describes what was going on the class. I attended 90% of the classes. This enabled me to observe most of what the instructor and the students, in general, and the participants, in particular, were doing throughout the course. Hence, it has been valuable to see first-hand the situations that the participants revealed in the interviews.

This section mainly focuses on the activities related directly to the purpose of the study. It aims at describing how the class proceeded and how the reading and
writing connection was treated in the class. Other themes emerging from observation
will be discussed later in this chapter. Finally, the observation themes mentioned in
this section do not necessarily conform to the themes emerging from the interviews.
As mentioned above, the idea is to give a fuller picture of the class, as observation
represented one of the study’s methods of data collection.

This section falls into two categories: the main themes emerging from the
instructions of the teacher, and the researcher's observation of the participants' performance while carrying out activities in the class.

Teacher Instruction

Specific instruction was given on several rhetorical features of written text in the
course of the semester. These will be covered briefly each in turn here.

Thesis Statement: The instructor introduced the concept of a thesis statement to the class. She explained the role of the thesis statement in the essay. She then discussed with the class the characteristics of a good thesis statement. The teacher referred together with the students to the textbook and examined some examples of correct and incorrect thesis statements. The teacher asked the students to read these examples from an exercise in the book and comment on them. Each student read one thesis statement and demonstrated to the class its features and whether it met the criteria for an effective thesis statement.

Later, the teacher assigned the first paper, and the students were especially asked to focus on the title and the thesis statement of their essays. Then the teacher formed a circle with the students and asked everyone to tell his or her title and its thesis statement. The instructor worked with the students on developing any thesis statement that needed improvement. The whole class was engaged on this activity, in which they discussed and analyzed the elements of each thesis statement. The focus
on thesis statements was an ongoing activity that the instructor did in the class. In fact, the instructor asked the student many times about the thesis statement of the articles and the passage in the textbook and the writer's book respectively.

Cohesive Devices: In one class session, the teacher discussed some writing features related to sentence level and paragraph cohesion. She introduced the importance of cohesive devices between sentences. She then gave some examples of cohesive devices that can be used between sentences to make them communicate well. Among these devices are pronoun reference, repetition of key words, and parallel structures. The teacher used examples from the textbook articles and showed how the sentences clearly relate to each other.

Later, the teacher continued working on developing sentence level forms. She asked the students to turn to the Goor and Hacker's book and asked them to do the exercises about parallelism, and pronouns, and repetition. She instructed them to read the sentences and provide correct forms using these devices. The teacher worked as a facilitator and provided help when needed.

Sentence Errors: Throughout the course the instructor discussed some common errors that the students included in their essays. She used the overhead projector to show examples of some of the students' writings that included common errors and errors that could be seen as serious. The teacher first asked the students to browse these samples in their computers and read them silently. Then the teacher called for the students' attention to discuss the errors. Two types of errors will be discussed below to show how the teacher dealt with common errors.

Wordiness: The teacher noticed that all the students had serious problems with wordiness. She addressed this problem thoroughly, then showed them how to fix some wordiness problems occurring in their writings and change wordy examples
into concise sentences. Later, she asked the students to share papers and read for wordiness. Examples of wordiness that the teacher discussed were:

**Table 2 - Examples of Wordiness Discussed in Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wordy</th>
<th>Concise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is a fact that Adam Smith wanted to find a theory that would explain how the economic world functions.</td>
<td>Adam Smith wanted to find a theory to explain how the economic world functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam saw the market as something that was &quot;self-regulating&quot; as long as everyone left it alone.</td>
<td>Adam saw the market as &quot;self-regulating&quot; if everyone left it alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before we could rush into the kitchen at high speed, the light went out suddenly, and instantly we were in total pitch black darkness.</td>
<td>Before we could rush into the kitchen, the light went out suddenly, and instantly we were in total darkness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reason the Eskimos were forced to eat their dogs was because the caribou, on which they depended for food, migrated out of reach.</td>
<td>The Eskimos were forced to eat their dogs because the caribou, on which they depended for food, migrated out of reach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor then turned to Goor and Hacker's where many sentences contained wordy sentences. There were two types of exercises about wordiness: (1) Single sentences that contain wordiness and (2) passages that contain some wordiness instances. She asked them to read carefully, scan for wordiness, and rewrite these sentences more concisely. She then called for students and asked them to explain their suggestions. Finally, she asked them to go back to the text book and read the assigned article, again asking them to pay a special attention to wordiness.

Run-on sentence: The teacher addressed this issue many times during the course; although it reflects a traditional issue normally regarded as ‘mechanics’ of writing, I include it here since it was emphasized in class. In presenting this topic, the instructor first explained this kind of error and its impact on the sentence structure. She gave examples of run-on sentence errors from the students' writings. Later, she showed some examples from their papers where run-on sentences occurred. Later, she
worked with the students on repairing examples of run-on sentences. After this, each student was asked to read his paper and identify a run-on sentence, if any occurred, and suggest a remedy for it. Then the teacher asked the students to open their text and read a section about run-on sentences, which included passages and single sentences that contained run-on sentence errors. She discussed with them how to fix the structure of these sentences. Finally, the instructor asked the students to read articles in the text book and pay attention to the fact that the sentences in the assigned essays are free from run-on sentence errors.

Below are examples of run-on sentences that were discussed in the class.

Some of the examples were excerpts taken from the students' writings. Other were examples taken from Goor and Hacker's book

Table - 3 Examples of Run-on Sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run-on sentence</th>
<th>Remedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My grandfather has dramatic mood swings, and he was diagnosed as manic-depressive.</td>
<td>My grandfather, who has dramatic mood swings, was diagnosed as manic-depressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Chaplin was the only person who wrote anything about Joe Hill before Hill's execution, he jotted down just a few notes based on an interview with a drunken sailor</td>
<td>Ralph Chaplin was the only person who wrote anything about Joe Hill. Before Hill's execution, he jotted down just a few notes based on an interview with a drunken sailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the state hide the evidence it seemed that way.</td>
<td>Did the state hide the evidence? It seemed that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Hill was not buried in Utah he was not buried in Wyoming either.</td>
<td>Joy Hill was not buried in Utah; he was not buried in Wyoming either.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logic and Unity: The instructor spent a few classes on unity. First of all, she talked to the students about unity and its importance to writing. She emphasized that students should adhere to the topic of their essays. The teacher then demonstrated this characteristic of writing by showing an introductory paragraph to the students and discussing the elements in the paragraph that contribute to unity.
Later, the teacher provided the following paragraphs and showed how these paragraphs were related to the main paragraph. She drew the students' attention to the unity existing between the remaining paragraphs and the thesis statement mentioned in the first paragraph. Also, the teacher emphasized the importance of connection devices between paragraphs. She cited some examples of these devices used in the paragraphs. The teacher then asked the students to read the articles in chapter two of the textbook and asked them to identify the elements of unity and the connecting elements used in these readings.

Peer Reading: This was an ongoing activity during the course, in which the teacher instructed the students to log on to WebCT, read at least two or three papers and respond to them. The students were normally given 15-20 minutes. This activity occurred once every two weeks. Every time the students engaged in this activity, they were asked to read and respond to different students. The students kept reading and responding to the same assignment paper (paper 1) until they posted another assignment paper (paper 2).

The teacher asked the students to take into account the writing issues discussed in the class when responding to their peers' papers. For example, if peer reading occurred after discussing run-on sentences, students were asked to give more attention to these when reading their peers' papers. She also instructed them to provide specific feedback with examples from the papers. After receiving feedback, students were required to read their peer's feedback and work on developing their papers based on the comments they received. The teacher walked around and provided help when needed. The participants' responses and reactions to this activity will be discussed later in this section.
Discussion and Text Analysis: The class engaged in text analysis of rhetorical structures and comprehension. In this activity, the teacher worked with the students on discussing and analyzing reading. The discussion took place in two parts: discussing the content of the reading, and analyzing the rhetorical structures. The reading texts also fall into two types: authentic articles from the text book or selected essays from the students' writings. However, when the students' writing was chosen, the focus was more on the structural errors than on the content because the structural errors are more problematic than the content, as the students’ simple sentences usually contained erroneous structures.

Typically, the teacher first discussed the content of the reading and ensured that the students did not have problems with it. For this, the teacher asked comprehensive questions and called on students to hear their responses. The teacher sometimes asked the students their opinions about the title of the article, asked them about their experiences, if any, regarding the title. Finally, the teacher asked them to choose any paragraph and respond to it.

After discussing the content of the reading, the class worked on discussing and analyzing some of its rhetorical structures that related to the writing issues highlighted during the course. For example, if the article is argumentative, she might discuss the argument types used by the writers and whether they supported the writer's claim or not, as stated in the thesis statement. Additionally, she might assign different paragraphs and ask them, individually or in groups, to analyze their features and then write and argumentative paragraphs for or against what they had read.

If the paper discussed was one of the students' writings, the teacher would show it on the overhead projector and discuss it together with the students. With the students' writing, the teacher focused largely on unity and stylistic points. For
example, she noted whether every paragraph was related to the main focus of the topic of the essay or not. Regarding word choice, for instance, she, explained in one session that the word "should" is judgmental, and thus not a neutral stylistic choice.

Participants' Performance

It is worth mentioning here the students' performance while implementing the classroom activities or reacting to the teacher's instructions and questions. This section highlights the major issues concerning the participants' behavior as I observed in the classroom. This includes (1) participants' attention, (2) their reactions to peer reading, (3) and their performance with their essays.

Participants' Attention

As stated earlier, the instructor presented analyses of articles from the textbook or of the students' writings. The students' attention to this activity was notable. They all kept taking notes based on the teacher's comments about either features of rhetorical structures or about some stylistic errors from the students' writings. For example, one of the participants (Arif) was constantly jotting down comments in his notebook and as he followed the teacher's analysis of texts.

I noticed that the students focused closely on the explanations and did not occupy themselves with the computers while the teacher was engaging in text analysis. I observed many times that the participants used the computers to browse the Internet or perform personal chatting during class activities, especially those that required them to use the computers, such as peer reading and peer feedback. However, this rarely happened with text analysis activities. At these times, they tended to either turn off their monitors or turn aside from their computers. If they had been using the computer for any irrelevant purpose, they tended to quit their online activity soon after the teacher started text analysis.
I also observed the participants' attention and responses to the teacher's instructions as they were doing exercises in the writer's book. After some discussion of writing issues, the teacher sometimes asked the students to open Goor and Hacker, book and do relative exercises to the issues discussed. The teacher worked out some exercises with them and then asked them to finish them by their own. She also allowed them to work in groups if they wanted. I observed the participants closely while performing such activities.

I noticed the participants' special devotion when performing writing exercises that had been discussed by the instructor. When the teacher worked with the students on these exercises, the students were acting exactly the same way they did with the activity of text analysis. Specifically, they listened carefully to the student or the teacher offering an explanation for each exercise item, and they took notes immediately as they worked on the sentences. They also showed enthusiasm in class participation while doing these exercises. For example, if an attempt at correcting a faulty structure was incorrect, another student was ready to give another response. In some activities, such as reading discussion, the instructor had to call on names to answer some comprehensive questions because no one volunteered to answer the questions. The responses were completely different with writing exercises, where the participants competed to either do the exercises or provide explanations.

*Participants' Reactions to Peer Reading*

As mentioned earlier, this activity occurred after discussing writing issues, after which the students were required to read and respond to two or three students, paying special attention to the writing issues already discussed. The researcher observed their performance without interrupting them with any question. I would either walk around or observe them from where I was seated.
Generally, the participants did not respond promptly to the teacher when she asked them to log on to WebCT. For example, some participants might promptly turn on their monitors but did not log on to WebCT. Instead, they might first browse the Internet, perform online chatting, or check emails. Fatimah, for instance, did not log onto WebCT. She spent half the time allotted for online activity in checking emails and replying to them. Similarly, Weng Hong performed online chatting before starting the required activity. The teacher noticed this and brought his attention back to the task. This scene happened frequently during the course.

I noted that the students seemed distracted as the class activities shifted between reading, responding, and performing online activities. The participants rarely focused on these tasks. Rather, they kept switching from reading to checking emails or from giving feedback to replying to online chatting. One participant kept going back and forth between WebCT and Yahoo from the start of the peer reading task until the end of the class. Sometimes, he did not read the whole essay. Instead he might scan it or give feedback without even finishing it. Another participant spent most of the time allotted for the activity browsing Amazon.com. He purchased one book and offered another book for sale. This participant did not read until he finished his merchandising activities. The way he treated his friends' essays was perfunctory. He read them quickly and provided very brief feedback. Other participants might interrupt each other while reading. For example, two participants spent 8 minutes talking to each other about issues irrelevant to the task without referring back to WebCT.

Other participants responded in diverse ways. They logged on to WebCT upon the teacher's request. They might read the title of one essay and then look for another essay. One participant read five titles and then selected two of them to read. Another
participant opened two essays at once and kept browsing back and forth. For example, she read the titles of the two essays and then compared them, providing comments. She then proceeded to the first paragraphs of each one and acted the same way. She spent more time comparing the two essays than focusing on the essays themselves. Therefore, sometimes she ran out of time without finishing one essay.

Another participant, although responding to the task as required, was slow in reading and brief in his comments. For example, he spent 4-6 minutes reading one paragraph and either provided one sentence feedback, or none at all.

Finally, I observed that most of the participants rarely used their notes, consulted their textbook, or referred to the checklist recommended by the instructor during peer reading or while giving feedback. Instead, they depended mainly on their knowledge or memory. Perhaps partly as a result, they often did not know what kind of feedback they needed to provide. One participant, for instance, spent a few minutes typing feedback and deleting it. He repeated this for several times until he consulted his friend for help. Another participant did the same thing, and eventually borrowed his friend's checklist. In contrast, one participant regularly placed his notes on one side and the checklist on the other side of his keyboard. He kept going back and forth between the notes, checklist, and the essay he was reading. He was faster and provided more feedback, in contrast to the other participants who did not use their references.

**Participants' Performance with their Essays**

The participants' performance when working on their essays after text analysis was very different from their behavior while engaging in peer reading and peer feedback. This is particularly puzzling, as most of the participants reacted to this activity in a completely different manner. The teacher sometimes asked the students
to work again on their essays before handing them to the teacher. The teacher also usually asked them to reread their essays after a class discussion on writing issues. This activity is similar to the previous one in which the students read and provided feedback to their peers. However, this one required them to develop their own papers taking into account the writing issues already discussed.

As suggested above, the participants' responses to this activity were more active than their performance in peer reading activities, although the two activities required them to react to student writing. The only difference between these two activities was that they were now reading their own papers and working on them, whereas in the peer reading activity, they read other students’ essays.

I observed three main differences between these two activities. The first difference was that, when dealing with their own writing, they immediately opened their documents and started working on them. None of them browsed any website or performed any irrelevant activity, such as online chatting or getting involved in off task activities. The second difference was that some of them used the instructor's notes and comments on text analysis. Two participants used both notes and textbook. In addition to the notes, one participant referred to his previous assignment paper. Although the previous paper was about a different topic, he consulted it while working to improve his current paper. The third difference was that some participants consulted the teacher about writing issues previously discussed before engaging in the activity. One participant took his notes to the teacher and discussed them with her. They spent three minutes after which the participant went back to his seat and started working on his essay, using the notes that he had just discussed with the teacher. Other participants also consulted with the instructor, though some had not brought their notes with them. Instead they asked the teacher about a specific issue in their
papers or asked her to clarify some writing issues discussed at the beginning of the class. Finally, observation showed that even after the class time was over, some participants stayed for sometime working on their essays. This never happened with peer reading or with other activities; participants would leave the class soon after the class was dismissed. Additionally, it happened several times that students from the next class had to come and wait for some of the participants to leave their seats. I cannot state why these differences existed from just observing the participants. However, the interviews will show how the participants viewed these activities.

Beliefs and Attitudes: Earlier and Later

This section provides a description of the participants' beliefs and attitudes toward writing, learning writing, and their views on the relationship between reading and writing at the beginning and at the ending of the course. This description is limited to the participants' beliefs and attitudes based on their responses to some questions that explicitly addressed this issue. Each participant's report is mentioned separately, to make it possible for the reader to see the changes in the participant's beliefs and attitudes. Some participants may report quite similar information; however, I feel it is essential to shed light on each participant's beliefs and attitudes because this is the nature and purpose of the study.

The beliefs and attitudes described below are derived from responses to four questions that were asked in interview one, at the beginning of the course (questions 1 and 2) and interview three, at the end of the course (questions 3 and 4). These questions are:

1. What do you think of writing?
2. Why do you think reading was required in the course?
3. How do you think your writing has changed during the course?
4. Have your feelings about writing or attitude toward writing and toward the relationship between reading and writing changed? Please explain your answer.

Below are responses offered by each participant to these questions and in the ensuing conversation.

Nadia

In her first response, Nadia compares her writing ability with her speaking ability. She states that she cannot write as well as she speaks. Moreover, she says that writing in English is so difficult because she has to think a lot as she does not have the required background to write. In her words, "in my language I don't need to think. I just write." Concerning the reading-writing connection, Nadia does not know why the reading is required in the writing course. She believes that reading is good for writing but she does not know how reading can enhance writing. Additionally, Nadia states that she has problems with reading. She says, "my reading is not good. I read but I don't understand. I think I need to know many words."

Nadia's attitudes toward writing at the end of the course have changed. She states that she has now learned how to start writing an essay by following some examples from the textbook and by applying the instructor's comments and instructions. She also mentions that she can write much better than at the beginning of the course. According to Nadia, "In the beginning, I don't really know how to write or start an essay." she expresses her belief about reading in the course as follows: "It helped me to give me some guide to write an essay." She mentions three examples of features she has learned about from the examples in the reading thesis statement, supporting details, and unity. Additionally she says, "I feel better or easier when I write an essay" because "I have learnt about the writing format and I can be more
Fatimah

Fatimah has a similar attitude toward writing at the beginning of the course. She states that writing is very difficult and she makes a lot of errors. In her words, "I have error in every sentence." Furthermore, she explains her problem by saying that she has difficulty expressing her thoughts in English, even when she has some knowledge about the topic. Fatimah does not know how to use readings to improve her writing. She says, "after I read I forget what I read." Additionally, she believes that reading can only improve her grammar. This is because "after we read passages we do the exercises and fill in the spaces".

At the end of the course, Fatimah's attitudes toward writing have become more positive. She believes that her writing has changed for the better. She says she now makes fewer mistakes and her essays contain fewer run-on-sentence errors. Moreover, she believes that reading has helped her in organizing the structure before and during writing. She feels that reading is very useful for writing if students read interesting topics. She also mentions that some vocabulary items may make the reading difficult to understand. However, she emphasizes that she writes differently from the way she used to write at the beginning of the course.

Taiki

Taiki's attitude toward writing at the beginning of the course is quite different from other participants' attitudes. His English was quite good. Additionally, he had experienced a course similar to College Writing in his home country of origin. However, he mentions that this ESL English writing course is more beneficial than
the one he took in Japan. In his words, "the course in Japan was good but it was not as well-organized as in here." He also believes that reading is essential to writing. However, although he believes that there is a connection between reading and writing, he does not specify this connection. He says, "I do not know what the connection of reading and writing, but something there . . . some connection between reading and writing."

As the course ends, Taiki's attitudes about writing have changed a little. As stated earlier, his level of English was considerably more advanced than that of his classmates. In his first interview, he states that he has got (A) in his first paper, and that therefore, he believes that his writing has not changed much. However, Taiki points out that he feels confused sometimes. He has learnt about different types of sentence patterns different types of essay modes, such as cause and effect, and argumentative essays. He states that he feels less comfortable as the course begins because he has started to recall all the information he learnt during his earlier writing course, which has caused him to increase his awareness about writing issues that he has covered previously. Accordingly, he comments, "I think [confusion] is because I know now that to write is. It not only you just write . . . you need to write and know the rules."

Taiki's belief about the relationship between reading and writing at the end of the course is clearer than at the beginning of the course. He mentions that he has started to gain new words and structures from the reading. He also mentions that he has known how to decide the type of the essay that he reads or writes. In our second interview, he no longer refers to confusion, and seems more confident.
Hafiz

In the first interview, Hafiz says that he has not practiced much reading in either his first language or in English in the past. His major problem in writing was getting ideas. In his words, "I need points. I need more time to get points." Hafiz points out that he was never required to read in his previous English courses. He mentions that reading is "very good" for writing. However, when asked why it is so, he does not give any answer. His only reply is "I have no idea." He also does not understand why reading is required in this course.

At the end of the course, Hafiz sums up his experience in positive terms: "I think my writing is better than before." He elaborates, "I know the skill to arrange the essay. For example, I know what I should put in thesis, topic sentence, and how to write the supporting details by the type of the essay I write." Furthermore, Hafiz has started to enjoy writing. He says, "I feel writing is more fun since I know the correct way to write an essay." On another level, Hafiz's attitudes about the relationship between reading and writing have positively changed, too. When asked about the relationship, he says, "I think it is very important now." Hafiz also expresses the most explicit view of the reading-writing link so far, when he claims that "readers do not have to know grammar. If they read and understand the correct grammar, they will write the same way as they read." He seems to feel, quite intuitively, that reading will help a writer to master the details of style and sentence form.

Weng Hong

Weng Hong's experience of writing before taking the writing course has not been different from that of the rest of the participants. He describes his writing competence in rather uncertain terms: "Um, it is very difficult to write because [there
is] not practice much and my previous times I didn't do well." He elaborates more on the effects of his weak English skills on his writing. In his words,

My English is very poor because I followed my friends' talk too much in my country language. That's why I can't improve English. And I feel very stressed here because my English is very slowly . . . and I feel the same thing with my writing.

Like other participants, Weng Hong believes that reading is very important for writing, but he does not know how. He says, "Yeah, it helps a lot but I don't know how . . . [I'm] not very sure how." similarly, Weng Hong did not know why this course required reading. He repeats his answer that reading is useful but cannot say why it is required in the course.

Weng Hong's attitudes about writing at the end of the semester have changed substantially. In his own words, "I think I did learn some writing skills like organizing my writing by a good thesis statement, a focus and narrow topic sentence, and a conclusion with restatement." Although his writing ability has developed, Weng Hong has not come to like writing because he is not interested in it. He justifies this attitude by stating that, "I prefer doing other works like calculation than writing." Then he says, "I know how I write." Weng Hong expresses himself much more clearly now on the relationship between reading and writing, unlike at the beginning of the course when he did know what to say. He states,

Writing skills can be improved through reading. I think so because people who write well [they] read a lot. While you are reading, you can know how others write and learn about others' writing style.
Kim Yun

Kim Yun, a Korean student who has lived in the US since the fifth grade, has practiced reading and writing in both languages. However she does not like reading and writing in English. "In high school," she says, "they just give a topic about an essay but they don't teach how you write that essay. They don't teach what [the] thesis statement [is]." Although she has finished her junior and senior high school years in the US, she still has negative attitudes about writing in English. In her words, "writing in Korea is very easier than English. It is very difficult because all the English sentences are different from Korean."

Like her attitudes about writing, her original attitude about the relationship between reading and writing is pessimistic. She believes that reading does not help writing, she explains, "because, I think, reading and writing are separate ones. Reading is easier than writing."

Kim Yun's feelings about writing at the end of the course have changed, although she feels that she still has problems with writing. She says, "my writing has changed, but I have problems. But I know different kinds of papers." Furthermore, she confirms, "my perception has changed a lot than the first day." Kim Yun emphasizes that although she likes the class, she has problems with reading and writing. She states, "I think my writing is better than before. But some of my papers' organization wasn't good but now I care about the organization, so I think I need to learn more and more and I need to write more carefully."

Kim Yun's attitude and belief about the relationship between reading and writing have also changed considerably. At the beginning of the course, she did not believe that there was any relationship between reading and writing. This belief has changed subtly at the end of the course, in that she at least sees reading as a source of
information for her writing. In her words, "I like to read before I write my paper because I know what I have to write." Nevertheless, Kim Yun emphasizes that although she has made some progress, she has problems with reading and writing. For example, she cares about essay organization at the end of the course more than before the course. But she still has some problems with organization, though she is unable to give specific examples.

Jefri

Jefri's first experience with writing before taking the course was basic. He viewed writing as "composing letters." Although he did not practice much writing in his language, he felt comfortable writing in the language of his home country. On the contrary, he mentions that he neither practised writing in English nor did he feel comfortable doing so. As he puts it, "it is very difficult to write because [there is] no practice. In my previous time, I didn't do well. My English language is very poor and my writing is very poor, too." Concerning the reading-writing connection, Jefri’s view is like that of other participants. He believes that reading is helpful for writing, but he does not mention how reading helps writing. "Reading is important," he says, "but I am not sure how." Furthermore, his explanation of why reading is required takes the form of a simple circular statement: "we have reading in this course because it is required."

Jefri responds differently at the end of the course. His increased confidence in his writing is evident. In his own words, "now I have more confidence about writing, title, topic sentence, and supporting sentences, etc. Last time, I spent much time without writing anything. Now I write easily because I know what I write and what organization." He adds, "[I know] how to express my feeling in my essay in the
correct way not the last time I use the wrong way in the arrangement of the paragraph and how to arrange ideas."

Jefri believes that free reading without discussion is not helpful because, "if you read a lot . . . you don't know the mistakes and maybe you don't understand the reading." Instead he prefers the instructor's way of teaching writing in the course. He puts it, "I believe that reading and discussion is much better than just reading."

Additionally, he explains that the reading assignments are useful, although he has problems with the vocabulary and style of some of the assigned essays. But, "I like when the professor discusses these problems in the class." The participants' experiences with class discussion will be dealt with in a separate section later in this chapter.

Hiroshi

Hiroshi's experience of writing is similar to that of other participants. He has not taken any special writing course in his home country. The only writing lessons he took were in high school. Hiroshi points out that his writing was not good because the courses that he took in Japan were "very basic" comparing them to college writing courses. Hiroshi's response to his feelings about writing in English evoked a comparison between writing in English and writing in his first language. He states, "I can easily write in my home country language. But it is very hard to write in English. I think I need to work hard." He offers no suggestions as to specific writing instruction in his classes so far, simply saying that "the teacher just tell[s] us to write."

Hiroshi's responses regarding the reading-writing relationship are similar to some other participants. He criticized his former writing classes because there were no readings. He believes that "it is not good. It should be reading in the course." However, like others, he cannot elaborate on his feeling that reading must be
important. As he puts it, "I know [that] reading is required in the course and I know [that] reading is good for writing but maybe I don't know how."

Again, Hiroshi's attitudes about writing have become positive and confident by the time of the interview. He says, "I improved my writing skills to become better by [reading] textbook, reading comments in WebCT, lectures from the professor. I can write a better topic sentence, I can write a better thesis statement [and] argumentative thesis statement." Hiroshi adds that he has become more interested in the class and more interested in writing because "now I know more types of essay."

Hiroshi's responses to the reading-writing relationship at the end of the course are different from his earlier ones. He now responds to the question, "Do you think you should read to help your writing?" with an enthusiastic "Yes, of course." Additionally, he justifies his answer without being asked to, if not in a particularly detailed way. He says, "because reading can improve the vocabulary levels and the writing skills and organization." He frequently emphasizes that the readings and the textbook can be used as reference for students.

Radziah

Radziah has a very negative attitude about writing in English at the beginning of the course. She says that her English is bad and that her writing is worse. Although she has completed some credit hours in English in college back home in her country, she still believes that her poor language skills hinder her writing ability. She points out that she has not taken any writing classes before this college writing course. Radziah says "we took English classes and writing was one subject." She adds, "There is no instruction. We just write." Radziah elaborates more on her writing problems. She says that she was not able to express her ideas in English because she was not
used to speaking or writing in English. According to Radziah, this problem caused brainstorming difficulty because, "I can not elaborate on my ideas."

Radziah reports that she was never exposed to reading in her writing classes in her home country. "There is no reading. We just write without reading. And we don't have textbooks." Radziah emphasizes that there should be reading in the writing class, especially in her country where students do not speak English. Yet, although Radziah is aware of the importance of reading, she fails to identify areas where reading can improve writing. In her words, "reading is helpful but unfortunately you don't know how [that is]." Her response to why reading was required in this course echoes the confusion of the other participants: "Reading will benefit the students but I don't know how."

Radziah's attitudes about writing at the end of the course are not exceptional. She appears to be more confident at this point about the way she organizes her essay. She comments that, "my organization was poor but now it is much better. I write differently now from four months ago." Radziah adds that she has identified her writing problems, "but I feel better now because I have [fewer] mistakes, like run on sentence, wordiness, agreement."

Her attitudes about the relationship between reading and writing have changed, as well. She now admits that she originally thought the reading required for the course was not useful. This attitude has changed by the end of the course. As he puts it, "the first day, I felt reading is unnecessary because I didn't think this will benefit me." Furthermore, she provides a justification for the change of her attitude. She mentions that when she reads before writing, she is able to get some ideas for both content and organization. In her own words, "I will get some ideas from the text before I start a paper and I will know how to organize a paper."
Arif's experience of writing in English has been very limited and that his work on English has been difficult for him: "I spend hours and hours to write my homework." Arif points out that the only writing courses he took were in high school and that these were very basic. "We just write letters, complaint letters and all kind of letters." Arif compares this simplistic approach to the writing courses that he took in his first language, which were much more advanced. In his words, "[L1 writing courses] were high level courses. We have a course called writing skills. Five years we had that course. But in English we just write letters." Arif fears that the writing course will be difficult for him because it requires writing well-organized essays.

Arif's attitudes about the relationship between reading and writing at the beginning of the course are different from other participants. He shows more awareness of the relationship between reading and writing because, as mentioned earlier, he took "special and high level writing courses” in his first language. He adds, "we have part grammar, part reading, part of composition writing." Arif's belief about the reading-writing relationship is quite clear: "reading the text of the book is the theory and writing is the practical thing. I always read to find schema for my writing" However, Arif's experience of this relationship in English has not been developed, as he again emphasizes when asked: "We don't have reading in the writing course. We just write letters." Arif also mentions that he does not know how to manage reading in English. As he puts it, "I can't focus so much on long readings, so I think that's a problem. I also have a problem with ordering my ideas." Arif, additionally, hopes that he will find good examples of essays in the textbook of the course to use for organizational purposes. He says, "I want to look for the same organization because I'm not so good at organizing."
Arif's attitudes about writing have changed positively at the end of the study. As he puts it, "I think I have improved a lot because the professor gives us a lot of work." Arif also expresses his inner feelings about writing. He says, "I am much more confident in writing and writing is easier then in the past." Arif says his writing has improved two ways: avoiding "silly" mistakes and recognizing some problems that he still needs to address. Arif emphasizes that, despite the problems he still has, he now "can construct better sentences and can describe the ideas better." Arif also notes that he has been developing during the course. In his words, "my second paper is better than my first paper and my third paper is better than my second paper."

Arif's view about the connection between reading and writing has not changed; yet it continues to develop. His belief expressed in the first interview, that reading is the theory and writing is the practical aspect, now extends to include reading and writing in English. Arif makes a specific point concerning the relationship. He says that ideas might be gained from general reading and from different sources, but learning how to write appropriate forms is best done through reading assigned texts and discussing their organization. The wish that Arif expressed at the beginning of the course seems to have come true—i.e., he has been able to find good examples of organization. Arif also states that he feels there is a relationship between reading, ideas, and organization. He believes that when he reads, he gets ideas from reading; therefore, his organization of the essay looks better. He puts it, "reading gives me ideas to develop organization."

Ji Sung

Ji Sung is aware of the low level of his writing ability at the beginning of the course. He complains, "one thing, I don't know much vocabulary. I cannot write very very nice composition. That's the problem. I use very very simple English."
Additionally, Ji Sung addresses this problem more specifically "sometimes I know the word but I don't know the spelling. Sometimes I don't know the word itself." He explains the source of the problem as follows, "I don't read. And if read I don't know the vocabulary . . . the other reason, I think, I can not remember the vocabulary. So I can't use it into my writing."

Ji Sung is also aware about the importance of reading with relation to writing development. But his problem is that he does not read in English. Like some other participants, Ji Sung cannot articulate how reading is helpful to writing. One of his responses to this issue is, "reading is very helpful but normally I don't know how." Ji Sung welcomes the inclusion of reading in the course. He hopes that the readings will be interesting and contain useful information.

Ji Sung says that his attitudes about writing at the end of the course have changed for the better. He attributes this attitude change to his growing ability to avoid some mistakes that he used to do at the beginning of the course: "my change was more ways on certain mistakes I did before. I think I changed a lot." However, Ji Sung is still aware that he has some problems in writing. Ji Sung also has developed something that he describes as "writing awareness." He explains this as he begins to be more aware of some writing techniques that have made writing more demanding task for him.

Although Ji Sung believes that his writing has improved, he mentions that he has not overcome some mistakes that were discussed in the class. He says, "I changed a lot but I still do a lot of mistakes." Again, Ji Sung emphasizes that although he still makes mistakes, he now views writing completely differently from a few months ago. He mentions that writing now means more than just submitting papers. As he phrases
it, "four months ago, I didn't care about run-on sentence, parallelism, organization, etc." He also states that he will be more careful with writing in the future.

Ji Sung perceives the relationship between reading and writing at the end of the course more clearly than at the beginning of the course. He understands the relationship better now, and can more easily express his views about it. His main point about this relationship is getting ideas from the reading. More specifically, he likes the idea of jotting down the points he found interesting while reading. In a related comment, Ji Sung mentions that reading influences him to do some research before writing. He says, "I now do some research before I write the essay because I can get some ideas and I can include some ideas and take some experts' [views]" and include in my essay." He comments, "I read and write some ideas and include them to support my essay." Ji Sung also understands that reading helps develop a writer’s awareness to rhetorical features, as readers examine how an essay is developed from the introduction to the conclusion and how paragraphs are connected. Basically, Ji Sung's belief about the importance of reading for writing has becomes more emphatic. He considers reading as a "treasure" for writing.

Free Reading versus Assigned Reading-to-Write Activities

The participants report that they practiced a limited amount of L2 free reading they did when they were in their countries. Based on the interview findings, they also engaged in reading from online and text sources during the course of the study. In addition, as pointed out earlier, the participants were required to do assigned reading for the present writing course. All the participants state that they have positive attitudes regarding the assigned readings preceding writing. In fact, they prefer these assigned readings preceding their writing to free reading. They say that that assigned readings provide them with more explicit opportunities to link reading and writing.
Jefri, for instance, states that the assigned reading, coupled with class explanation and discussion, has helped him understand the reading-writing connection better than any time before. He says:

I think I now know that reading and writing are one skill. In the past we took reading and writing in high school but we did not study them together. The reading subject was just reading we do not talk about sentences or the kinds of structures. Here we learnt that we can use the information that we read . . . I think I can write better now because I know how to write by reading good examples. I prefer to read some examples about my paper before I write. I think just reading is not helpful because reading is so difficult. I like to read about things I know.

Arif has also developed a better understanding of the reading-writing relationship through assigned readings. He believes that pre-selected texts have helped him use the information and thus remember it for a longer time. Arif expresses his view about free reading versus assigned reading as follows:

When the professor told us to read for my definition paper, I used some information from the article and I supported my thesis statement. I now remember [the] information and can use them again. I think [to] read and write is good for us because we are international students. My problem is that when I just read, I forgot what I read . . . this course is good for me because I can use what I read before I forget.

Like other participants, Kim Yun has done free reading to some extent before this course, and she believes that pleasure reading is valuable. She recalls her experiences of pleasure reading when she was in school in the US. However, she likes
the explicit relationship between reading and writing, and she believes that this experience has provided her with valuable guidance. She says:

I like this experience. This experience is different. I used to read books and bring them back to school but my writing is very poor. This course is very good for me because I now know why I read. I read the articles in the book and I know what I will do. I think it is good to get some rules and then you read about them and see them in an essay . . . you can easily you use them in your paper.

Nadia expresses a similar opinion: "[the reading assignments] helped me to give me some guide to write an essay."

Hiroshi provides another reason for his preference of assigned readings. He emphasizes that free reading is very difficult for him. Although Hiroshi has not practiced much pleasure reading, at least until he participated in the present course, he believes that the assigned readings that he has done during the course have given him a good start in writing, because his English was not good enough to allow him to practice free reading. He says:

I think I need someone to help me with my reading and writing. I read but I did not know what is going on. I think my English was very poor and I do not understand much . . . I do not finish when I read. I think I needed help when I read. I think the course helped because the instructor explained the subject before we read. Also after we read, we can ask the professor and she explained to us. Sometimes when I have any problem I go back to my book and read examples. I think now I know how texts can help my writing. Now I read and see if there are wordiness, action verbs, thesis statement, etc.
Weng Hong's view concerning free readings versus assigned readings echoes the opinions of the other participants. He has a positive attitude toward the latter. Weng Hong has done more hours of pleasure reading in his home country than most other participants. He believes that free reading enhances background knowledge, whereas required reading enhances both background knowledge and awareness of written structures. Weng Hong comments as follows on this:

When I read in the past I only look for information. I have no problem when I write. I can support my thesis statement. But I can not write a good thesis statement. The instructor told us that our thesis statement has to be good and has insertion. I did not know about that before. I can only write supporting details but I can not order them well. I think the teacher helped me . . . I read articles in the book and the writer's book. They helped me a lot . . . I can arrange my sentences well and I get information for my paper. I like the writer's book because [it] we read essay in the writer's book and then we fix the wrong sentences. I think reading is good. I like it. I read when I was in my country. But I like the class so much [because] it helped me a lot. I can write a good thesis statement and support it.

Taiki's attitude about using assigned reading texts over free reading for is once again similar to other participants. However, he seems to feel that prior reading-to-writing with attention to specific structures is sometimes overwhelming. He points out that such reading imposes a burden on him when he feels that he has to use specific structures in his paper. Taiki explains:

I like this class. But I think the teacher wanted me to use the sentences and he type of sentences that I don't like. Sometimes I want to write my sentence but I have to write the sentence that the teacher explained in the class. Sometimes
when I read information from the book I use [it]. I just use this information. I can not think of [other] information. I like to read and write what I like. I like this.

Based on the findings, the participants' attitudes regarding free reading versus assigned reading for writing purposes are quite similar. They all have positive attitudes regarding assigned reading over free reading. One probable explanation for this is that most of the participants are EFL students who have lived in environments where English is a foreign language. Therefore, they have not had the chance to appreciate the value of extensive reading because they have very few experiences with pleasure reading. Another explanation may be that all the participants have difficulties with reading, as mentioned in the section. They believe that the L2 readings they did in their countries can only improve their grammar or provide information. For example, Fatimah considers these readings to have been an exercise for grammatical drills. She says, "after we read passages we do the exercises and fill [in] the spaces." The next section describes what specific benefits the participants feel they have gained from using assigned reading texts that contain rhetorical structures.

Benefits of Assigned Reading-to-Writing

Based on the participants' reports, this section presents the benefits that the participants believe they obtained from engaging in assigned readings for writing purposes. Based on the findings from the participants' interviews, the benefits fall into two parts: (1) benefits related to what the student participants report about structural gains; and (2) benefits related to content information from source readings. Because the participants have reported many common benefits, I will try to list the gains only once, even if they have been mentioned by several participants.
Part One: Structural Gains

Rhetorical Modes

Evidence from the interviews reveals an association between in-class discussion of text structures and participants' awareness of structural modes of essays, such as cause and effect, compare-contrast, argumentative, definition, etc. All the participant students report that they have become aware of these various rhetorical modes; yet they never refer to the word ‘rhetoric’ in their responses. Some students brought up the instructor's discussion and examination of different models of writing. Also, the participants recall their work with textbook examples of these modes. They consider this awareness valuable, although they report that they had some problems when using these modes. Their problems will be discussed in more detail in chapter five. Some participants focus more than others on their knowledge of these modes. For example, Fatimah believes that she is now aware of these modes and knows that any essays she reads or writes must follow a specific type of rhetorical modes. Fatimah comments:

This is the first time I read and write in one class. In the past, I did not know we read different kinds of papers. We write cause and effect paper or compare-contrast paper. Every homework is a different paper . . . the last homework we wrote argumentative paper . . . the textbook has many examples [of these types of essays]. The teacher told us that any kind of essay has some signs or marks . . . we look for the signs to know what kind of essay [it is] . . . I think I need to study more examples to know better. But now I am happy I understand these different kinds of papers. Sometimes I want the professor to spend more time so that I understand more.
Hafiz expresses his belief about this theme in a quite similar way. He believes that knowing different kinds of rhetorical modes has helped him to become aware about the features of each mode. Hafiz says:

I think now I know what the essay compare and contrast mean[s]. Before I do not understand anything about that. Now I know why we write different essays . . . the teacher told us that every one has different way to write it. I know the skill to arrange the essay. For example, I know what I should put in thesis, topic sentence, and how to write the supporting details by the type of the essay I write. Now if I read compare and contrast essay I know [that] the thesis statement should talk about compare and contrast . . . sometimes I know that the essay has to be about argument but spend long time to think what I write. It is not easy. But I try to write.

Ji Sung also mentions that he has become aware of the development of different rhetorical modes. He believes that integrating reading in the writing class has helped him increase his ability to apply the knowledge he gains from reading to his writing. He states that he now expects a specific mode of essay to follow a specific development. Ji Sung explained:

I now understand that if I read or write argumentative paper, I have to make my paper all about argument . . . the professor said the paper must mention arguments . . . also when I read argumentative essay[s] in the book I noticed that they keep the argument until the end of the essay . . . the teacher told us to do the same thing . . . I know these types now. When I wrote my paper about argument I make sure that I stick to the argument because I know now what I'm doing.
**Text Organization**

This theme receives quite consistent attention from the participants. Based on the findings from the interviews, especially the third one, the participants have made direct reference to their increased awareness of features such as introduction, thesis statement, topic sentences, and supporting ideas that relate to the thesis statement. They believe that the assigned readings in the textbook, and the discussion of texts, have helped them considerably to improve their abilities to write well-organized papers. According to the participants' responses, this section falls into two parts: the role of assigned readings from the textbook, and the role of text analysis and exercises. In fact, each participant refers to both the assigned readings and the text analysis. They believe that the two roles complement each other. Below are some excerpts from the participants' responses.

*Reading from the Textbook.* Nadia believes that the articles in the textbook are her best recourse when she needs more information about text organization for her essay. She says:

> When I write the essay, I have to read through the textbook to get the format… when the professor give[s] us the assignment, I know that I have to write a good paper because the professor told us that we have to write the correct format. I read the instruction and then I read one or two examples from the book. I make sure that my paper has a title, introduction, thesis statement and so on.

Jefri reports a similar belief to Nadia's. He mentions that he now feels more comfortable than at the beginning of the course. He believes that knowing the right organization has decreased the tension he used to feel. Jefri also believes that the models of articles in the textbook have helped him to understand the appropriate
organization required for his paper. Jefri cites both the teacher’s instruction and the assigned readings as leading to this increased awareness. He explains in these words:

In my previous time, I did not know what organization [is]. Now I know that organization means we organize our paper and write paragraphs . . . we write the paragraphs because each paragraph has a topic sentence. In our book we have good examples . . . I read the examples and see how they wrote them. For example, I see the thesis statements and then read the paragraphs and see if they talk about the thesis statement. The teacher said every paragraph should have one idea . . . I like to go home and read the book after the teacher explained the lesson. I think this is good for me because I have what the teacher said and what the book said.

Taiki's belief is similar to that of the other participants on this issue. He believes that required reading models related to the writing task is very helpful. His response focuses on the importance of reading some articles that are about the same issue discussed in class. Taiki was aware of some organizational patterns before taking the class. However, he did not read models of the same organization. Therefore, he believes that required reading has helped him confirm his knowledge about organization. As he puts it:

I took a course in Japan that was about writing different kind of essays. But this course is more organized and well-prepared. The course in Japan did not have reading. We just write the thesis statement and the supporting details. Here we discuss a topic then we read about it . . . it is good because we read and we write before we forget . . . I think it is good for us because we don't speak English very well. When I read some articles that have the same organization I feel confident that I will write the same way. I now know that
some topics have special organization. For example, argumentative essay
should have some paragraphs and each paragraph [has] one claim . . . The
book has good examples of argumentative essays.

Finally, Radziah's response seems to go even beyond the teacher's explanation of
texts and assigned readings. Still considering the effects of discussion about
organization and assigned readings, she says she also values the instructions provided
in the text book about text organization. "I like the teacher's explanation," she says, "I
also like when I read the passage from the book and study the tables of organization . .
. I understand more and more." She adds, "I will get some ideas from the text before
starting a paper and I will know how to organize a paper."

Text Analysis and Exercises. Findings from the interviews show that text
analysis activities that the instructor did seem to have had a great influence on the
participants. As stated earlier, text analysis was an ongoing activity that the instructor
organized in which an article or a sample from the students' writing or from the
textbook were discussed and analyzed in class. All the participants prefer this activity
to free reading. They consider this activity valuable because it enables them to see
what makes an article either good or bad. Earlier, the participants' observed
performance while doing these activities was described as positive and serious, which
helps confirm the sincerity of their statements here. Only one participant expresses a
different view about text analysis and text organization. In the paragraphs below, I
will begin with the participants who reported benefits of text analysis on text
organization.

Hiroshi says that text analysis is a new experience for him. He believes that
the text analysis discussions have helped him create awareness of text organization. In
his words:
We do not even do that [text analysis] in my language. It is good thing. The professor explained the essay and all the paragraphs. I think it is very important . . . it is very important that we see essays and we how they are written because we will write like them . . . the professor told us that this essay has introduction and thesis statement and the conclusion, etc. And we discuss the introduction and the thesis statement and so on. Then we the teacher explained the paragraphs and the conclusion. We need that because we don't know the organization.

Kim Yun is quite aware of her need to develop competence in organization. She worries about organization more than about anything else, although she has studied in the US since fifth grade. She believes that text analysis activities have helped her improve her organization. Kim Yun says,

I think the idea of discussing a text in front of the class is so helpful. I never had that in my classes . . . In my previous classes, the teacher will call me to her room and discuss my paper with me. It's like a conference. But here the instructor teaches us and uses the article that we read at home. I think in this case we pay more attention to the teacher because he is discussing and we are watching . . . The instructor used real articles and we see how they written. I think I know how to organize my paper now. But I have some problems with organization.

Kim Yun's and other participants' problems will be discussed in details in a separate section; the quote here is cited only to show the importance she places on organization.

Weng Hong is among the participants who believe that text analysis has a positive impact on their mastery of text organization. Weng Hong favors this strategy
of using texts to illustrate appropriate organization because he believes this strategy has helped him apply the points discussed at any point in writing his current paper. He thinks it is beneficial that the teacher shows examples of texts which illustrate the type of the essay they are working with. Weng Hong comments,

I learnt a lot from it [text analysis] since the professor used it as an example to show what pattern we should follow when writing a paper . . . it's a good example of an argument paper since it shows us such kind of paper should have a claim, argument and supports. I like it because I used most things that I've learned from this [strategy]. Because I used most things that I've learned, the professor have [has] given me the highest grade among the paper that I've written . . . My paper is better organized now.

Specific Use of Words

Eight participants believe that assigned reading has helped them use specific words in their papers. The other four participants say they notice new words when reading, but they report that they did care much to use them. The participants who have used new words believe that their papers are better for their using the new words. They believe that their 'definition' paper contains more new words than any other paper, because the instructor particularly assigned them to read from outside resources when working on this paper. They think that outside research for their papers has helped them find materials that match their topics more than the articles in their textbook. The instructor encouraged them to search and read outside sources for all the papers they wrote. But she especially urged them to consult outside materials for their 'definition' papers. Below are some responses of the participants who report the impact of assigned readings and text analysis on use of specific words.
Assigned reading before writing has influenced Ji Sung to encounter some new words and use them, which eventually has led him to incorporate them into his English vocabulary. He believes that this strategy of reading for writing is so beneficial for him. Ji Sung explains:

I took two writing course in my country. I always write the same vocab in my homework. Sometimes I know the word but I don't know the spelling . . . sometimes I want to write a word but I don't know it in English. I don't know many vocabs . . . this course is good. I read before I write my homework and I read good words and I used them. Now I can use them again . . . I can remember them because I read them and used them in my papers.

Another participant, Radziah, expresses her opinion about the importance of using "good words." She believes that the class discussion has triggered her attention to the importance of using specific words in writing. She comments:

The professor told us that this word is good and that word is not good . . . she told us why the writer used this word . . . I think it is good because English is not my country language. We understand more. I like more the professor talk about our papers because we have the same mistakes . . . I think the professor help us to correct our words because we use the words wrong.

Arif's response is similar. Moreover, his response includes awareness that his strategy of using with new words has replaced his earlier practice of trying to paraphrase an idea if the right word was not at hand. He says, "in previous times, when I write my homework I write long sentence. Now I just write the word directly."

Kim Yun, although always reporting frustration and bitterness about writing, believes that assigned readings and text analysis have helped her become more
conscious of word choice in her writing. She says, "I began to notice my words and sometimes I change them."

Two participants respond to this theme in a similar way, but they present short, superficial responses. They report that they have understood the instructor's explanation, but they did not pay attention to whether they used new words or not. One of them is not sure if he knows how to use them or not. The other one claims that he feels he should use his own words. However, in reading their writing samples, I find that they have used a few strong words in their papers. For instance, Jefri used four low-frequency words in one essay: 'Turbine', 'displacement', 'anticipate', and 'Torque.' With a follow-up email and an attachment of one sample of their writings, I sought some clarification from them on their use of these words. The strong words were highlighted to make them easy to see. One participant, Hafiz, comments that he knew these words anyway. Only later, when contacted in a follow-up email, does he belatedly confirm that he has been prompted to use them by the reading he did. On that occasion, Jefri replies with the following explanation, which acknowledges that the reading provided vocabulary for his essay:

In the interview, I was so hurry. I had an exam for my other class. Sorry that I did not answer the question. I did not study [well] for my exam . . . I read the paper again and yes these words I learnt them from the reading.

Some participants claim that the use of specific words taken from the assigned reading decreases wordiness because it allows them to use 'direct words' that carry the meaning they want. All the participants report that they have not previously been introduced to the concept of wordiness. The first time that they have realized this problem of wordiness is in this course. Jefri, for instance, says that he has not recognized the meaning of wordiness until the class had two weeks of exposure to the
idea. Nadia mentions that she has realized the usefulness of using "strong words that are important" to avoid long sentences and wordiness.

One participant, Hiroshi, reports that he has used new words, but he was hesitant to report his experience. He fears that using words from reading may constitute plagiarism, which shows his lack of experience in dealing with source texts.

Sentence Patterns

In the first interview, the participants report that they did not know anything about sentence patterns. They also mention that they use simple sentences. However, at the end of the course, they report that they have understood what sentence patterns mean and that they are aware of different sentence patterns, although some responses show that they still have some problems with advanced sentence patterns, such as complex sentences and compound-complex sentences.

Taiki seems to prefer the instructor's way of introducing sentence patterns through text analysis and exercises. Taiki believes that, although he is still struggling with some sentence patterns, he has gained useful knowledge about sentence patterns. The quotation below is Taiki's response on this theme (Taiki's problem with complex sentences is discussed later):

I always write very easy sentence . . . now I know other sentences. I don't know how I can use them right. But I think I know them now. In the past I [did not] know them. I can now write [compound] sentence . . . I still sometimes I make mistakes [with complex sentences]. But I know it but it is difficult to write always.

Hiroshi's response presents a positive attitude toward the instructor's method of teaching sentence patterns. He likes the way the instructor illustrates sentence
patterns, assigns purposeful reading, and requires writing implementation of these patterns. Hiroshi's words are:

The professor was clear and easy. She was slow. I think this is good because we can understand. The professor asked us to read the passage in the book . . . she ask[ed] us to close our book[s] and explained the simple sentence and the compound sentence and so on. Then we read the passage again. We read another passage. Then we write the paper. I think this good and easy for me because I don't know sentences before. Now I know simple sentences and other sentences . . . I can use them.

Another participant, Hafiz, believes that using different sentence patterns made his writing more powerful. He says that he has used different sentence patterns instead of using one simple pattern throughout the whole paper. He mentions that he sometimes consults the writer's book while writing to get more information for the structure of the sentence patterns he has used. He says:

I feel I write strong paper now. In the past my writing is very basic. For example, I write simple sentences because I did not study that there [are] different sentences. Now I'm better. I feel my paper is strong . . . In my last paper you can see that I wrote simple sentence[s] and complex sentence[s]. The professor said we have to use them . . . I don't write complex compound sentences correctly. I still have mistakes . . . But I know simple and compound and complex.

Ji Sung reports another benefit about using sentence patterns. He believes that using different kinds of sentence patterns has helped him avoid run-on sentence errors. Ji Sung also claims that using some models of sentence patters has helped him
visualize how to overcome run-on sentence problems by giving him the chance to examine the use of connectors and punctuation. As he puts it:

Before the course I [did] not understand the meaning of run on sentence. I [had] many mistakes with run on sentence. Now I know. It mean[s] I don't write different sentences together. I write them alone or write compound sentence . . . I use *and or but* and comma. The professor told us to read the passage in exercise book and we underline the run on sentence. From my point of view I can see real examples of this problem.

*Parallelism*

Parallelism represented essential aspect of the course work as described earlier in this chapter. This section describes what the participants report from their own experiences of exposure to parallelism through purposeful reading, text analysis, and structural exercises. At the beginning of the course, it was evident that the participants did not know what the term 'parallelism' means. No one answered the instructor's question about the meaning of parallel structure. They also show in the interviews that parallelism is a new structure to them. Nadia, for instance, says, "I never [experienced] parallelism before." They all state that parallelism is a technique in writing that is new to them.

Some participants report benefits toward using parallelism in their writing. Other participants report the same benefits but also mention some problems with reading and using parallelism. The findings concerning the participants' problems are described later in Chapter Five.

At the beginning of the course, Jefri had mixed feelings about using different sentence patterns and parallelism. He thought that he should not use parallel structures because these structures contradicted with using sentence patterns, which involve
using varieties of sentences. However, findings from the interview show that Jefri eventually developed a clearer image about parallelism and sentence patterns. He explained this change with direct reference to assigned reading, structure analysis in class, and exercises. He says:

The professor [taught] us that we use different patterns . . . for example, we write simple sentence and compound sentence. I [thought] we also change words in the sentence. I can not explain well . . . but we don't write parallelism. When the professor told us about parallelism I didn't get it. I did not understand it. I think I was confused. The professor asked us to read the passage and examples in the book. I saw wrong and correct sentences. We say correct if it is correct and we say wrong if it wrong.

Hafiz reports another value of teaching parallelism through assigned reading. He has developed positive attitudes toward reading and writing with relation to parallelism. He states that he has fun in reading whenever he encounters parallel structures. Furthermore, he reports that, due to integrating this aspect of his reading into his writing, he has started to examine why some patterns represent parallel structures. In his words,

I like parallelism. I make[s] me think what is parallelism and why . . . my friend asked me [to] tell him how the sentence is parallelism. I told him look! It is easy. Just look the words are like each others. I think it's . . . it is like a game. It is fun.

Run-on Sentence

All the participants report that the run-on sentence represents a major problem in their writing. Representing different language backgrounds, they reveal that their language structures are different from English. They rank the run-on sentence as one
of the major problem they have. The instructor noted that run-on sentences represented an ongoing problem throughout the course, especially at the beginning of the term.

Fatimah's experience of reading assigned articles and passages that contain highlighted sentences of correct and incorrect usages of run-on sentence structures seems to have been encouraging for her. She states that, although still struggling with run-on sentences, she has made some progress in understanding this problem. In her response on this issue, she does not explicitly refer to assigned reading, although she reports that she has performed mostly all the required assigned home reading. She explains:

Sometimes I read my paper and I read my friends' papers and can not see any run-on sentence. When my professor correct[s] my paper, I see them. I don't know why? . . . My professor said don't make too long [sentences]. I think this helped me. Now I try to write short sentences and put full stop or write compound sentence and full stop . . . this is good because I can know the sentence and know the verb and the subject and the object. If I write long sentence then I write many verbs and so on . . . The [exercise] book is good because we corrected the wrong sentence. In my last paper I [had] run-on sentence mistakes. [But there are fewer] mistakes than the previous time.

Kim Yun's response to the role of assigned reading and text analysis concerning the run-on sentence is quite similar. However, she evidently prefers analyzing structural sentences that contain run-on sentence problems to reading texts that are run-on sentence free. Specifically, she favors discussion of students' writing samples or examples from the exercise book. She expresses her opinion in these words:
I learnt a lot from the mistakes of run-on sentence. You know? We have the same mistakes. I think run-on sentence is very good . . . I mean learning run-on sentence is useful because it is difficult and we have to learn it so that we don't do it again. I like reading my friend's papers and I like um . . . the professor show[s] the mistakes of run-on sentence in papers of the students. When we open the workbook we all like it because we learnt a lot from the mistakes and the correction.

Ji Sung's experience of working on avoiding run-on sentence structures through reading modeled passages and in-class structure analysis has resulted in a belief about what he wants to write. He believes that the focus on avoiding run-on sentence errors has helped him decide exactly when he wants to say. He makes direct reference to the gains from assigned reading and text discussion. He explains:

When I first studied run-on sentence, I [thought] that I just should write good sentence without this mistake . . . I mean if I have many mistakes of run on sentence, I will get low grade. Yes, my grade was good. I also learnt that writing good sentence without run-on sentence let me think how I write . . . before, I keep writing and I don't know where I'm going. Now I write one sentence and then write the second sentence and so on . . . I know what I say. But I didn't know that because I just write . . . now I see the passages in the exercises. They are ordered. I do the same thing. I think connectors helped me much.

Hiroshi reports another benefit concerning exposure to assigned readings and he talks of the balance between aiming for length in sentences and avoiding run-on sentences. He argues that writing long sentences might impress the instructor. However, Hiroshi’s competence in combining short sentences into a single long
sentence does not seem to have helped him compose correct forms. In the course of struggling with this problem, he has developed another goal: not to always try for long sentences, as they may be incorrect. He explicitly refers to text analysis and assigned readings and student essays from the textbook as sources he has used for examples of long and short sentences. He claims that these activities have helped him reconsider his previous practice of using inaccurate long sentences. He reports:

Sometimes I write long sentence because I don't think I should write short sentences. I want to get high scores. But I'm not good [at] this. I made many mistakes of run-on sentence. The professor told me I can write long sentence if I know the connection . . . she [taught] us this. She used essays and told us to write like that. I also read the essays in the chapter. There are long and short sentences. I don't need to write long sentences all the time.

Revision

When the interviewer asked the interviewees about the kinds of revision they used to make before taking the course, their responses show that grammar and spelling received far more attention than any consideration of rhetorical structures. Weng Hong, for instance says, "I will make sure of grammar. Just like that . . . but I don't revise organization." Other participants say they used to focus on spelling when revising their writing. For example, Kim Yun says, "I go over my dictionary to fix some words, or I ask my friends." In contrast, some participants report that they did not engage in any kind of revision because they use word processing to type their homework and that word processing catches up any spelling mistake. One participant, Ji Sung, said that he revised his paper if he had time.

Based on the findings from the interviews, the participants' previous beliefs about revision have dramatically changed. The findings show that the changes fall
into three types. These involve the importance of revision, the kind of revision they make, and the strategies they use when revising. Below are the participants' opinions and some excerpts taken from their comments on revision at the end of the course.

Nadia's response echoes other participants' opinions about the importance of revision. She believes that revision is valuable because she knows what to do when she revises. Nadia describes her experience as follows:

I think revision is very important. I read my paper and fix the mistakes. I think it is very important because you can see the mistakes that you know and fix them. When I do [revise] my paper, I make my paper better . . . this is important because you need to know the mistakes in your paper also because I read good sentences and know now how I make revision.

Taiki reports that his revision in the course has included more than just grammar or spelling. He states that he has started to consider revising the elements of the thesis statement, supporting details, and structural issues. Taiki elaborates:

I check grammar because I have mistakes in grammar. I think grammar is important. Also I check my sentences . . . in the previous time I didn't check the ideas and the [problems] that I have like no good thesis statement or run-on sentence and wordiness. Now I check the grammar and the sentence level.

Kim Yun's experience with revision has revealed a strategy she uses when revising her paper. Her response has shown not only that she has made changes, as other participants do, but also that she has developed a way to deal with writing structures in her revision process. Her strategy of revision now reflect the way she deals with assigned reading, as she tried to improve her essay by consulting other essays. She says:
I understand somehow now why we read in the course. Some people when they read a book like essays they learn how to write and fix essays. So the reading will help to fix essays because [people] could think. Auu (laughing) they could realize [these kinds] of essays and have to write this way. There [are] many essays that are good and we can read our paper and read the essay to fix the mistakes.

Another participant, Hafiz, has provided a similar experience of employing reading to revise his paper. Hafiz states that he searches for online essays when revising his paper. He points out that he does this when he receives some feedback from his classmates. His purpose is to make sure the feedback he receives is accurate. He says:

Maybe I search online to get some examples of essays and correct my paper. When you read, you correct the structure of the sentence like you correct grammar. You learn how to make the sentence and learn [vocabulary] from that.

One participant, Hiroshi, reports his experience with revision from a different direction. He states that he reads some papers of his classmates and the comments they have received. He believes that they have the same problems and he can learn from their mistakes and the comments they receive. He gives an example:

If I have mistakes in wordiness or parallelism, I read some papers in the WebCT and learn from the comments . . . they don't give good comments to my paper, so I read another paper. Maybe sometimes I find good examples of the same mistake and I learn from it.

Two participants report that they deal with revision the same way the instructor has taught them. In other words, they analyze their drafts in ways similar to
what the instructor has modeled in text analysis discussions in class. One of these participants, Radziah, puts it:

After I get my first draft back, I followed what the professor did. It is very useful because I make revision to all the sentences . . . after I correct the mistakes that the professor did [i.e. marked], I read my paper again and I [analyze] . . . I see what I said in the sentence. If I like it and it is good I let it. If it is not good, I change it. I analyze the structure and see if I have good or bad.

One participant, Weng Hong, presents another strategy of dealing with revision. He considers revising his paper as doing exercises. He says, "when I revise my paper, I follow like the workbook. I read my sentence and try to fix it like we do in the exercise." Overall, the participants' attitudes about revision were positive. However, one participant, Arif, expresses anxiety when receiving his papers replete with many comments or corrections. However, at the end of the course, he joins other participants in claiming that revision has become fun because they know the kinds of the mistakes they commit, and they know how to correct them.

Part Two: Content Information

Most of the assigned readings that the participants did were irrelevant to the topics of their papers. In other words, the required readings in the textbook were mostly used to address structural issues rather than the specific topics the students were writing about. However, the findings show that the participants searched for outside sources to find more information related to their topics. Previous research shows similar findings. Raphael and Kirschner (1985) argue that in order for students to write effective expository texts, they have to acquire knowledge about the topic.
Although outside reading was not part of the requirements except for the
definition paper, I have included this section in the findings of this study for two
reasons. First, the readings that the participants did to acquire background information
from outside sources resemble the assigned readings they did to learn about structural
issues. The assigned readings were meant to expose the participants to specific
rhetorical structures; while the outside readings were used to provide the participants
with specific information about the topics. Thus, the two reading served quite distinct
purposes. Second, the participants' responses to two questions at the beginning and at
the end of the course about outside reading show parallel outcomes. At the beginning
of the course, they state that they hardly sought background information either
through reading texts or through any other sources, just as they had little awareness of
rhetorical features. In contrast, at the end of the course, they report progress on both
fronts, as they have developed positive attitudes concerning the importance of
collecting information as well writing with attention to rhetorical structures.

One participant, Hiroshi, mentions that the gains he has made in the course
have encouraged him to search for background information through outside readings.
He says that he has never read any article or essay before writing, in the way he has
done in this course. He adds, "I read my book and learnt that I can write good
sentence. So I think that I can also find good information. I don't have good
knowledge in English (laughing). I am not American." He states that reading related
to his topic has provided him with "strong information" that he has used to support his
thesis statement.

Another participant, Weng Hong, believes that the reading-writing connection
has helped him gain valuable information for himself and his paper. He mentions that
the information he gained has reminded in his mind because he has used it in his
papers. He says "I read some information in the Internet and I see if [it is] good and I can use [it] in my paper. I think my paper has important information. I also know about the [topic] now . . . my information is good about the topic. I can talk about the topic because I know now."

Another participant, Fatimah, mentions that she has sought other sources because she wanted to find relevant information about her topic sentences. She said, "I know what I want to write, but I don't have enough details to support the topic sentence. I don't have problems when I umm write the topic sentence. I just can not write examples for the topic sentence." She also mentions that she tries to evaluate the sources she finds critically. She says, "I don't find good information always. I used the Internet and read to find good ideas."

Another participant, who also sought outside readings on the Internet, mentions that the discussion lead by the instructor about the content of the assigned readings has helped him to understand the articles. He believes that this improved comprehension has motivated him to seek outside sources, to find good content for his paper, as well. He believes that using good content is essential to writing a good paper. He explains:

The professor asked us to answer the questions. If we know the answer, we tell her. If we don't know, she answered the questions. She told us to write the answers in the computer . . . I understood the passage and I write the answers. Then the professor told us to choose one or two paragraphs and we write our opinions. I think I understood the passage well and I wrote my opinion. This is good because we need to write like this. We need to write good paper . . . the good paper is good because it has good information and structure.
The participants' main problems concerning outside reading are lack of necessary knowledge and comprehension. The findings show that the participants have deficits in content knowledge, which compels them to seek outside materials. For example, Radziah compares writing in English and in her first language. She says, "in my language I can write [about] any thing. But in English I can not write [about] any thing." According to the participants' responses, most of the required readings do not relate to the content of their papers. Therefore, they seek outside sources to gain information about the topics of their papers. Weng Hong says, "I read [on] the Internet. I look for essays about the same topic." The participants' overall problems concerning reading-writing activities are discussed in the next chapter.

Motivation to Write

This section documents the effect of the course on the participants' motivation to engage in reading-writing activities.

Some participants mention that the course has influenced them to read with special focus on structure. They like assigned reading because it helps them read familiar structures that were discussed in class. For example, Ji Sung says:

I think reading now is good because I know the form of the sentence. I know if do a mistake and I try to fix it. I think it is important that you know the sentence [structure] before you read because when you read you can easily read.

Weng Hong doubts that he will engage in much writing, since he claims that he is not interested in writing. However, he does state that the course has been very helpful, and he intends to use the same procedures in his future writing courses:

I will do the same thing in the 202 class. I think the professor and the course is important. I can pass the next class if I work hard and read and write. I think
now I can do good job in the next course. My problem is that I [am] not interested in writing. I just write in school.

Some students mention that *Successful College Writing* (the main textbook) is an interesting book. Kim Yun, for instance, is motivated to keep working on her textbook even after she has finished the course. She also says that she will keep the textbook because it is helpful for her. She explains her motivation:

After the course, I will read the textbook. There are many good things that we did not study in the course. The textbook is so good because it [teaches] how to write in English. I think I need to learn other things . . . after Christmas, I will study the book . . . I don't have to look for articles because the book has good stuff.

Some participants are motivated by the confidence that they have gained from the course. They believe that their increased competence has motivated them to read and write more in future. For example, Jefri mentions that he has more confidence in his writing than ever before. He claims that this confidence motivates him to undertake more reading and writing. He says:

The course was good. I'm now sure that I know that I can write. For example, now I know organization, thesis statement, supporting details, topic sentence and the conclusion and the forms. I think I know now. In the future this will help me because I have good information about writing. Before the course I don't know writing very well. But now I know.

*Discussion*

The findings of this study concerning the attitudes of the participants toward the benefits they have gained appear to support previous research in a number of issues. It seems that the participants received little exposure to L2 literacy when they
were in their home countries. This is consistent with what other researchers claim about the experience of ESL learners (Berghoff, 1997; Eisterhold; 1990; Heller, 1991; Micek, 1994). This lack of exposure to literacy leads to lack of background knowledge and lack of awareness about the conventional modes of essays (Eisterhold, 1990). The findings from the participant's responses are consistent with these claims of Eisterhold (1990).

The findings of this study support previous research showing that extensive reading alone is not sufficient for the reading writing connection (Janopoulos, 1986). Krashen (1984) says, "reading is necessary but not sufficient for acquisition of writing competence" (p. 25). The present study shows similar findings. The participants, although reporting that they read for a few hours a week, seem not to have been able to improve their reading based on this experience. For example, Kim Yun's case, in particular, is consistent with what other researchers have claimed that the reading-writing relationship is constrained by long-term commitment to reading in L2 (Asraf & Ahmad, 2003; Krashen, 1984). Although Kim Yun has lived in the US for quite seven years before joining college, and has been to public school since the fifth grade, where she was exposed to literacy in school, her attitudes about writing and about the connection between reading at the beginning of the course seem similar to those of other participants who arrived in the US just a few weeks before the course started. This would seem surprising at first sight. However, it may simply support what Eisterhold (1990) has emphasized, namely that there is a difference between language proficiency and literacy acquisition. Kim Yun's additional years in the U.S. educational system do no seem to have resulted in a changed view of the writing process. The findings of the study concerning Kim Yun and other participants alike show that they speak fluently, yet they have limited L2 literacy.
Recall that the participants often failed to respond in class to the instructor's questions about a whole range of rhetorical features. These findings, along with the others from the current study, seem to echo other researchers' views that the reading-writing relationship should be made explicit to ESL/EFL learners through introducing text analysis and discussion (Glazer, 1973; Micek, 1994; Shanahan, 1988). In this study, the participants prefer text analysis, class discussion of structural issues, and explicit instruction to free reading because they reported that explicit connection between reading and writing has helped them to visualize the connection more closely than just reading. Leki (1993) emphasizes that the reading-writing connection should be introduced through explicit instruction because reading is "too difficult" for ESL students. The present study focuses on this aspect of explicit reading and writing connection.

The findings related to motivation show that the participants have gained motivation to read and write in the same way they have been taught. Evidently, this motivation can be described as 'intrinsic' motivation, as opposed to "extrinsic" motivation. Lepper (1988) defines intrinsic motivation "as behavior undertaken for its own sake, for the enjoyment it provides, the learning it permits, or the feelings of accomplishment it provokes" (p. 292). It is evident from the findings above that the participants' motivations are intrinsic because the students are motivated by their own desire, confidence, and ability to pursue reading and writing. Spaulding (1992) claims that when students perceive their capability to perform a task, they are likely to be intrinsically motivated to exert more efforts. Spaulding also urges writing teachers to pay attention to their students' perceived competence, for this represents an important predictor of motivation. This high level of motivation, if realized and
utilized, is likely to reinforced students to pursue reading and writing, and will thus allow them to continue improving their skills (Spaulding, 1992).

Previous research on students' beliefs and attitudes shows that students developed positive attitudes toward reading and writing in the course of training that emphasized the connection between the two. However, none of these studies determined specific improvements in the students' writing (Asraf & Ahmad, 2003). This study is significant for two reasons: first, it describes the explicit relationship between reading and writing, as seen by the students. Second, it describes not only the participants' beliefs and attitudes, but also their experiences and areas of development and difficulties. The participants reported several benefits that they have gained due to integrating reading and writing. They also reported that using explicit instruction of reading and writing had motivated them on different ways. In addition, the study is significant because it describes the problems that the participants have encountered. These problems are described next.
CHAPTER FIVE
SOME FURTHER EMERGING THEMES FROM THE STUDY

Problems of Reading and Writing

As mentioned earlier in Chapter One, this study aims at describing the participants' beliefs and experiences during an introductory college writing course that uses assigned reading and text analysis. The previous chapter was largely devoted to the progress the participants felt they made, and to their growing awareness of rhetorical structures due to their experience in the course. To complete the picture, this chapter describes the problems that the participants experience when engaging in pre-writing reading activities. This section is significant because it pinpoints where the difficulties lie based on the students' experiences. As research on the interaction between reading and writing from sources is a neglected area (Spivey, 1990), this study focuses mainly on the issue of direct writing from sources, the participant's experiences, either positive or negative, and whether they are able to employ what they read in their texts.

The problems that the participants report mainly emerge from their responses to the questions of the second interview, the mid-term interview. As stated in Chapter Three, this interview serves to record the participants' experiences during the time they were engaged in the course activities. Additionally, some other responses about the participants' problems are collected from the third interview at the end of the course. The participants' problems are described below by them. If some participants share the same problem, only one participant's response is quoted, with mention of how common the particular claim or theme was in the group as a whole.
Some participants report that the course includes many issues about writing. Their concerns are either that they do not have enough time to study or that they get confused with some structural issues. The participants who report this problem say that they may not give their papers enough attention if they run out of time when doing their assignments. They also state that, although they know that they are required to use some of the structures that they have learned, they may not bother if they do not have enough time or if they are confused about how to identify or produce the structures that have been recommended by the instructor for specific papers.

Three participants have serious concerns about the time frame. They report that they have to do several assignments for this course, such as reading one or two articles and answering the comprehension questions, preparing for the structural exercises, and writing drafts. Ji Sung describes his experience as follows:

This is the first time that I study for writing. In my home country I just write the homework. Here no. I have to study and read and write. Sometimes, I go out with my friends and come to the dorm very late . . . I try to [do] my homework but I can't. I [do] it in the morning before the class. Sometimes, I don't have time to read and answer the questions. I think the course is too much because you don't have the time to do all that.

Ji Sung’s comment suggests that he is not used to thinking of writing as a complex and demanding process. Taiki confirms Ji Sung’s idea that the work load feels heavy. He specifically is aware of himself as an ESL learner. He adds:

I think the course needs [much] homework, just as the professor say you get a lot of homework. Because we are from a foreign country, we can't do all homework. She [the professor] will write down what we have to do in the last
part of the class. I think this is good for us because sometimes maybe we don't jot down or we just maybe forget.

Hafiz expresses the same problem of work load, which he relates to his concern about the work for his other courses. He states that the course is useful, but he cannot catch up with the assignments of each course. He feels that he might improve his writing better if he did not have the pressure of the other courses. He explains his problem:

I'm taking this course and I am also studying in finance. Finance is not easy. I have to study hard. This is my first semester and I want to get high grades. You know, we have many exams. We also have to read and study...this [writing course] is good, really good. But I can't just study writing. I have to study [for] finance... I didn't have much time to spend on the last paper since I have to study from the exams of other subjects.

Again, his reference to 'just' studying writing suggests that he is encountering a new view of writing as a complex and demanding process, a concept that has not been part of his prior writing experience.

Confusion is another problem that has resulted from work load. Jefri mentions some confusion he has about bringing reading and writing together, which has made him constantly compare the rhetorical structures that he reads with what he writes. According to Jefri, this has caused confusion for him. The following excerpt points out Jefri's problem:

Most of the time, I don't know how to start writing a paper. So I read the article in the syllabus and try to see the introduction. My paper is about compare and contrast but the article is not so clear... I think this is problem because I want to write but the article is difficult... in the compare and
contrast paper, I did not find the thesis statement. I also sometimes find the
structures of my paper [are] too similar. I read the structures in the essay and I
don't know I write like that.

Fatimah reports a problem similar to Jefri’s. However, Fatimah’s confusion
pertains to the different types of expository modes that were introduced with the
readings as models. She mentions that she has learned about many kinds of expository
essay types during this one course. Additionally, she states that she has to read about
each mode. Fatimah begins to feel confused in the middle of the course when the
number of essay types reaches three. It is at this time that she reports that she has
begun to confuse the different kinds of rhetorical modes. Fatimah narrates her
experience as follows:

I study different papers. I learn cause and effect and compare and contrast and
argument and also definition. The first article that I studied was not difficult.
After four weeks, I did not know well. I mean I have to study hard because the
definition paper is not like the compare and contrast. The argument paper, you
have to say why the [topic] is good or bad. But I have to know how I say that.
In the compare and contrast paper, you have to compare between two things. It
is the same like the argument paper (laughing). I think I need to learn by heart
how I write the papers because I mixed them.

Another participant, Hiroshi, provides a specific example for the difficulty that
he has faced while working on his argumentative paper. His problem is "[reading] two
subjects so that [he can] write the argumentative paper." He says that he has to read
two sources and understand them so that he can use the information to support his
claims and argue for them. His problem gets worse when he starts to "memorize the
information." He resorts to memorization from one text because he wants to be able to
recall the information when reading the other text, which represents the other side of the argument. He keeps going back and forth between the two texts so that he can reproduce the claims and the supporting ideas for them.

Finally, Hafiz reports what can be described to be a 'psychological' problem. He is worried about the demand to write well-structured and informative papers. The instructor insists that he has to try to write a good paper using assigned readings and the structural issues discussed in class. He says that he has understood this demand, but points out that he "didn't fully understand all the structures in the reading." He points to a kind of tension between content and form when he says he feels that he has "to read one article to find good information and one article to find good structures." He mentions that he knows what to write but does not know how to write it. Hafiz feels that this has caused "pressure on [him] to use the structures that the professor explained," a task that seems beyond his abilities, judging from his responses.

This problem of using both information and text structures from sources represents a major difficulty that consumes much time and puts pressure on the participant students. Since most of the participants are experiencing this kind of reading-writing connection for the first time, they may lack strategies for drawing writing ideas from source texts that they read. A similar problem was first reported by Raphael (1988) who found that students' problems with reading texts is caused by a lack of procedures to use the texts for getting ideas and arranging them.

**Sentence Structures**

The participants report that they have learned about sentence structures or sentence patterns through text analysis and assigned readings. Taiki is one of those who made this claim. However, Taiki stated that he has encountered a problem with complex sentences. Specifically, he feels he understands when the instructor uses
texts to illustrate different types of sentence patterns. But he has experienced
difficulties when asked to identify advanced types of sentence patterns, such as
complex sentences or compound complex sentences. Taiki explains his problem in
these words:

I read the article and didn't find any complex sentence. I'm sure that there are
complex sentences in the article because the professor told us so. But I can not
easily find them. In the beginning I asked my friend to help me because it is
difficult . . . I read and read but I can't see it. The essay in the book is very
difficult. It is not all the time help[ing] me.

Parallel Structures

Some participants report that it is the first time they have encountered the
concept of parallelism. For example, Nadia said, "I never [experienced] parallelism
before." Other participants report that they misunderstand parallelism because it has
been introduced to them after sentence patterns. In other words, where the earlier unit
involved the students' writing specific sentence types, the unit on parallelism asks
them to use parallel structures, regardless of what sentence or phrase type is in
question. Some participants seem to think that parallelism involves the same thing as
sentence patterns—a new structure, not a way of manipulating virtually any structure
in the language. One participant, Arif, reports that he has understood the instructor's
explanation of parallelism through text analysis, but, when reading, he does not find
similar sentences that contain clear parallel structures. Although he reports that he
"did not always have this problem," he feels disappointed when not finding clear
structures to those he has experienced as illustrative examples in class. He explains
his problem as follows:
I understand what the teacher say[s]. I know parallelism. The problem with me is I read in the textbook and I don't see this structure. Sometimes I don't understand how this structure is parallelism. When I don't understand it, I become . . . um I hate it. I feel I read but the reading [doesn't] help me (laughing).

Fatimah's problem involves using parallelism in writing. She tries to use this structure to impress her instructor; but she has not been able to use it, although she claims she has understood it. Fatimah is not able to provide more explanation about her problem. All she says is that she wants to use parallelism, but does not know how to start the structure and what type of structural elements she should use. Fatimah emphasizes this discontinuity between passive and active knowledge about parallelism in these words:

[Parallelism] is easy. But it is difficult when I write it. I don't know how I write it . . . yeah, when I read it I understand it but not easy when you use it in your paper. I think the reading is helping me to understand it but when I want to use it, it is not easy. I always try to use it in my paper but not always I know. It is good for the paper . . . it is good because my paper become[s] strong.

Run-on Sentences

Most of the participants report a useful link between assigned reading and writing in avoiding problems with run-on sentences. However some participants have experienced difficulties regarding reading some texts that are run-on sentence free or passages that contained run-on sentence structures. The problem seems to be related to what theoretical linguists call one form of 'negative evidence.' The students feel they are admonished to read texts that do not contain the very structure they are supposed to learn to avoid.
Kim Yun is one of the participants who complain about run-on sentences. If she wants to work on run-on sentence instances, she feels it will not help her to read texts that do not have run-on sentence problems she feels she is not able to benefit from them if they are structurally correct and do not offer her examples of the form she needs to avoid. Kim Yun says:

I can't know if there is any run on sentence when the sentence is correct. I can not know how I t can be run on sentence. When the professor told us to read the article, I did not know where this problem was. She said, “Look for sentences that are good and do not have run on sentence." The article is in the newspaper. English newspapers is correct. I think it is hard to find wrong sentences. I read the article and all the sentences are right . . . I think it is difficult because the article is correct.

Another participant, Ji Sung, reports another problematic issue. Although his problem is applicable to any structural issue, he mentions it when he is speaking of run-on sentences. He seems to be concerned about reading a whole article with a requirement to focus only on one or two structural issues. He talks about this issue as follows:

I feel the course is so slow. It is boring sometimes because I read the homework and I just look for one thing. We read the article in the book and I felt too bad. It is like we have to find just run-on sentence. I want to read what I want to read. But I have to read because I want to pass the course.

**Content Structures**

This issue of the content information represents a major problem to the participants, as most of them report that they have lacked the required knowledge to write more detailed papers. The participants feel they need to resort to outside
readings to make up for their insufficient knowledge of content. The issue of content is described in detail in chapter four. The participants seek out readings to search for information for their papers, and as they do so, they encounter a range of problems.

One participant, Nadia, describes her frustration with using very "professional" pieces of information. She is worried that her instructor may think that this piece of information does not reflect her own knowledge about the topic. She is also nervous that the instructor may think that she uses the information without knowing the meaning of it. Nadia reveals her fear as follows:

I read good information, but I don't use [it]. The professor will know I didn't write it . . . she will know I did not come up with the information. Sometimes, I really like the information . . . [It is] just good for my paper but I don't use [it] because [it is] professional . . . in this case, I try to read and find [other] information.

Some participants describe a related problem they have encountered involving the difficulty to locate suitable information for their papers. This problem is mentioned briefly in the previous chapter, where it noted that the participants have problems with comprehension. Hafiz, for example, reports that he uses some information from the text, but he is not always able to locate the other information needed for his argument paper. He also states that since he has started getting valuable information from sources, he has felt obliged to keep searching for other information of the same quality. He considers this problematic to him, as he feels he is just imitating other writers and never using his own ideas. In a response in which he also talks of the difficulty of finding information, he says:

I read online. I usually use Google and Yahoo. The problem [is that] I can't sometimes read find the good information. I read the paragraph but not
understanding what the information [is]. Sometimes there are many [pieces of] information. It is hard to find the information. I also do not like that we always read and get the information. I want to say something but I can't because I mentioned information from the Internet . . . and I have to mention all the information like this way.

Finally, Radziah mentions that she has a problem focusing on both content information and sentence structure. She considers this problematic to her because when she "focuses on content, she feels she cannot give equal attention to structure and vice versa. In other words, when she has problems with structure, she may work on these at the expense of providing detailed information.

*Common Grammar Errors*

The findings of this study, although focusing on rhetorical structures, obviously revealed that the participants have serious grammatical problems. Although these problems did not emerge from engagement in reading and writing activities, as opposed to the problems discussed above, they are included in this study because all the participants reported that they have serious problems with grammar when writing. In fact, some excerpts from the verbatim participants' responses that have been quoted throughout this study show that they have serious mistakes. The grammatical mistakes they either reported or committed include spelling, punctuations, subject-verb agreement, verb tense, and auxiliaries. The findings of grammatical mistakes are elicited from interviews, and writing samples. Responses from the interviews show what mistakes the participants have grabbed with and how they have perceived their grammatical mistakes. Writing samples are used to scan other problems that they did not report in the interviews and to cite some examples of grammatical errors.
Evidence from Interviews: All the participants report that grammar is very crucial to their writing. Radziah, for instance, mentions that grammar represents a major weakness to her writing. In the first interview, at the beginning of the study, she did not report any information about her weaknesses or strengths except grammar. Radziah, likewise, still has the same concern at the end of the course. Radziah explains her concern about grammar:

I have many mistakes in grammar. In every sentence, I have mistakes. I studied grammar in my home country but I still do mistakes. The professor told me that I have many mistakes. If I know the mistakes I try to correct the mistakes. Sometimes I don't know the correction. I now have mistakes in grammar.

Ji Sung agrees with Radziah. He also believes that grammatical problems affect his writing process. In his words,

In the previous times, I have difficulties in grammar. Now I think when I write, I can't write because I know that my paper has many mistakes . . . I think I have to correct the mistakes so that I can write. The professor used my paper in the class and talked about the grammar mistakes . . . umm like the spelling, the subject-verb, and agreement.

Hiroshi expresses similar concerns about grammar. He states that he has developed in writing structures but still having some grammatical mistakes. For example, he says that he writes different sentences patterns, but he makes mistakes with verb tenses and subject-verb agreement.

The course is good but we didn't study grammar much. I know that this course is about writing but grammar is part [of] writing. The professor told us that we correct the [grammatical] errors but we did not take many lessons about
grammar. For example, I can write compound sentence but you can see that I have [grammatical] mistakes in it.

However, some participants' responses reveal that integrating grammatical instruction along with discussion of rhetorical structures is effective and useful. They refer to situations when the instructor discusses common grammatical mistakes during text analysis of their writings. Although they have similar attitudes toward grammar, they report that they have worked hard the problems that have been addressed. Yet, they did not name specific grammatical features. For example, Taiki explains,

I still have [grammatical] mistakes. I like to be able to correct my mistakes but mostly I don't know them all. But when I write now, I [pay] attention to the errors that we do all . . . I like that I don't do the same errors that the professor told us. I try my best.

Evidence from writing samples: This section provides short excerpts from the participants' writings that show some common grammatical mistakes. The following table shows the sentences and the types of the grammatical mistakes. Each sentence has some words highlighted that represent the types of the grammatical mistakes I write the sentences with the grammatical mistakes highlighted. Sometimes the sentences have more mistakes than the ones highlighted, but they are ignored so that the focus in each sentence is on one type of mistake. Any type of mistake that is ignored in a sentence is demonstrated in another sentence. Finally, the sentences used in the table are single, but I make sure that the mistakes are obvious.

Table 4- Grammar Mistakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Types of Mistake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If someone walk on the naked feet they get hurt.</td>
<td>subject-verb agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The empty bottle leave there may become a dangerous to the person who walks over there (indefinite article with adjective)</td>
<td>indefinite article with adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If <strong>youngsters</strong> step on it, <strong>he</strong> or <strong>she</strong> may get hurt and <strong>it</strong> can be cure in short period.</td>
<td>antecedent (noun-pronoun agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They did not care that what we <strong>having</strong> in previous time.</td>
<td>auxiliary missing with 'have'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 18th century, the <strong>bride will be</strong> wear in a pure white wedding dress and cover with a white silk veil.</td>
<td>Verb tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If elderly step on it, they may .... serious injured</td>
<td>fragment (lacking verb after 'may')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People was</strong> feel that’s not enough for that</td>
<td>subject verb-agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The crushed of the bottle will cause the car’s tire puncture.</strong> The crushed of the bottle may cause the puncture of the car.</td>
<td>Redundancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although there are significant differences between <strong>two wedding ceremony</strong></td>
<td>Agreement (two + ceremony) + fragment (dependent clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our world, we are having many <strong>kind</strong> of different <strong>way of wedding.</strong></td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <strong>way they are having wedding</strong> are different</td>
<td>subject-verb agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the text, part time job will cause several bad effects to <strong>a students.</strong> First of all, working more hours will affect <strong>your</strong> health</td>
<td>antecedent + article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>And a people</strong> who <strong>works</strong> are common to become <strong>an alcoholic</strong></td>
<td>misuse of article + subject-verb agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

As the above findings show, a considerable part of the problems reported by participants relate to the nature of reading and writing in L2. Leki (1993) considers reading extremely difficult for nonnative speakers. However, previous studies have not addressed the problems that reading difficulty poses for the reading-writing connection. This study partially describes these problems in documenting the difficulty participants had with understanding the assigned readings, identifying the rhetorical features in these readings, and most important, adapting these structures to their own writing. Although readings were assigned to help students enhance their writing, responses from the interviews show that this activity is at best problematic.

The participants also report that the course includes what they perceive as a heavy work load. In previous courses, writing has involved a simple, one-step
process. In contrast, they now encounter a set of course requirements which includes reading assigned articles, answering comprehension questions, doing structural exercises, analyzing rhetorical structures, writing drafts, and preparing for class discussion. They are now further required to define their thesis statement carefully, to plan their writing strategy in detail, and to attend to the particular mode they are writing in (argumentative, comparison-contrast, etc.). They feel that this new set of requirements constitutes too much work. Moreover, since they are not accustomed to associating these activities with writing, they easily dismiss them if they need to attend to their other course work. Some participants report that they might not read all the required readings if they had exams. Others report that they stop reading if they become frustrated with hard vocabulary items. They believe that adding reading assignments to writing makes writing more demanding; this suggests that, despite their positive general statements, they may not have a deeply internalized feeling that their work with the readings will help them write better. Researchers call for the attention of teachers to avoid such a problem.

The participants certainly raise a valid issue when they complain about having a heavy work load. Researchers have long been aware of this problem; for example, Schmidt (2002) states that required texts and course materials should be manageable and interesting. In this case, I understand that some articles in the textbook are authentic texts. In principle, this is desirable; however, some may be difficult for the participants, who are ESL students and have little experience with reading such texts. This problem was not on my agenda originally. However, it has emerged as a potentially useful result, as it can serve as evidence of a problem to be avoided in the future. One possible solution for this problem is to introduce the reading-writing connection early instead of squeezing it into one course relatively late in the ESL
learner’s target language experience. Shahana (1988) emphasizes that the reading-writing connection should be presented early to maximize the usefulness of such integration; the responses from participants in this study provide additional motivation for implementing this suggestion.

Based on the findings concerning structural problems, that the participants have, such as run-on sentences, wordiness, awkward sentence patterns, and lack of parallelism, it seems again that it is important to integrate reading and writing early, so that reading texts will serve to present concrete examples of good writing to the developing writer. Researchers such as Carson and Leki, (1993) and Shahana (1988) strongly recommend explicit teaching of structures by use of reading. More specifically, Kroll (1993) emphasizes that teachers discuss with students their specific choices of words and structures from the reading so that they can address them more vigilantly. The responses reported above suggest that this is no easy task, but that it requires considerable adjustment on the learner’s part, and should therefore be a regular part of language instruction from an early stage.

In addition, the participants reported a problem that was recurring with them even before the course started. This problem is about grammar. Although this problem did not emerge from engagement in reading and writing activities, as opposed to the problems discussed above, it is included in this study because all the participants consistently reported that they have serious grammatical mistakes either at the beginning or at the end of the study. This problem is described below.

Furthermore, the findings show that the participants have serious problems with grammar. These findings support the findings of other studies conducted by Glossner (1990) who studied college students' personal constructs for writing and found that students reported concerns about their grammatical weakness in their
writing. The findings of the current study also support the findings of studies conducted to describe the experiences of ESL learners with extensive reading (Alshamrani (2003) and EFL learners' beliefs about their problems with writing (Alfageeh, 2004).

**Strategies for Using Reading Sources for Writing**

In initiating this study, I intended in part to describe what strategies the participants employ when writing from texts. I was particularly interested in exploring the strategies they have used which may provide useful insights to teachers, educators, or course designers. However, the participants' responses to this particular theme reveal very brief answers. Some participants answer with "I followed what the professor told us." Other participants mention that they just read and write. Only one participant, Weng Hong, responds with more elaboration, though he, too, avoids specific detail. He says, "From the professor's comments on other's paper, I learned what's important for certain papers and what we should be care, and I would do the same thing when I analyze my paper."

In referring to the teacher's instructions, the students at least indirectly evoke the instructor’s urging them to use the structural issues that were discussed in class; they also acknowledge the activities they carried out with structural exercises in the writer's book. In addition, they are explicitly aware of using readings to look for new vocabulary items to use in their papers. Finally, some participants mention that they have used some strategies with text revision. Although the instructor did not explicitly recommend these strategies in the revision stage, 6 participants (Weng Hong, Jefri, Kim Yun, Hiroshi, Nadia, and Taiki) reported that they have revised their papers the same way the instructor analyzed texts (see the section on revision in Chapter Four).
Only one participant, Weng Hong, mentions that he has used planning as a way to arrange information that he has gained from reading. He believes that arranging so much information requires planning. However, he does not elaborate more on this issue. All that he says concerning planning of information is "I plan what I want to write because I read [much] information. I think I should organize the information." Previously, he adds, "I focus[ed] on spelling and grammar . . . now I need information and plan it and make sure the structure is correct."

All the participants reported that they visited the Writing Center as a way to seek help, usually after receiving feedback from the instructor. Most started visiting the Writing Center regularly at the Middle of the course. Only one participant reports that he has been visiting the Writing Center since the beginning of the course. Upon going to the Writing Center, they inform the tutors that they are looking for editing on structural levels and grammar. Some participants report that they have prepared some structural issues to consult the tutors about them. Most of these structures are the ones raised in the class. Specifically, each participant is concerned more about the structures that he or she has problems with.

Some participants reported that they discussed some structures or paper organization with their friends. They mentioned that they do this because they want to make sure their structures or punctuation are correct, especially when using a variety of sentence patterns. Two participants, who were roommates, reveal that they have discussed the differences between compound and complex sentences, and that this discussion has helped them develop their awareness about sentence structures. Fatimah, reports that she phones her friend and discusses with her the content of an assigned article. She says that she has done this three or four times. Her friend calls her two times to talk to her about "formats and the title."
Finally, Hafiz reports that he has ordered his time so that he has enough time for reading and enough time for writing. However, he has done this only for the last paper, because he believes that "time is now very important. We have to read and write." He mentions that he does better when he has enough time reading and enough time for writing. Presumably, he either has become aware of the time element from experience, or is more focused on it because of the demands of other courses at the end of the term.

Text Features

I discussed with the participants some samples of their papers that they have written for the class. I collected the samples from WebCT where the students posted their assignments. All the samples have been graded before I have collected them. In this part of our interview, participants comment on some structural issues they have used in the samples. They were also given the chance to analyze their writings and explain their choices. Some participants enjoyed demonstrating their writings to me. They state that it is interesting to present their writing structure and content to someone. However, the aim of this method is to see concrete evidence of the effects of instruction, other than what the participants have reported. Additionally, as stated earlier, the aim of this method is to triangulate the findings of the study with other methods of data collection (see Chapter Three). This technique also aims at getting some sense of the ways in which their writings have developed over the course.

Accordingly, I met with each participant and discussed selections from their writings, using hard copies of the papers so as to have the instructor's comments on hand, as the online copies do not include such comments. As described above, the participants willingly shared their experiences, explaining their choice of written structures, and reporting problems about some structures marked by the instructor.
Below are some samples of their papers, together with their comments and explanation.

The sample below is from Kim Yun's first assignment:

I think this little girl shouldn't throw this empty bottle on the ground. Ground is not only for this girl. If she throws the one empty bottle every day then after day and days the street will become garbage bump. Also someday someone could trip over and maybe they have to have an operation. If little girl did not throw bottle then cleaners do not have to clean the street.

The participant wrote this text at the time when the instructor was introducing the thesis statement and its features. It is evident that this text lacks essential elements of the essay. The procedures of discussion that the participant and I hold is as follows: the researcher asks the student to comment on her text. Noticing some other important elements that needed to be discussed, I raised some questions about some elements of the text and had the student commented on her piece. The participant comments on her own piece as follows:

I don't have introduction. I just wrote my idea without writing the introduction. I know it is short, too--- laughing. I didn't write full topic. This is my first paper, you know. I think my papers are better now . . . I don't have thesis statement . . . also no conclusion.

The participant agrees with me about some other suggestions that this piece needs, such as title, details, punctuation. In fact, I told the participant that there are no more comments because the text has lacked essential elements. The participant agrees with me with a smile on her face.

The same participant's later sample of the same assignment she writes is provided below. This sample receives the same procedures of discussion that the first one does. This sample is written after two weeks of text analysis and exposure to
modeling articles from either the text book or the writer's book. The sample below shows more improvement, especially in organization, although still needing more development. The sample is shown below and followed by the participant's comments about the text.

Article of The Boor Was, a teen-age girl threw the empty bottle on the ground, but as soon as Mrs. Seigel asked teen-age girl that pick that bottle up. Mrs. Seigle did an awfully good job. The empty bottle could be dangerous to people. For example: babies, older people and also blind people. Community has to hire someone that has to clean the street. And also, if town is dirty then visitors might think this town is very dirty so I do not want to come this town any more.

The empty bottle could be dangerous for the babies, elder people, and blind people. Babies the can no walk very well thus, babies could trip over because of the bottle. Also babies’ skin is especially sensitive so they have wound easier then an older people. But the problem for the elder people is old people’s bones are more prone to fracture. One of my English teacher in high school, she fall down on the stair because of the bottle. She had to have a major operation three times, thus, she could not come to the school half year. Most dangerous situation is when blind person falls down. Blind people cannot see so they use a stick to find what is on the ground or way to the place. But then if he/she did not find this little bottle on the ground then they will easily trip over.

Community has to hire someone for clean the street or buy the machine. Nowadays tons of people throwing the garbage on the ground, so community hired people for clean the street or buy the clean machines. That community pays the cleaner or machine from our tax. And also because of that people how lives in this town they have to pay more tax than before. Some group of people could think I will threw the rubbish on the ground because I pay my tax and community pays to the cleaner. When they have thins thought people threw the more rubbish on the ground, after few days latter you can see more cleaner and clean machine. That means you have to pay more tax than before.
Finally, if your town is dirty then visitors might think your town is very dirty so I do not want to come this town any more. That could be a serious problem for the town community. Most of town has the main street that has shopping malls or restaurant and those shops are paying the most of money for the tax but if people do not come to the main street then they can not make money also that means they can not pay tax if that happen community has any money to pay all the public systems that they had.

Many people threw the rubbish on the street because it is not his/her property so they think they can make dirty, but they have to know the empty bottle could be dangerous for the babies, elder people, and blind people. Community has to hire someone for clean the street or buy the machine. And also if your town is dirty then visitors might think your town is very dirty so I do not want to come this town any more. Thus, my final thought is do not threw the rubbish on the ground.

This sample evidently shows much improvement comparing to the first sample discussed above. The participant mentions that she has written this sample after she has been introduced to organization of the essay. She refers to the first sample and states that she "did not know that [she has] to write this organization." However, she seems to be confident about the overall organization of the second sample. She says, "I think this is better because I organized the paragraphs." She also mentions that she is aware that the first paragraph has contained the thesis statement. She reads the thesis statement making sure it is there. Additionally, she matches her statement with the rest of the paragraphs confirming that each paragraph is related to the thesis statement.

I discussed with the participant some issues that she does not bring up. For example, I brought her attention that this text does not have a title. Furthermore, I discussed with her the thesis statement. Although she comments positively about it, she welcomes my comments about the thesis statement that it is stated in more than
one sentence. Instead, I added, the thesis statement should be composed in one sentence with the inclusion of the essential elements that control the whole essay. She replies, "yeah, I know that now."

Moreover, I discussed some word choices and sentence structures with the participant writer. For example, I have noticed that she has used the phrasal verb *trip over*. She mentions that it is her first time to use this phrasal verb. She says that she has used this phrasal verb because it is used in the reading, and because it is the best verb that communicates the meaning. I have also noticed some mistakes in this text. We had a brief discussion in which she mentioned that these mistakes are so common with her even earlier than she took this course. Some of these mistakes are, spelling, punctuation including comma splice, run-on sentence, and sentence fragment and lack of cohesion and coherence. The participant mentions that this text does not reflect her overall improvement because this text is the second assignment that she did in the course, and that her writing skills have improved as she worked on her problems through use of reading models. The next sample is one of her samples that she has written in the middle of the course.

**Abortion is Murder**

Abortion is one of the most hard about topics today in society. Abortion is that act killing a human before it is even born into the world. Many people have different views if it is right for a woman to have an abortion or not. The people on both sides of this topic have reasoning for their own way of thinking.

Personally, I have known people that have had abortions, but I technically have no experience in having an abortion due to my physical aspects. I am against abortion though, and I wish that, if it were possible, it be outlawed or at least contained being performed in accredited hospitals and institutions. If abortion is undeniable, and yet some people feel that it should be just a personal matter between a woman and the doctor, it leads me to think
they would believe that other acts of destruction of human beings such as infanticide and homicide should be of no concern to society and therefore eliminate them from the criminal code.

This, I cannot believe, is the thinking of the majority, although the tendency for doctors to respect the selfish desire of parents and not treat the newborn defective with a necessary lifesaving measure is becoming increasingly more common. Those pressing for repeal of the abortion laws believe that there are different sorts of human beings and that by some arbitrary standard, they can place different values on their lives. Of course, different human beings have different values to each of us as individuals: my mother means more to me than she does to you. However, the right to live of all human beings is undeniable. I do not think that those are negotiable. It's easy to be concerned with the welfare of those we know and love, while regarding everybody else as less important and somehow, less real. Most people would rather hear about the death of thousands in the Honduras flooding disaster than of a serious accident involving a close friend or favorite relative. That is why some are less disturbed by the slaughter of thousands of unborn children than by the personal problems of a pregnant woman across the street. To rationalize this double standard, they pretend to themselves that the unborn child is a less valuable human life because it has no active social relationships and can therefore be disposed of by others who have an arbitrary standard of their own for the value of a human life.

As an opponent to abortion, I will readily agree, as will all those who are against abortion, that pregnancy resulting from rape or incest is a tragedy. Rape is a detestable crime, but no sane reasoning can place the slightest blame on the unborn child it might produce. The act of rape or incest is emotional and physical trauma to the young girl or woman. Should we compound the psychic scar already inflicted on the mother by her having the guilt of destroying a living being, which was partially hers? Throughout history, pregnant women who for one crime or another were sentenced to death were given a stay of execution until after the delivery of the child: it being the contention of courts that one could not punish the innocent child for the crime of the mother. Can we punish it for a crime against the mother? In conclusion,
I hate to think of the fact of the many women in this world that partake in abortions.

Abortions are a terrible act and it should be viewed just as if a full-grown adult was killed. The people in society that support abortions should have some sense smacked into them because if it was their own life that had to be decided on, they would most definitely choose life instead of death. For the women that are raped by other men, I truly do feel sorry that they were forced into the act of having sex instead of deciding when they wanted to, but abortion shouldn't be thought of, no matter what the circumstances are.

The women that choose to have abortion on demand should feel ashamed of themselves because they are not smart enough to realize the responsibilities of having sex. So, the next time you think of even attempting an abortion, please do not because you are not being fair with life.

This text, although not the last paper she writes in the course, virtually shows the student's writing development. The above essay is the third one among five papers that she has written throughout the course. This sample seems to be more developed than the first two samples. For example, this sample has a title, unlike the first and the second samples that do not include titles. Furthermore, she said that she has followed the same organizational structure of the articles in Mc Whorter's book. She also said that she has written the thesis statement in "one sentence and it is clear." The thesis statement in this text includes controlling elements which controls the rest of the essay. She has made fewer punctuation mistakes than the in the previous essay. For example, she uses commas to join compound sentences. She commented on that stating that punctuations are very important to avoid run-on sentence and other grammatical mistakes. Unlike the previous essay, this essay contains fewer run-on sentence problems. Yet, she has some structures that are run-on sentence (see the second paragraph). Furthermore, it is evident that this essay includes more detailed information than the previous one. She mentioned that she read outside texts and
found plenty of information. I asked her about some words that she has used in the text, such as "outlawed," "infanticide," "pressing," "repeal," etc. She answered that she used some of the words from online text and some from a magazine she has a home. She also mentioned that she did not know of these words before writing the essay.

However, the participant has made some mistakes concerning run-on sentence and punctuation mistakes. She has noticed that she still makes such mistakes, but she says she is much better now. She also has some problems with antecedent pronouns. The participant states that she has received some comments from the instructor about the thesis statement and the topic sentences of this essay. She finally stated that this essay is the first argumentative essay she wrote.

Another participant's sample is mentioned below. This sample shows the participant writer's limited knowledge about organization at the beginning of the course. It also shows that the writer has not provided enough information. This sample is:

**THE BOOR WAR (OPINION)**

In my point of view, I think this teen-age girls should not threw the empty bottle on the ground. It is extremely dangerous to others especially elderly and children. Besides, throwing bottle empty bottles also descend the country's reputation of cleanliness. Furthermore, it will cause pollution too.

The participant mentions that he has understood how he writes an essay. The following outline shows the participant's improvement on sentence level, paragraph level, and structure level. Although not developed yet, it shows that the participant knows what to say and how to say it. Yet, the outline below shows some structural problems. For example, paragraph four does not relate to the thesis statement. Additionally, there are subject-verb agreement mistakes, problems of antecedent pronouns, and spelling mistakes. The participant's sample reads:
Introduction: I think the girl should not throw a bottle on the street, leaving a bottle on the street is extremely dangerous because it may cause personal injure.

Thesis statement: Leaving a bottle on the street is extremely dangerous because it may cause personal injure.

Topic sentence 1: Young children may get injure from those empty bottle.  
S1: They may accidentally swallow those broken bottle pieces.  
S2: They will be cut when they try to pick up those broken bottle.  
S3: When they walking on the street, it is possible to trip by a bottle and fall down.  
S4: They may cause people injure when they play with a broken bottle.

Topic sentence 2: Elder may not walk forever because of this empty bottle.  
S1: They may easily fall down by stepping on the round bottle.  
S2: Broken bottle may cut their leg when they wearing slipper.  
S3: Tripped by a bottle can result them knocked by incoming car.  

Topic sentence 3: Disable people are under dangerous situation on the street.  
S1: They will be cut by stepping on a broken bottle.  
S2: Bottle may get their way when they are on a wheelchair.  
S3: They may fall down by stepping on a bottle and knock by a car.  
S4: They will suffer because when they fall down, they can’t even ask for help if they are mute.

Topic sentence 4: The thrown bottle is dangerous to the environment.  
S1: The bottle can be a larval habitat for flies.  
S2: Disease can easily spread because the cleanliness of the street.  
S3: It cannot be recycled because it left on the street.

Conclusion: The girl should no throw a bottle on the street, because of a small little bottle, it make our life in a dangerous way.

More samples of the participants' writings are included in Appendix F.

Readers'-Writers' Awareness of Audience

Although the participants are required, as part of the course, to make peer review and to post their papers online, which means that papers are available for other students to read them at any time, the participants do not seem to consider their audience seriously when writing. Their responses concerning awareness about audience have shown different attitudes. Some participants report that they never care
about their readers. Others seem to consider their readers in terms of sharing experiences but not when writing.

Some participants' responses reveal that they have not considered at all about who they write for or why they write what. One participant says, "I dunno, but I just write the homework." The participants who did not consider their readers state that the most important audience they care for is only the instructor. Radziah says, "I care much about my instructor but I don't care about my peers." Yet most of the participant reported that they did not mind having their papers read by other students. For example, Fatimah mentions that she feels "normal" if she knows that other students read her paper. She also says that having her papers read by other students does not make any difference about the way she writes.

On the contrary, Kim Yun strongly dislikes having her papers read by others. In fact, she feels anxious about her papers being read by other students. This anxiety has resulted from her awareness of writing proficiency level. She does not like others to read her papers because she thinks her paper is not understandable. She puts it, "I care about [my peers]. I feel bad for them because sometimes my paper is very hard to be understood because my vocabs is not right." Therefore, her preference was that she does not "want other people to read [her] paper."

Three participants do not care about having their papers read by others, either. For them, they have to write anyway regardless of the readers. Yet, they mention that they welcome the idea of sharing papers with each other to "exchange opinions," but they do not seem to care about their readers when engaging in writing although they know that three or four students will read their papers and provide comments to them.
Peer Responses to Writing

As described earlier in chapter four that the participants do not seem to take peer reading seriously in class, the verbatim responses have answered some questions that were not obtained from just observing them. The participants mention that, sometimes during peer reading, they are chat with their classmates because they know that peer review and the feedback they have gained from their peers are not graded or counted as part of the final grade. They mentioned that they are required to respond to papers regardless of the quality of their responses although the instructor urges them to read carefully and provide in-depth comments.

Other responses explain why participants do not react seriously to peer reading in class. These responses have revealed that accessing WebCT off-campus gave them another choice to read papers and respond to them instead of one choice, i. e. in class. For example, Ji Sung says that most of the comments that he has provided are done from his computer at home.

Some participants claim that the feedback they have received from their peers are not useful. Others state that they are confusing. For example, Hafiz says that sometimes he gets confused when he reads the students' responses. He explains, "I don't know [if] the comments they gave me [are] not correct or not… we learn together, but the comments might be wrong also." Others claim that most comments are on organization or thesis statements which are already discussed in class. In other words, participants get bored working on the same issues. Furthermore, Nadia, mention that the feedback is mostly on structure and nothing is on the content. Nadia describes her own way of providing comments, "I give feedback on text organization and paragraph levels, like the whole essay and how it is organized and connected."

Similarly, she describes the comments she has received:
most [comments] are about the organization like whether I have a good thesis, a proper topic sentence. They usually don't comment on the content of my papers . . . I think the best comments [are] on the content. As I mentioned before, they seldom comment on the contents. But I think comments on the contents are also very important because we are not just writing out the organization or grammar, but contents, as my own opinion is the most important part of a paper. So I think the best comments are on the contents.

Based on the above findings, the participants appear to consider the instructor the only audience they write for. They assume that giving their papers the attention required by the instructor is sufficient for the audience, too. None of them appears to write more carefully even if know their classmates will read their papers. Additionally, they seem to pay more attention to structure and organization when responding to each other because this is the focus of the course, which seems to affect other aspects of the reading-writing relationships, such as reader-writer connection. Furthermore, most of the participants prefer the instructor's feedback to their classmates' feedback. They consider the instructor feedback much more valuable and insightful. Therefore, they apparently seem to underestimate the comments from other students, which affect their awareness of their readers. Still, the class never discusses the quality of feedback as the participants seem to lack experiences in peer reading or peer feedback, in particular, and in reading-writing connection, in general.

The participants' level of awareness about their audience in this study sounds reasonable because this kind of connection between the writer and the audience represents one aspect of the reading-writing connection that is not emphasized in the course. Moreover, this connection takes a long time and involves much exposure to
literacy and interest as the course focuses mainly on assigned reading from sources and text analysis.

Participants' Advice to Future Students

The participants have last word to say at the end of the study. They provided pieces of advice to other students who may find this study applicable to them in terms of their experiences with L2 and the writing course integrates reading as a means to enhance writing. Based on the findings of this study, the participants' beliefs about writing and about the relationship between reading and writing have changed. Therefore, it is interesting to have a glimpse of the participants view for future students who will take ESL college writing. The participants were requested to offer pieces of advice for future students. Below are some of the students' responses.

Some advice shows to urge students coming from high schools to seize the moment when taking the course. Kim Yun's offers her advice:

I will ask them [future students] to forget what they studied in high school. if they want to learn writing, this course is very important. We do learn writing in high school. I will tell them to keep an essay and discuss how they organize it. I think college course is the best.

Weng Hong realizes the important of the course and accordingly offers his advice as follows:

I would tell the students try to be serious and pay more attention to the writing class since I think it is one of the most useful class [es] that I have taken in this semester. I think the reading did help me to write better.

Nadia's advice to future students reflects her experience with the course. She exactly recommends future students to do the same thing that was required in the course. She offers her advice:
First I will tell anyone to analyze the articles and pick up the main points and follow the appropriate format for the essay. Also, I will tell [the students] to read the articles very carefully. If you don't read and analyze the articles, don't take the course.

Taiki’s advice addresses students who care about their writing ability. His advice extends student taking ESL college writing. He offers his advice to any student desiring to improve her or his writing. He advises:

I like this course. I think I can also do the same thing in the computer courses. All the students can do the same thing. They can read the newspapers and learn from that . . . I will say to them to read and write. You can do that at home because I think actually reading is only way to know what the essay is like.

Radziah offers a piece of advice that carries strategies for students to do when reading articles intended be used for writing enhancement. She presents the strategies as follows:

They [future students] have to read more and more. They have to know the way they use reading then it can improve their writing. First, understand what the article said. Second, if [you] have something [you] don't know, ask about it or check the dictionary. Third, [moved here to be the third one] read the article properly because it's going to relate to the paper that we are going to write. Fourth, [originally third] use the new things in your paper.

Finally, Ji Sung offers what can be labeled a "recommendation." He urges students to study hard to improve their writing. Equally, he also presents advice to future teachers regarding the use of reading in writing classes. Although his recommendation can be described as "superficial," he recommends:
I think the students have to be serious because they will learn things from this class. Also I think reading should be used in the writing course. It is very important that we have reading. The teachers should use reading and writing.

The data from the participant's advice, though thin, indicate that participants' beliefs and attitudes about writing have been modified after they have finished the course. The change seems toward writing, integrating reading and writing, and strategies to learn writing with reference to use reading for this purpose. Their advice to future students may indicate that the participant themselves seem to benefit from their experiences toward their own future of when reading and writing. A study that focuses on after-course career may be valuable and render insightful implications to people interested in the effects of enforcing the reading-writing connection on students' future writing development.

Participants' Metaphors about Reading and Writing

In order to deepen my understanding of the participants' ideas on reading and writing, I asked each participant to provide a metaphor about reading and writing. Tobin (1989) claims that metaphors are significant in the sense that they can provide indirect responses on writing issues. The idea is that indirect responses are effective and insightful because they show beyond just superficial beliefs. He also claims that metaphors are informative because usually students are reluctant to express their frustration and bitterness about writing or learning to write. Therefore, teachers can gain glimpses of their students' concerns through the use of metaphors. Metaphors are powerful because they help convey a concept that is unfamiliar when it is associated with another concrete object (Sisson, 1998).

Since I realized the concept of metaphor might be new and unfamiliar to the participants, I explained the concept to them before asking them. Additionally, I
waited until the third interview to ask this question, since they would have developed more understanding about the course and the reading-writing connection by that time.

Two participants (Radziah and Jefri) could not think of any metaphors, although they had positive attitudes toward reading and writing. They claimed that they did not understand how to think of metaphor, although I explained to them and gave them examples. Another participant's (Hafiz) response, although showing relationship between reading and writing, was non-metaphorical and was, therefore, excluded.

Given the same cue, the remaining participants were able to to finish the following two sentences:

- Reading an essay is like ……………………………………………
- Writing an essay is like ……………………………………………

The following verbatim excerpts demonstrate the student participants' responses.

Weng Hong

Reading an essay is like taking a driving lesson, usually you would like something through it. The lesson is good for us because we learn from it. We also learn from reading.

Writing an essay is like driving a car, for example. You have to stop if you see a stop sign. In writing, you have to use full stop. Umm, if you don't stop, the police will stop. If you write wrong, the professor will tell you that you did a mistake. Umm reading is reading the lesson and writing is doing the lesson.

Fatimah

Reading an essay is like when you appreciate an orchestra. You listen to the people do many things and we hear a good sound.

Writing an essay is like that you hear the song of the orchestra. You just see many things but we hear one thing . . . writing has these things from the reading
Hiroshi

Reading is like dreaming. I dream of something and see it.
Writing a paper is like many pieces and you put them together.

Kim Yun

Reading an essay is like a machine to fix writing.
Writing is like getting a boyfriend, handsome and good boyfriend (laughing).
Yeah, I think writing should be good . . . we should write handsome papers.
Sometimes it is hard to write a good paper.

Arif

Reading an essay is like a machine that is collect[ing] ideas.
Writing a paper is like transferring machine. When you write you transfer what you have in the brain to the piece of paper.

Taiki

Reading an essay is like a dictionary to improve our knowledge.
Writing a paper is like a bird, freedom in expression.

Nadia

Reading a paper is like raw meat.
Writing is like cooking. You cook the raw meet and get well-done food.

Ji Sung

Reading an essay is like a treasure.
Writing is like climbing a mountain to find the treasure.

These metaphors render significant implications in the participants' attitudes and understanding of the role of reading and writing. Unlike their responses in the first interviews, their metaphors or similes show much more appreciation for the reading-writing connection.

Five participants (Weng Hong, Fatimah, Arif, Nadia, and Ji Sung) presented metaphors of reading and writing that can be best described as "complimentary images". For example, Fatimah likens reading to listening to an orchestra, while writing is more like playing beautiful music. This image and others show a direct
relationship between reading and writing. Reading was foreseen to be an essential component of writing.

Other participants (Hiroshi, Kim Yun, and Taiki) presented different images for reading and writing. Their metaphors did not seem to focus on a relationship, but they expressed positive attitudes toward reading and writing and the role of each one. Finally, a point worth mentioning is that the metaphors do not show any negative attitudes or reflect problems. However, the "climbing a mountain" metaphor depicts hard endeavors to develop writing.

Focus Group Interviews

I met with some participants in an off-campus group interviews. As stated in chapter three, I contacted the participants after the third interviews and offered that they voluntarily participate in an after-class group interviews. All the participants that took the individual interviews were talkative and provided detailed responses. I did not have any problem choosing more talkative students. Yet, to ensure enough number of participants, I contacted all the participants seeking their voluntary participation in the focus group interviews. Eight participants accepted to attend the group discussion. Three participants apologized. Later three of eight sent emails to me apologizing with deep sorrow that they were busy with course work and could not make it. Thus, five students participated in the group focus interviews which took place in a nearby restaurant. The participants arrived on time, friendly talked for a while, had dinner, and then started the group discussion. I prepared myself well for the interview. The immediate transcriptions of recorded responses and instant analysis of data collected from the first two interviews have helped me be well-prepared. This was a reaction to techniques provided by Lincoln and Guba (1985), Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993), and Merriam and Simpson (1984).
The focus group interviews were intended to exclusively serve two parallel roles: (1) checking reliability of the study by hearing some participant's responses about silent issues that they have brought up in the former individual interviews and (2) bringing together students whose responses in the individual interviews constituted different opinions. Regarding the first role, the participants who participated in individual interviews and in focus group interviews reported consistent responses regarding salient issues, such as their attitudes about explicit relationship between reading and writing, benefits of assigned reading, and difficulties pertaining to implementation this relationship. The participants listened to their responses that they reported early in the study and the seemed to keep the same attitude or opinion about their experiences. For example, Ji Sung confirmed with two words that time and requirements of the course, in general, and the relationship reading and writing, in particular, put pressure on him. However, Ji Sung, like other participants in the group interviews, did not comment in details about in the group interview. He just said, "yes, of course." All the participants' responses seemed to reflect their own responses in the individual interviews. The consistent responses that they reported emphasize the reliability of the participants' responses about their writing and learning writing through assigned reading and text discussion.

Regarding the second role of bringing different responses together, I was looking for students whose responses in the individual interviews constituted different opinions so that interaction between the participants is stimulated. However, the participant seemed to agree with each other regarding all the agendas of the focus interviews. Likewise, it is worth mentioned that I did not either notice major differences in the participants' responses in the first interviews. I assumed that he might find drastically different opinions from the individual interviews, but he did
not. Upon contacting the participants, though, I was certain not to invite participants who reported similar attitudes and experiences as the least to stimulate the discussion. For example, responses from the individual interviews showed that some participants reported high emphasis on problems regarding the reading-writing connection; other students were mainly concerned about the benefits that they have gained from such relationship between reading and writing; others reported increase in their awareness about structural elements.

Again, the participants did not have any "hot" discussion or argument over any issue. In fact, instead of debating, two participants confirmed a response reported by one of the participants concerning his awareness about noticing similar writing structures that were discussed in class. When I asked them if they had the different experience when reading, they reported that they agree with their friend's response although they did not mention that in individual interviews or when they were asked before their friend. These two participants seemed to be triggered by their classmate's response about a benefit that they reported that they have experienced but did not bring it up or realize it.

The above findings about focus group interviews show that the participants did not change their beliefs that they have gained throughout the course. Nor did they have debatable issues. If they were different, they reported different experiences about an issue which. But they did not present contradictory opinions or experiences. In other word, they presented various opinions about the benefits form the course. All these opinions can be described as "complimentary" opinions. None of them opposes the other. Again, although the group focus interview did not present insightful and rich discussion, the harmony of the participants' responses to the individual interviews
is essential, though. It indicates that the findings are consistent, and accordingly recommendations can be made.

The Process of Writing Approach

The course partially focused on the writing process. The instructor introduced writing process through two main sources: attention to writing and revision. The instructor explicitly stated that they have to write well-developed papers. She also urged them to go through three drafts and revise their papers carefully before submitting the final one. Accordingly, the students wrote three drafts and posted them on WebCT. Through the draft intervals, the students were required to revise their papers in terms of structures and content.

Without directly addressing the writing process, some participants reported that they went through the writing process represented in (1) revising papers, and (2) consulting sources to write more supporting details. They reported that they wanted to write papers that are well-organized and contain good content. However, unlike findings found in Zamel (1983) and Ramies (1985) studies, the participants reported that they resorted to reading sources to discover meaning for their papers or to trigger any existing ideas that they may have more than depending on their own knowledge. For example, Nadia says explains her case: "I'm week in elaborate the ideas, although I know what's the meaning but very hard to explain . . . because my English is not very well so that in writing I cant not elaborate it well." Other participants considered going through three drafts boring to them because they wrote the same paper. for example, Arif says:

It (going through drafts) is good, but it's very slow. Two weeks we only do one essay, compared with my college last time. I think one class we finished
one essay on the spot. But it's good because we can read back what we wrote and we can correct.

This is not to show that the findings of this study concerning the writing process underestimate the value of the writing process. It is explicitly mentioned earlier that the current study does not aim at providing in-depth description about the writing processes that the participants go through. Instead, its main aim of including the writing process is to show that integrating reading and writing in writing courses does not contradict with the importance of the reading-writing connection and recent emphasis on the writing process, especially with ESL/EFL learners who appear to lack conventional styles of essays and knowledge of content information. In fact, including reading in the course seems to reinforce the writing process. A follow-up study might focus more deeply on the writing process in such a class that integrates reading and writing.

The above participant, although not fully appreciating the purpose of going through drafts, seems to work on his paper in the form of revision after engaging in activities related to reading and writing. He is among the participants who reported that they use sources to find relative information about their topics. Furthermore, the also appear to appear to lack knowledge of writing process. Raphael (1988) found out that deficit knowledge about content and writing process cause major problems to student writers. Therefore, writing process is essential to writing if it is reinforced. Fisher (1986) suggests that constructing new knowledge through reading encourages students to engage more actively and cognitively in writing. Findings, as stated earlier, show that the participants learn from reading sources.

Additionally, findings at the beginning of the study show that the participants were worried about grammar and spelling far more than about the way they write.
Later findings, however, show more attention to meaning creation, structural issues and writing strategies. Some participants reported that they have started to plan before writing; other participants reported that they have consulted reading sources to either add more content information or revise structural issues. These findings relate to other researchers who claim that reading and writing are related because they both involve meaning creation (Rubin & Hansen, 1986; Savage, 1998) and other processes, such as planning, revising (Tierney & Pearson, 1983).
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter, the final chapter, begins with a brief presentation of the major findings. These findings relate to: (a) observation of the classroom, (b) free reading versus assigned reading, (c) participants' beliefs and attitudes at the beginning and at the end of the course, (d) problems related to reading-writing related activities, (e) strategies, (f) text features, (g) group focus interviews, and (h) the writing process. Following this brief review of findings, pedagogical implications and recommendations are provided in response to the research questions. The chapter concludes with suggestions for further research.

The main findings from this study show that participants' beliefs, attitudes, and experiences with regard to using assigned readings in relation to their writing were positive; they found it to be a powerful technique for enhancing writing competence. However, participants encountered problems that teachers and textbook authors should be aware of when teaching writing through reading and when designing textbooks. These problems also suggest directions for further studies.

During this study, I conducted observations, as well as interviews, which yielded rich data. Equally important, the participants were helpful and talkative, which helped me thoroughly explore their experiences. Sometimes joyfully, other times seriously, they addressed all the questions I asked them in the interviews. I was curious as to whether the participants would be forthcoming about their experiences, but they showed that my fears were unfounded.

I am grateful to the five participants who attended the group focus interview, though this interview only allowed them to confirm their earlier statements, it was
useful in that it provided me with further evidence that the participants were in agreement on the basic themes raised in the individual interviews. Finally, I am grateful to the participants for willingly providing me with samples of their writing, which allowed us to discuss some features of their texts. Not only did the participants cooperate gladly, they actually seemed to enjoy the discussion of their texts.

In the next section, I briefly review the research questions of the study, and give a summary of the results.

Research Questions

This study has attempted to answer one main question:

How are students' beliefs and attitudes impacted by engaging in a college composition course focused on the rhetorical structures of assigned reading?

In answer to this main question, it is clear that the participants have modified their previous beliefs and attitudes when engaging in assigned readings for writing purposes. They reported many benefits from using this technique. Their reading helped them understand writing requirements, and reading and text analysis had a clear impact on their writing abilities, judging from their responses to the relevant interview questions. They considered assigned reading to be a powerful tool for them as ESL writers. Finally, they reported that the course produced a considerable increase in their awareness of and confidence in composition. The study has also attempted to answer a set of secondary questions. These are:

1. What are ESL students’ beliefs and attitudes about reading-to-write at the end of the writing course?

In contrast with participants' responses about their beliefs regarding reading-to-write at the beginning of the course, their responses at the end of the course revealed positive attitudes about the method. When asked at the end of the course,
participants responded in ways that suggest that reading-to-write activities have helped them appreciate their College Writing course.

2. What strategies do ESL students utilize when engaging in reading and writing activities, when the two activities are linked in their classroom experience?

Based on participants' responses, reading-to-write activities did help them develop strategies for writing and learning to write through assigned reading. Although they typically did not mention specific strategies, they did refer often to the increased awareness that the reading-to-write focus brought to them, and said that they tried to emulate the writing models they read in the course. They mentioned vocabulary, as well as general structural features, as aspects of their reading that they consciously tried to imitate in their writing.

3. What obstacles and difficulties do ESL students experience when engaging in such activities?

As described in Chapter Five, the participants encountered problems and difficulties when using reading for writing purposes. These included difficulty with comprehension of reading content, and with grasping and applying the rhetorical structures of the assigned readings.

4. What are ESL students’ beliefs about the effects of reading on text organization and rhetorical structure?

Text organization was a salient finding in the study. Participants reported that using models of writing helped them obtain a vivid picture of the organizational format they needed to follow. Writing samples from the students confirm the reliability of these interview responses. Some participants' written samples showed development in organization even after only two weeks of exposure to models and rhetorical discussion.
5. Judging from students' perceptions, how does the reading-to-write approach impact ESL students to seek out reading as a way to improve their writing?

Some participants reported that they had started to notice rhetorical structures similar to those discussed in class when they read independently. Furthermore, some participants reported that they will continue to use these techniques and advise others to use them as well.

6. How does students' writing develop over the course of the term, and what impact do the students feel the explicit rhetorical instruction had on their writing?

Although writing development takes time, the use of assigned reading to enhance writing is perceived to have a successful impact on the participants. Participants reported a preference for texts that present explicit rhetorical structures. Some participants reported that they learned writing in a short time frame thanks to this instruction. Other participants' responses revealed greater familiarity with some rhetorical structures through the use of pre-selected texts.

**Major Findings**

Briefly, the main findings of the study are summarized below.

1. At the beginning of the course, the participants generally believed reading to be important, but they did not know how reading could enhance writing. They reported that reading and writing had been taught separately in their schools at home, and that no attention was given to rhetorical structure in either reading or writing.

2. At the beginning of the study, participants reported similar attitudes about writing in English. They expressed bitterness and frustration about writing, and did not report any specific strategies they used for writing, reporting they just wrote when
asked to do so. Furthermore, they were not aware of their strengths and weaknesses as writers, beyond worries about grammar.

3. Participants shared similar responses concerning their lack of knowledge about background information on the reading selections, and they reported that they seldom read independently.

4. At the end of the course, participants had quite positive attitude toward writing, learning to write, and the reading-writing connection. Although they had some problems, but they also were aware of their progress. They reported growth in confidence and an increased readiness to write. They also indicated that writing had become fun since they now knew what to do. Although the participants showed consistent responses, I caution readers that they might overstate trends in their comments to show social desirability to me as a researcher who was regularly attending the class.

5. Participants noted several benefits that they had gained from using assigned reading and assigned articles and passages before writing. These include a better sense of rhetorical structures and greater comprehension of content information. Other benefits were related to skills in revision, punctuation, and grammar.

6. Participants reported an increase in their mastery of vocabulary that they gained from consciously adopting words from their assigned reading and text analysis. They mentioned that their writing appeared to be more powerful than at the beginning of the course due to the use of these new words.

7. Participants reported several challenges that they encountered during the course. For instance, they expressed concerns about the time frame, the work load, and confusion over dealing with both content and rhetorical structure at once.
8. Participants reported that their writing development was hindered by their limited knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, cohesive devices and unity. However, these concerns show that they had become aware of these limitations and were working to improve their skills.

9. The participants' metaphors for reading and writing depicted positive views about the roles of reading, writing, and reading-to-write. However, although they had positive attitudes, some of them viewed writing and reading as hard tasks that need constant efforts.

10. Participants did not react seriously to peer feedback. They preferred instructor feedback to peer feedback. They either did not trust their friends' knowledge or felt the feedback they received was inaccurate. Some participants reported that reacting to feedback was not counted in the final grade, and thus it did not seem important to them.

11. Participants seemed not to have developed a reader-writer connection or a sense of audience. They responded with indifference to peer readers, focusing only on their instructor’s feedback. Furthermore, no participants paid attention to the name of the article writers or interacted with their ideas of these writers. Their interactions seemed to be with the text structures more than with the writers or the ideas. Furthermore, they also did not negotiate meaning with peer writers. Their responses were confined to organization and structure; they complained of not having negotiation on content, but seemed disinclined to initiate such discussion with their peers.

Research Methodology Findings

One incidental, yet valuable, benefit of this research has been the knowledge I have gained. In particular, I have developed a profound awareness of research
methodology. I am especially pleased with the number and quality of the interviews that I conducted in the study. Every interview was unique, in that each one was set at a critical interval of the course. For example, the first and the mid-term interviews provided me with in-depth information relevant to the research questions. Specifically, the mid-term interviews were so helpful because they allowed me to explore issues related to the participants' ongoing experiences. Additionally, these interviews helped me carefully review the questions that I used in the third interviews. Accordingly, in the third interviews, I was able to take into consideration issues that had emerged from the first two interviews.

The quality of the interaction between the participants and myself was equally important. Having previously conducted some research projects in which I had to contact participants online, either by email or instant messaging, I now fully appreciate face-to-face interviews. First and foremost, they fulfill a primary requirement of the natural research setting. Therefore, this study meets the research criteria of Lincoln and Guba (1985), who warn researchers not to misinterpret the word "natural." They urge researchers to use methods of data collection that are absolutely natural:

When we assert that naturalistic inquiry demands a natural setting, we should not be understood as making a play on the word “natural,” nor of espousing philosophic naturalism, nor of equating the natural with good, nor of regressing to the prepositivist position . . . Rather, we suggest that inquiry must be carried out in a “natural” setting because phenomena of study . . . take their meaning as much from their contexts as they do from themselves. (p. 189)
Accordingly, I strongly recommend that researchers employ a set of interviews, rather than only one, when investigating a topic such as this one.

Implications and Recommendations

The data derived from the students' responses to the research questions present (a) general implications for teachers of writing as well as (b) specific implications concerning the teaching of reading-to-writing.

**General Implications for Teachers of Writing**

1. The beliefs and attitudes of ESL/EFL students are constructed based on previous experiences with activities related to reading and writing. Teachers should be aware of these beliefs when integrating reading and writing, since students may come to the class with perceived experiences or with limited exposure to these methods. The participants in this study faced some initial confusion due to their lack of experience in dealing with assigned texts used to promote their writing. Therefore, these previous beliefs may support or hinder students' effective use of reading-to-writing.

2. ESL/EFL writers share many common beliefs, experiences, and problems, although they may come from different language backgrounds. The participants in this study represent several language and culture groups. Yet they reported strikingly similar experiences, benefits, and problems related to the development of their writing skills in English. For example, all of the participants reported relatively similar amounts of exposure to L2 literacy. Likewise, their writing samples showed parallel growth in skills of organization, which participants achieved by focusing on assigned reading and text
analysis. Therefore, teachers need to pay special attention to the
students' common characteristics, which may represent potential
strengths when fostering reading-to-write activities, in spite of
apparently different cultural backgrounds.

3. The participants in this study showed several specific difficulties that
may have lessened the effectiveness of the reading-to-write
engagement. Accordingly, teachers should be sure to foster
communication with their students about the students’ experiences, for
that is likely to help teachers hear and respond to student concerns.
The positive experiences and challenges that students perceive can be
utilized to promote writing, and any problems can be resolved or
minimized by an ongoing dialogue between students and teachers. In
fact, some participants reported in their final comments about the
study that the interviews had focused their attention on their writing
development and writing problems, and had thus become a part of
their learning experience. Once again, I encourage teachers to be
aware of their students' experiences during the course, and not only at
the end of the course, so that not only the instructor’s future students,
but also his or her current ones will be able to gain the advantage of
having their voices heard and their ongoing experiences appreciated
by their instructors.

Specific Implications for the Use of Reading-to-Write Activities

I hope the findings of this study will help readers to understand the effects of
using assigned reading on the writing development of ESL learners. The study shows
instances of the ways in which beliefs and attitudes can change if students are exposed
to the direct relationship between reading and writing. Therefore, the findings suggest a number of points regarding the teaching of writing. Above all, the participants showed a special preference for instruction that draws an explicit relationship between reading and writing; their comments at the start of the course suggest that they would not have spontaneously found connections, as they seemed not to be disposed to think of specific links. Teachers might find the technique of overtly relating reading to writing practices useful in promoting student success. Some specific recommendations are presented below in numerical form for reader convenience.

1. Since participants claimed to have gained many benefits by integrating reading and writing in the course, ESL/EFL language teachers and course designers might consider integrating reading as a regular part of writing curricula. Likewise, writing can be used in reading classes.

2. Evidence found in this study supports the use of models to show organization. This technique seems to have helped participants create a vivid picture of the forms of text organization. Participants found the text illustrations useful and effective. Therefore, teachers might consider using models of text to introduce organization in order to reduce the time spent explaining concepts of organization.

3. McWhorter's book contains authentic essays written by advanced students. Participants reported an enthusiastic response to reading and discussing such authentic texts. Therefore, a recommendation for teachers is to consider introducing authentic texts as early as possible with ESL students, provided that the texts chosen are reasonable in terms of language complexity.
4. All of the participants except one expressed willingness to have their papers read by other students. Although they did not enthusiastically interact with each others' papers, they did not mind having other students read their papers. However, it is rare in, EFL settings that students overtly share and respond to their papers, and the students in this study seem to have lacked a way to identify with this new activity. Teachers, accordingly, may need to consider the need to introduce and discuss this activity with their students, as it will be unfamiliar to many. Sharing papers is known to enhance cooperation rather than competition, and is most effective if students fully understand the goals and the process of peer feedback.

5. The participants in this study reported a lack of audience awareness, perceiving the instructor as the only reader that they cared about. Teachers might consider ways to help students become aware of the writers of the texts they read, for instance, by writing journals or critiques addressed directly to these published authors. Also teachers need to focus the students' attention on their peers' papers and engage them in multiple, active kinds of feedback activities. These might include co-authorship of a paper first drafted by one student. A follow-up study might be appropriate to investigate this issue.

6. Since participants did not take peer response seriously, a probable recommendation is to make peer assessment part of the grade in away that draws their attention to this crucial activity.

7. Participants reported problems completing assignments due to the limited time frame and the rigorous requirements of the course. They
would have liked the course more if they had had more time to practice what they learned instead of addressing new issues in every class. Teachers, accordingly, are urged to give enough opportunities for students to practice what they have gained from reading and discussion, since writing proficiency develops over time.

8. Participants reported problems related to comprehension and vocabulary in their readings, including some that they did on their own to gain information. Since reading and writing are related, writing teachers need to consider introducing or reviewing strategies for reading, including ways to handle new words in context.

9. Since participants reported that they have encountered problems when resorting to online read to find information, writing teachers may consider demonstrating strategies for reading online. Such strategies are likely to help students read effectively.

10. Participants of this study enjoyed sharing their experiences with the researcher. In fact, they reported that the interviews and other interactions helped them develop more awareness about their writing and the value of their readings as models. Of course, classes cannot always have an outside researcher present, However, writing teachers might consider holding mini conferences with their students to discuss their recent concerns about writing in general and about reading-to-write in particular.

11. Participants reported a positive attitude toward the course. They sometimes expressed their gratitude to the instructor who showed kindness, support, advice, and above all, cared about them.
Simultaneously, they mentioned that she was insistent and reasonable in her requirements. They considered this as a balance between being kind and demanding. Writing teachers need to closely monitor their method of interacting with their writing students to maintain this delicate balance. Students need to see a smile and a serious attitude at the same time.

Recommendations for Further Research

While conducting this study, I came across several ideas that I would recommend be investigated in future research. I address this issue here in more detail. The duration of this study was very limited. Research shows that writing development can be best seen in a long term of engagement. I am eager to repeat this study with an expanded period of time and involving more than one course.

This descriptive study focuses heavily on verbatim responses about the participants' beliefs and attitudes toward the use of assigned reading for writing purposes. Although writing samples were used in this study, they did not receive the same amount of attention as the interviews. Therefore, a study that examines students' writing development more closely over a longer period of time would be highly informative.

As this study has focused on a small number of students (11), I am interested in comparing the results of this study with a similar study that would involve a larger sample of ESL/EFL students. The findings of this study cannot be generalized. Therefore, a follow-up study with a larger number of participants could be a significant contribution to the field.

This study focuses on ESL students enrolled in ENGL 101, ESL College Writing, at a college in the U.S. Findings of a study carried out in an EFL setting
where English is not spoken as the main language might also make a valuable contribution. Likewise, a study carried out with students enrolled in writing intensive content area courses, rather than composition courses, would be valuable.

Online reading and writing represent a new trend in the current period. In fact, the participants in this study reported that they used the Internet to seek additional texts. Therefore, further studies that investigate the students’ view of the relationships between online reading and writing would render useful insights. It is also important for educators to study the effects of the increasing use of technology in the classroom.

The present study involved that the researcher attended the class regularly; therefore, the participants might have overstated their trends to please the researcher. A study in which responses were confidential would present valuable data, such as via emails provided that participants show seriousness and have enough time to write their responses.

On another level, it is interesting to consider a study investigating the ways in which teachers integrate reading and writing. Such a study would shed light on the teachers' beliefs and methods of student involvement in reading and writing related activities. Likewise, another study could investigate factors that hinder writing teachers from employing reading texts in their writing classrooms. Research, including this study, has shown the significance of the reading-writing connection. Therefore, additional studies that investigate this connection from different directions are needed to show that separating these two skills represent a potentially important obstacle to student writers.

Finally, it is worth mentioned that although the post-process approach implies that writing extend beyond just going through writing process and that it requires continuous reading, but recent work has not supported it. Silva's recent work has
focused on differences between writing in L1 and L2 and rarely referring to reading as an essential factor for L2 writing development. Similarly Matsuda (2003) objected to the dominance of the writing process on the expense of social factors, but he did not point out the role of reading that can familiarize writers, especially L2 writers, with social issues. A recently conducted study by Fageeh (2003) that focused on the problems facing EFL writers did not explicitly account for reading as an important factor. Therefore, this dissertation serves to re-link between the importance of reading shown by previous literature and the use of writing techniques that involves reading activities to enhance writing.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A: Interview Questions: Interview One

1. Please talk about your experience of learning English and learning writing.
2. Describe the previous English writing courses that you took?
3. Can you tell me how the writing courses was planned and organized in your country?
4. Was there reading in the writing course in college?
5. What do you think of that?
6. It's bad or good?
7. Do you read much in your language?
8. If yes, what do you like to read?
9. Do you read in English?
10. If yes, what do you like to read?
11. If no, why do you not read in English?
12. How do you feel about writing in your language?
13. How do you feel about writing in English?
14. Do you think reading in the course will help you?
15. Do you know how the reading will help you?
16. What are the strongest parts that you have as a writer?
17. What are your weakest parts?
18. What do you do when you write?
19. Do you revise?
20. If yes, what kind of changes you make?
21. How did you learn to write in English?
22. Who helped you to write in English?
23. Do you understand why reading is required in this course?
24. Please, describe the course.
Appendix B: Mid-Term Interview Questions

1. Can you describe your feelings about the course?

2. What problems do you have with course that are related to reading?

3. Have you completed all the assigned readings?
4. If not, why not?
5. If so, what did you think of them?

6. Do you think that the goals of the course are clear to you now? Do you understand what the professor has explained about, for example, reading the articles in the textbook, parallelism, and clarity of writing?

7. Can you compare your perceptions about the course between now and the first days of the course?

8. Do you follow any specific plan for the course? Please explain.

9. Do you think the reading assignments for the course are useful? If so, how do you think they help you?

10. What do you think makes an essay good?

11. How do you think your writing is changing?

12. What are you trying to do differently as you write?

13. How much do you think the following activities have helped you (using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is ‘very little’ and 10 is ‘a lot’)?

- Trying to become aware of features of the readings
- Teacher explanation (of coherence, coherent, wordiness, etc)
- Feedback from the professor
- Exercises
Please, explain your choice?

14. Do you think the readings you are doing will help you to write better? If so, how? If no, why not?

15. Do you refer back to the text books, reading text, teacher feedback, and your notes when writing? Explain your answer.

16. Do you highlight any of the features discussed in class when reading from your book? Please, explain your answer.

17. Which of these writing features do you understand? Which do you try to use when you write?

- parallelism
- cutting wordiness
- action verbs
- avoiding general words
Please, elaborate on your choice.

18. Do you read outside of the course (on the Internet, from magazines, etc)? If so, what do you read? Do you enjoy this reading? Can you say anything about why you enjoy it?
Appendix C: Final Interview Questions

1. How do you think your writing has changed during this course?
2. Have your feelings about writing or your attitude toward writing changed? If so, how have these changed?
3. Have this course, the instructor, or your peers help you in any way to overcome your difficulties with writing?
4. What problems do you think you have as a writer now?
5. How do you feel about having your papers read by your classmates?
6. What useful comments do you get from them?
7. As a reader, what do you consider are the best comments you have made on your classmates' papers?
8. Do you write more carefully when you know your classmates will read your paper? In what way?
9. Do you seek out readers to ask them to read your papers? Please tell me about your experience.
10. Do you think a good writer is a person who reads a lot? If so, what do you think is the connection?
11. Do you think you should read more to help your writing? Please share your thought with me.
12. What problems do you have with the idea of using reading to help your writing assignment? In what ways do you think this might work to improve your writing?
13. Please complete the following sentences:
14. Writing a paper is like ......................................................
15. Reading an essay is like ......................................................
16. Why do you think the course has assigned readings?
17. What do you think you have learned from the readings? When you read anything else, do you try to use words, sentence patterns, or other strategies that the writer uses? Please, be as specific as you can.
18. What do you think you have learned from the exercises in the Writer’s Reference?
19. Do you think these exercises have helped you write better? In what way?
20. Do you remember when you chose a claim from the article about "Abolish High School?," and talked about how the author supports the claim? How do you feel about doing that? Did it help you understand writing better? How?

21. The professor sometimes used some of your classmate papers and discussed them with the class: what do you think of this activity? Did it help you? If so, how? If no, why not?

22. Do you think it helped you to analyze readings in class? In what way?

23. Do you ever analyze your own writing the same way?

24. Did you like the student writing better than the professional writing in your textbook? Why?

25. Can you name any of the writers you read this term in your readers?

26. What do you think is your best essay in the term? What makes you feel this one is better than others you have written?

27. Do you think you write the same way now as you did four months ago?

28. How do you plan to work on your writing in the future?

29. Will you keep your textbooks and handouts of this course for future reference?

30. What advice do you have for future students?

31. Please, now we will read some of your essays and I will ask if you have any comment about the structures and organization.

32. Closing- Do you have any other general comments about the use of reading in this writing course related to your progress in writing?
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**Title**: ESL College Students’ Beliefs and Attitudes About Reading-to-Write in Classroom Composition
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**Principal Investigator:** Ali Al-Ghonaim (724) 357-8737  
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Appendix E: Course Design

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
English Department
EN101 College Writing
Fall, 2004

Office Hours: T R 8:30-9:30 and 1:00-2:30
or by appointment
E-mail consulting at all other times
E-mail: Please use my WebCT e-mail account for this course

SYLLABUS

I. Course Description

What is this course about?

This course offers opportunities for developing skills and strategies for successful college writing. It is based on the assumption that becoming a successful writer requires hard work, guidance, and feedback. It asks students to provide the hard work while their instructor and their peers provide the guidance and the feedback. It engages participants in the thinking-writing process by emphasizing the connection between reading and writing, by including issues of interest to college students, and by providing models of good writing. Furthermore, it encourages students to examine their learning style, write for a specific audience, and edit their papers to achieve the desired communicative effect.

II. Course Objectives

What will I learn in this course?

This course will help you become a better writer in the following ways. It will help you:

• Understand the connection between reading and writing
• Become and stay involved with the course by including readings of interest and concern to college students
• Learn from professional and student models of good writing
• Discover the writing strategies that work best for you
• Identify and eliminate basic problems with the content, structure, accuracy, and mechanics of your papers

In this course you will also learn about:
II. Required Texts and Materials


4. 3.5 diskette for your homework

III. Course requirements

**What do I have to do for this class?**

You are required to complete work assignments and present these on time.

1. You are required to **prepare assigned readings and participate in tasks related to these in class**. Preparing reading materials includes reading, annotating, and answering questions on these materials.

2. You are required to **prepare draft versions of papers assigned for each class, post these drafts on the WebCT bulletin board, and respond to two classmates' drafts on the bulletin board**. You should also check your WebCT e-mail account before every class. In class you are expected to participate in workshops to perfect specific aspects of those papers.

3. You are required to **write 5 papers**: Paper 1 (500 words), a response essay; Paper 2 (500 words), a comparison and contrast essay; Paper 3 (700 words), a definition essay; Paper 4 (700 words), a cause and effect essay; and Paper 5 (700 words), an argumentative essay. You are supposed to participate in class in all activities related to the analysis, synthesis, and editing of all parts of these papers. You are expected to read and comment on your classmates' draft versions of these parts. Papers, which have not gone through the process of in-class discussion and peer review, will not be
accepted. The final papers, along with the accompanying drafts and peer reviews, will be submitted on the assigned dates.

4. You are required to develop an individual Accuracy Project and to take an Accuracy Test as your Final Exam, based on D. Hacker's "A writer's reference" and "Developmental exercises to accompany a writer's reference," to perfect your choice of words and your ability to write grammatical sentences and effective texts. For this project, you will take a diagnostic test to identify grammar problems in your writing. Then, you will select appropriate practice from D. Hacker's "Developmental exercises," which you should complete regularly throughout the semester and submit on the assigned date. Finally, on or by the date of your final exam you will take a WebCT final exam that is similar in format to the diagnostic test you took at the beginning of the semester.

IV. Attendance Policy

You are required to attend classes regularly. Class attendance is very important because it prepares you for all graded activities. Two cases of tardiness amount to one absence. You are allowed three hours of absence in case of emergency. In this case you are expected to come to the next class prepared. Absences beyond this number will affect directly your grade for class preparation and participation, and, indirectly, all other aspects of your work. Given the workshop format of this class, you will be advised to drop it or withdraw from it after six hours of absence.

V. Grading Policy

Your grades will be based on content, timely submission, and adherence to the guidelines. Final grades will be calculated on the following basis:

| 1. Paper 1 | 10% |
| 2. Paper 2 | 10% |
| 3. Paper 3 | 20% |
| 4. Paper 4 | 20% |
| 5. Paper 5 | 20% |
| 7. Accuracy test (Final exam) | 20% |

Note: A failing grade in one of the above areas will result in a failing grade for the class.

VI. WebCT Policy

Part of the course content for this class is available through WebCT or Web Course Tools. Students can access course materials such as the Syllabus, the Calendar, and more at http://www.iup.edu/webct/. Certain course materials are available only through WebCT. These include the Calendar, the Bulletin Board, Chat Rooms, private e-mail accounts for all course participants, and more. Students are required to use WebCT for their class preparation and participation. Students will have to e-mail/post certain assignments on this class' WebCT page for discussion. Most out-of-class communication and all e-mail correspondence with the professor and other students will be through WebCT.
### Class Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Work Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/14</td>
<td>Introduction to the course and to WebCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16</td>
<td>Diagnostic test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1/21 | Writing about readings  
Paper 1: Response essay – discussion | Read: Ch. 3  
Text: The Boor War |
| 1/23 | Prewriting  
Paper 1: Response essay | Read: Ch. 4, pp 67-86  
Paper 1: Draft 1 |
| 1/28 | Thesis statement  
Definition & application  
Paper 1: Response essay | Read: Ch. 5, pp 95-115  
Paper 1: Draft 2 |
| 1/30 | Conferences: Paper 1 | Bring Paper 1 |
| 2/4 | Drafting an essay - structure, organization, paragraphs  
Accuracy Project | Read: Ch. 6, pp 117-146  
Bring Hacker, both books  
**Paper 1: Submit for grading** |
| 2/6 | Conferences & Accuracy Project | Bring Accuracy project; Hacker- both books |
| 2/11 | Comparison & contrast: Point by point & subject by subject organization  
Paper 2: Comparison & contrast-discussion | Read: Ch. 13, pp 369-379  
Texts: Lincoln and Roosevelt  
A taste of snow |
| 2/13 | Integrating comparison & contrast into an essay  
Paper 2: Comparison & contrast | Read: Ch. 13, pp 383-407  
Text: His marriage and hers  
Paper 2: Draft 1 |
| 2/18 | Comparison & contrast combined with other patterns  
Paper 2: Comparison & contrast | Read: Ch. 13, pp 407-411  
Text: By being honest about violence...  
Paper 2: Draft 2 |
| 2/20 | Conferences: Paper 2 | Bring Paper 2 |
| 2/25 | Definition D explaining what you mean  
Accuracy Project  
Paper 3: Definition – discussion | Read: Ch. 15, pp 460-473  
Text: The case for frivolity  
**Paper 2: Submit for grading** |
| 2/27 | Integrating definition into an essay  
Paper 3: Definition | Read: Ch. 15, pp 473-495  
Text: Life without father  
Paper 3: Draft 1 |
| 3/11 | Definition combined with other patterns  
Paper 3: Definition | Read: Ch. 15, pp 496-501  
Text: High-tech piracy  
Paper 3: Draft 2 |
| 3/13 | Classification combined with other patterns  
Paper 3: Definition | Paper 3: Final draft |
| 3/18 | Conferences: Paper 3 | Bring Paper 3 |
| 3/20 | What are cause and effect  
Paper 4: Cause and effect - discussion | Read: Ch. 16, pp 503-517  
Text: Personality is what makes W...  
**Paper 3: submit for grading** |
| 3/25 | Accuracy Project  
Individual conferences with Writing center tutors | Bring: Hacker, both books.  
Identify specific issues for conference |
| 3/27 | Accuracy Project  
Individual conferences with Writing center tutors | Bring: Hacker, both books  
Identify specific issues for conference |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4/1  | Integrating cause and effect into an essay  
Paper 3: feedback  
Paper 4: Cause and effect |
|      | Read: Ch. 16, pp 518-541  
Text: Part-time employment ...  
Paper 4: Draft 1 |
| 4/3  | Causal analysis and other patterns combined  
Paper 4: Cause and effect |
|      | Ch. 16, pp 542-546  
Text: College president's plan ...  
Paper 4: Draft 2 |
| 4/8  | Conferences: Paper 4 & Accuracy Project |
|      | Bring: Paper 4: Draft 2 & Accuracy Project |
| 4/10 | Reading arguments  
Paper 5: Argumentative essay - discussion |
|      | Read: Ch. 17, pp 562-572 |
| 4/15 | Writing an argument: what is an argument  
Paper 5: Argumentative essay |
|      | Read: Ch. 18, pp 581-593  
Text: Human cloning? Don't just ...  
Paper 5: Draft 1 |
| 4/17 | Responding to arguments  
Paper 5: Argumentative essay |
|      | Read: Ch. 18, pp 616-624  
Texts: In defense of splitting up ...  
Where marriage is a scary ...  
Paper 5: Draft 2 |
| 4/22 | Conferences: Paper 5 & Accuracy Project |
|      | Bring: Paper 5: Draft 2 & Accuracy Project |
| 4/24 | Preparation for Final Exam |
|      | Accuracy Project: submit for grading  
Paper 5: Submit for grading |
| 4/24 | **Final exam** - Students take the test from any Internet-connected computer. They go to the Quiz option of their WebCT accounts for that. |
|      | Accuracy Test |
Appendix F: Samples of Student's Writing

(1)

Korean traditional marriage and recent wedding style is very different. They differ in clothes, honeymoon, and accommodation. Nowadays, most of couples are doing their wedding style because the traditional wedding cost more money than nowadays' wadding.

Hundreds years ago in Korean wear ‘Hanbok’ it is Korea clothe at that time but now days it is Korean transitional clothe. Koran transitional wedding bride and bridegroom wear special ‘Hanbok’ for the wedding. In brides clothes’ basic color is red and it has many different figures in the cloth however man’s cloths’ basic color is blue and it has simple figures. Nowadays bride wears white dress and bridegroom wear black tuxedo.

Traditional wedding in Korea takes a day to end. It happens in brides’ house. Korean wedding is very big issue to the town, so all of town people are coming to the brides’ house and attend the wedding. When wedding is over, people have a big party in the brides’ house. After this party is over, the bride and bridegroom walk in to the room and have their first night. Nowadays wedding is very simple. The bride and the bridegroom call only their family and friends. When wedding party is over they eat together. This is all and after whole wedding is done, the couple goes to have the honeymoon.

Honeymoon wasn’t part of the wedding in the past. In the past, travel between cities was hard to do and also going to other country was impossible to do because at that time Korea had many wars between china and Japan also in Korea was very unstable country. But now couples plan to make honeymoon trips. In the past, old peoples’ honeymoon was in ‘Jejoodo, a Korean island. But now many peoples’ honeymoon places are in other countries.

Living with mans’ parents was of course at that time in Korea and also bride can't go to her parents’ house. Also there was no divorce. Men could have two or three wives if they want to. Nowadays, many people don't live in mans’ parent because they don’t want to or parents don’t want to do that because they can care for themselves. And man can’t have more than one wife and if they want to divorce then they do it by the law.

Nowadays' wedding and traditional wedding is very different. They differ in clothes, honeymoon, and accommodation. But this change is not very important. The most important propose of wedding is not how they do it or how much people are coming to the wedding, most important propose is make happy family and how much they loving each other.
The Malaysian dollar used to have a conversion rate with the US dollar at 2.50 Malaysian dollar to $1.00 USD; but during 1997 the whole Asian economy was struck badly by an international currency trader named “George Soros”. Since then, The Malaysian dollar was peg with the US dollar at a rate of $3.80 Malaysian to $1.00 USD.

The purpose was to stabilize the weak Malaysian dollar from falling further. But after 8 years should the Malaysian dollar remain at $3.80 to $1.00 USD. Since world war two, the US economy has been the strongest economy in the world; it never faced any strong crisis until 2 years back, when president Bush steps in to the White House. He only emphasis on war and neglected the economy. From his first term of presidency, he did not contribute much to the economy, but created the most job loss in 75 years of American history, and reducing the value of the dollar. The value of US dollar is 40 percent lower compared to Euro. Many countries in the world that are peg with the US dollar are facing a very hard time, due to its low buying power. Therefore many countries for example China are considering lifting the peg with the US dollar.

In my survey I have interviewed 3 of my friends from 3 different countries. All of them are in finance majors, and I will like to learn from different angles of judgments. First I interview my housemate that’s from Taiwan, my ex-classmate from Malaysia and my current classmate that is an American.

My housemate thinks that is a very good thing to lift up the peg with the US dollar. He believes that by lifting up the peg, the value of Malaysian dollar will appreciate, and will enable Malaysian to have a greater buying power for foreign goods.

My current finance classmate whom is an American thinks that is not a good idea lifting the peg of Malaysian dollar. From the American aspect, it will ruin the US economy further. He said that if one country decides to lift its peg against the US dollar, there is a very high possibility that other countries will follow. Once other countries starts to lift their peg, the US dollar will not just be lower then the Euro, it will be lower against the world, and it will be much harder bring back its stand.

My ex-classmate from Malaysia thinks that, there will be pros and cons about this issue. The advantage will be the common known that, Malaysians will have higher buying power on foreign goods. Besides that the greater advantage will be on the debts of Malaysian government. During the development on the Malaysian economy for the past two decades Malaysia has been very aggressive on developing the country, therefore the Malaysian government has been selling off a lot of national bonds to Japan and other countries. By increasing the value of the Malaysian dollar it’s going to be a great advantage for the government to repay the loans. The disadvantage factor will be on; the manufacturing goods from Malaysia won’t be as competitive as it used to be. With a lower currency rate it will reduced our selling price compare to other countries that has a high currency value. But according to my friend, overall the lifting of the peg will definitely benefit the economy of Malaysia.
Organ Donation

Organ donation is a controversial topic which people take different views. It can be extremely beneficial in some circumstances. Some people think that organ donation is barbaric. An individual may have many reasons as to why they are or why they are not organ donors. By interviewing five friends and I will include myself as the sixth, I got to three negative and three positive conclusions of being a donator. Student choice and beliefs about becoming organ donors constitute some questions.

In my question, three people turned out to be organ donors. The general consensus among the organ donors was that they donated because they thought that they could save someone’s life. These students also said that there is a long waiting list for organs. If people donate their organs this list will be shorter and many people’s lives could be saved. One of my friends commented by saying, “why have my organs under ground with when they are no use when I could donate them and save someone’s life.” This subject actually appeared to be very emotional for some students. One of my friends also reminded me of the movie “Taiki Q” that came out several years ago with Denzel Washington in it. It was about the boy who has a bad heart and he is going to die very soon if he doesn’t get a new one. His father is about to kill himself so that he can give his son his heart when a call comes in that there was an accident and they now have a positive match for the young boy. My friend said that by watching this movie it would make you want to be a donor because the boy is so young and if they could save somebody like that’s life, then it is worth it. These people felt very strongly about why they were organ donors and couldn’t understand why anybody wouldn’t be one. However, the other students did not agree with this statement.

The rest of my friends claimed that they were not organ donors. I agree with this point as well. I think that human beings are supposed to be buried with everything that God has given them. I feel that these organs are mine and want to be buried with them. In Bulgaria where I am from, organ donation is not as popular as it is in the United States. People are not even familiar that it exists. One of my friends who think the same as I do said that there is a myth about donation. He says that if your drivers license says that you are donor and you are at the hospital in terrible conditions, the doctors would let you pass away easier. He was sure that if you were about to die doctors wouldn’t resuscitate you, and they would just let you die because there is such a demand for organs. However, as I am against organ donating I do not think that this is true.

After listening and going through people’s conclusions I considered why people are organ donors. However, I still do not agree with organ donating, but now I see many of the other sides to it. Organ donation appears for some to be a very sensitive subject. I actually thought about the time I watched “Taiki Q” and it made me upset that the boy would die if he did not get a donor quick. I think that maybe some day I might become an organ donor but right now I am not ready for it. These questions and other student’s responses have made me see the bigger picture.
Euthanasia

“Euthanasia is the act or practice of ending the life of an individual suffering from a terminal illness or an incurable condition, as by lethal injection or the suspension of extraordinary medical treatment.” (Online dictionary) It comes from the Greek words for 'good' (Eu) and 'death' (thanasia). The Netherlands is the first country to legalize euthanasia and Belgium is the second. But, should euthanasia be legalized? I have interview six of my friend, half of them against euthanasia and half of them agree to legalized euthanasia. I also excess to some open forum. I found that around 70% who have taken the survey agree to legalize euthanasia. Majority of people who agree to legalize euthanasia believe that human have their right to control their life in spite suffer in terminal ill or not, but pressure toward a patient may leads them to death.

Humans have the right to choose either to stay alive or death. Legitimate government has no role in deciding what a person does with his or her own body. An individual ought to have the right to make decisions of a deeply personal nature about how they want to conduct their lives. If some people would choose death, that’s a choice that may be regretted, but nevertheless this choice must be respected. Death should be voluntary. This means that everybody should be free to extend their lives and to arrange for their bodies. It also means that voluntary euthanasia, under conditions of informed consent, is a basic human right.

Suffering from inadequate pain control can be one of the strongest motivating factors for the request to death. Most experts agree that people no longer have to die in pain, nor in a drug-induced stupor. Not only should patients be able to abstain from treatment, but also if they have a terminal or extremely painful condition, they should be able to use the assistance of a doctor in order die with as little pain as possible, that means to apply euthanasia. Many psychiatric experts show that curable depression in the terminally ill is generally neither diagnosed nor treated. This suggests that if doctors are given the power to assist in suicide, more people will rather die from untreated depression than from their underlying illness. Insistence, against the patient's wishes, that death be postponed by every means available is contrary to law and practice. It would also be cruel and inhumane.

The feeling of becoming a burden on family may lead the patient to choose assisted death. Families have all kinds of subtle ways, conscious and unconscious, of putting pressure on a patient to request euthanasia and relive them of the financial and social burden of care. Many patients already feel guilty for imposing burdens on those on those who care for them, even when the families are happy to bear the burden. To provide an avenue for the discharge of that guilt in a request for euthanasia is to risk putting to death a great many patients who do not wish to die.

Euthanasia is different with assisted suicide. Euthanasia is one person causes another to die, for example, a doctor gives a lethal injection to a patient. However, assisted suicide is one person helps another to take their own life, for example, a doctor hands the patient an overdose of medicine which the patient self-administers. I believe that there are some circumstances when euthanasia is the morally correct action. I also understand that there are real concerns about legalizing euthanasia
because of legitimate defense. Nobody can conduct another person’s life, live or death is depends on that particular person. Other than euthanasia, it has many ways to suicide. If the patient can’t stand for curable pain, euthanasia is a good way to relieve his or her pain. However, pressure on the patient may leads them to choose to end of their life.