English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 23, No. 2 Summer 2017

Reading-Writing Integration in Enhancing L2 Speaking Ability

Suzy Kim[*]
(Kongju National University)
Hae Sung Sohng[**]
(Kongju National University)
Michael Diehl
(Kongju National University)

Kim, Suzy, Sohng, Hae Sung & Diehl, Michael (2017). Reading-writing integration in enhancing L2 speaking ability. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 23*(2), 1-16.

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether reading-writing integration can contribute to L2 speaking improvement, which has never been attempted. In order to examine its influences on speaking, quantitative study was conducted with 24 university students for fifteen weeks. The participants were randomly assigned to two groups: an experimental group, reading-writing integration in a regular class, and a control group, mainly focusing on reading instructions. The students in the experimental group was provided with basic writing skills and writing tasks connected to reading such as writing summaries and responses in journals, whereas those in the control group went through the procedure of a typical institute class in which they read and work on comprehension check-up exercises. The two groups' performances in the pre-and post-test were compared and analyzed to explore any difference in improvements in speaking performance and any qualitative change in language domains between the two groups over the period. The study found that the students who regularly participated in reading-writing activities significantly improved their overall speaking ability and significant differences were also found in language domains. The results of the study indicate that reading-writing integration had a positive effect on speaking performance and could be an alternative method to improve speaking skill in Korean EFL settings.

〔**reading-writing integration/second language learning/speaking ability/writing ability**〕

---

[*] First author [**] Corresponding author

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Internet-dominated international society, speaking ability becomes more important for communication. Many people in globalized era desire to communicate with others from all over the world. Moreover, these days a higher proficiency in the spoken language is demanded for the economy and getting good jobs. To better engage in communication with others and to get more job opportunities, language learners want to be better performers of speaking. To meet social demands and learners' needs, the emphasis of oral production skill in learning language is inevitable.

Speaking is defined as the interpersonal function of language through which meaning is produced and transferred (Hughes, 2013). According to Ur (1996, p. 120), "Of all the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) speaking seems intuitively the most important." However, speaking is a great challenge for foreign language learners since students in an English as a foreign language environment have few opportunities to speak English outside of the classroom (Zhang, 2009). Choi (2012) reported that Korean EFL learners lack opportunities to interact with native English speakers, and when students encounter real English conversational speakers, they are afraid of expressing their opinions and thoughts. Therefore, learners strive to acquire a certain level of the foreign language and have difficulty attaining basic fluency. There has been remarkable growth in the English education in Korea due to great enthusiasm in education. Many studies (Choi, 2014; Lee, 2006; Moon, 2013; Na & Kim, 2014), however, reported that students are still struggling to find a way of polishing their speaking skill and their language abilities do not improve relative to the efforts and time they put into their studies.

In accordance with the recognition of the saliency of speaking in globalized era, there have been increasing studies regarding how EFL students' speaking ability can be developed. In relation to speaking, many researchers (Kim, 2000; Lee, 2006; Lee & Yoon, 2010; Na & Kim, 2014) believe that writing-based approach could be beneficial for developing L2 speaking skill, considering similar syntactic patterns in writing and speaking. They concluded that speaking can be taught with various writing activities and writing to learn is an effective way to acquire speaking skills.

In contrast with this, with respect to speaking skill of L2, other researchers (Cho & Krashen, 1994; Choi, 2014; Moon, 2013) demonstrate that reading is an effective way for L2 learners to improve their speaking skills and their findings suggested that educators should put reading into their curriculum for developing speaking skills. It is obvious that reading and writing have a positive impact on developing speaking ability.

Speaking is still noted as the primary concern for L2 learners as illustrated above, and it is clear that speaking ability is urgently required for them in the globalized world. The

present study was designed to discover a new way to teach speaking and to examine its effectiveness for practicing a target language in an accessible way.

Despite the effectiveness of reading and writing in improving L2 speaking as described earlier, there have been no previous researches on integrating reading-writing on spoken language development. Therefore, this current study was carried out under the assumption that combining reading and writing can be effective to foster speaking competence, taking into consideration of the effectiveness of reading and writing on speaking. This study aimed to examine whether integrating reading-writing influences the speaking performance of elementary level college students. Based on the necessity and the purpose of the study, two research questions have been made as follows.

1) Does reading-writing integration affect Korean college students' speaking performance?
2) Is there any significant difference between students' speaking performance of reading-writing integration group and that of the non-integration group in particular domains?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Reading to Speak

Schleppegrell and Colombi (2002) point out that after L2 learners acquire linguistic features from books, they practice using them in their discourses and rely on their own strategies to foster their speaking skills. Reading can play a big role in developing speaking skills. Students who read a lot are more likely to speak well. Through reading, students develop both fluency and accuracy of expression in their speaking. Davies and Pearse (2000) stress the importance of communication: "Real success in English teaching and learning is when the learners can actually communicate in English inside and outside the classroom." Reading will add to learners' conversational performance. Reading will help learners to decipher new words that they need for conversations. Similarly, Krashen and Terrell (1989, p. 88) illustrate that reading enables the learners to comprehend better which is an important factor that can develop language competence they need for conversations. Through reading, language learners can learn vocabulary knowledge which may facilitate their speaking performance and their usage of structure in the target language.

As for the speaking, a recent empirical study reported that extensive reading could be one of fruitful ways to improve speaking skill. With eight college-level participants, Choi (2014) investigated the effects of extensive reading of children's literature on L2

learners' speaking ability. The participants in the study were offered to read children's literature of elementary to high school levels over six months. The participants' reading lists, reading journals and notes were collected, and discussions were recorded, transcribed, and processed to produce quantitative and qualitative data. The results indicated that extensive reading is an effective way to improve speaking proficiency and it helps foreign language learners to develop their ability to understand implied meaning of words and makes them capable of expressing their ideas, feelings, and emotions. In addition, regarding the relationship between reading and speaking, Moon (2013) examined the effects of the application of narrative texts to the first year of high school students on their speaking abilities. 60 students were assigned to two different types of texts –narrative and expository– over 16 class periods. The experimental group was provided with narrative text and the control group was with expository text. Some communicative tasks such as information gap and jigsaw were given to the students of the both groups. As a result, the students in the experimental group achieved higher scores than those in the control group in speaking, indicating statistically significant difference. Although the narrative text was more helpful as an input of spoken language, it is obvious that reading influenced the speaking proficiency of the high school students no matter what types of text it is. The findings, thus, suggested the use of more narrative text in English textbooks to help students improve speaking abilities.

2. Writing to Speak

Although writing and speaking are two separate skills of language with particular differences, they both belong to productive skills and are very much interrelated due to sharing many similar components (Jordan, 1997). Weissberg (2006) believes that students can improve their language skills as well as their social interaction skills through fundamental writing practice since oral and written skills share the same strategies such as topic selection and providing comments. In addition, Nation and Newton (2009) stated that written input can be a very influential factor to encourage speaking. Newton (1995) found out that all the vocabulary used by learners for negotiation are the ones present in their written input.

Regarding the relationship between writing and speaking, Cleland and Pickering (2006) carried out a study in which they tried to investigate the mechanisms used in writing and speaking and constructing different syntactic patterns. The results showed that the syntactic operation rooted in both spoken and written production were identical. Zhu (2007) also conducted a study to examine their relationships and the participants in this study were ESL students in an American university. The syntactic maturity of 10 ESL students was analyzed both in speaking and writing, and the findings indicated that

there is a positive relationship between college level ESL students' speaking and writing proficiency. The common fundamental cognitive abilities between written and oral language make the two very much dependent on each other (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2008). El-Koumy (1998) conducted a study examining the effect of dialogue journal writing on EFL students' speaking proficiency, in which the results indicated the significantly improved performance for the experimental group. He adds that several studies have dealt with writing skill from different points of view but not considering it as a means of speaking proficiency enhancement.

The relationship between writing and speaking has been studied considering similar syntactic patterns in writing and speaking. In the light of Korean EFL learning advocacy, Lee (2006) conducted a study to compare Korean EFL learners' speech (oral productions) with their compositions (written productions). The results indicated that the proficiency in oral presentations of EFL college students heavily depends on how much they are able to write, implying writing and speaking skills are closely co-related. Therefore, the findings suggested that teachers do not need to separate teaching how to speak from teaching how to write and use same strategies to help learners improve their writing and speaking skills.

In addition, Kim (2000) examined the effects of writing activities on the speaking of middle school students. The results showed that writing activities positively affect their speaking skills and suggested that speaking be taught with various writing activities more integratively and interactively.

Similarly, Na and Kim (2014) also investigated the effects of writing to learn on sixth graders' English speaking. As for the result, writing to learn had significant effects on developing speaking abilities in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. They concluded that writing to learn is an effective way to acquire speaking skills.

In a similar vein, Lee and Yoon (2010) investigated the effects of writing activity on learners' speaking skills. They conducted an in-depth qualitative study with eight students over twenty classes for eight weeks. The study explored any difference in improvement in speaking performance and any qualitative change in discussion and speech activity between writing-speaking group and speaking-only group. The results of the study showed that writing activity has a positive effect on speaking performance in terms of accuracy and fluency, and there is qualitative difference in the two groups' speaking performance.

To sum up, the results of a number of studies on L2 speaking indicated that writing and speaking were closely related to each other and writing-based approach had a positive effect on the development of speaking skills.

3. Reading-Writing Integration

In everyday use of language, people are continually integrating the language skills or switching from one skill to another. Many studies have demonstrated that integration teaching of reading-writing can be effective for second language learning since two skills can reinforce each other (Hudson, 2007). With reference to reading-writing integration, Grabe and Kaplan (1996) argues that reading and writing were reciprocal activities and the outcome of a reading activity could serve as input for writing and writing could lead a student to further reading resources. In addition, Stotsky (1983) presented that the correlational studies showed almost consistently that reading produced more skilled writers, and that better readers tended to produce more syntactically mature composition than poorer readers. Shanahan (2000) also mentioned that reading and writing are connected and quite similar, and thus their developments should be parallel each other closely. It seems that better writers tended to be better readers and better readers tended to be better writers. Moreover, literacy can be developed most efficiently when reading and writing are taught together in the classroom (Grabe, 2004). Furthermore, Grabe and Kaplan (1996) portrayed that a reading activity provides input for writing and that writing in turn offers resources for reading. Consequently, it is crucial to perceive that reading and writing interaction affects language learning.

Thus, Grabe and Zhang (2013) suggest that teachers and curricula need to focus explicit attention on reading comprehension activities with the texts that students must use in reading-writing tasks. Connecting these two skills can facilitate deeper reading comprehension because they are interactive and interrelated, and further the connection can help solve problems within each area. By combining these two skills, a more complete view of literacy is created and writing can be used as a check on readers' comprehension. Readers may be exposed to rich language inputs and may experiment with them in their writing. Grabe (2004) concluded that reading-writing should be taught together and the combination of both literacy skills enhances learning in all areas.

In conclusion, it is revealed that reading and writing are interrelated and mutually affect each other, and integrating these two skills can facilitate language learning.

III. METHOD

1. Participants and Contexts

This study selected an English course, called *Practical English 2* which aimed at helping improve communicative competencies in English such as speaking and writing.

The course was mainly offered for freshman of college as requirement and was completed over 15 weeks. The students who participated in this study was made up of 28 EFL college students (male/ female) who registered in the 15-week mandatory English course at N university in Korea. The two classes were randomly assigned into the control group (n=14) and the experimental group (n=14) of the study. Their age ranged from 19 to 22 years old. As the first phase of the study, the participants took the Computer Speaking Test which was developed by a company in Korea to assess oral proficiency. During the test, the test takers were guided to engage in a variety of tasks such as reading aloud, retelling story and expressing opinions. The oral proficiency scoring categories are comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. The scoring scale is from 20 to 80, and performance is judged to be at one of ten possible levels: Superior (75-80); Advanced (57-74)-high, mid, low; Intermediate (40-56)-high, mid, low; Novice (20-39)-high, mid, low. Most of the participants' scores ranged from 20 to 39, indicating low proficiency level of English and only three students were intermediate, scoring from 40 to 50. However, out of the 28 students, 4 students were excluded because they had a problem with class attendance and could not catch up with the rest of the class during the term. Thus, they were excluded from the analysis and the only 24 students were considered as subjects.

2. Classroom Materials

According to the students' proficiency level, the textbook was created based on *Composition Practice* (Linda, 2005), *Annie's Mailbox* journals from newspaper, and *Ready to Write* (Karen & Christine, 2003). *Composition Practice* was developed for an intensive composition course for an elementary level of second language learners. All reading passages and model compositions in the text focus on certain kinds of composition writing such as narration and description. It has 10 units and each unit has exercises for students to check up their reading comprehension, grammar and vocabulary. *Ready to Write* used for the summary writing provides learners with basic writing skills such as how to paraphrase and how to summarize. In addition, all of the journals selected from newspaper have a colloquial style with familiar topics and are written by letter form. Unlike the textbook for the experimental group, the writing section of the textbook for the control group was not included for the study.

3. Procedures

At the beginning of the term all the students of both the experimental and the control group took a pretest including the writing and speaking during the regular class period.

Although the students had already been evaluated as being elementary level learners based on computer speaking test results, the pretest was administered to ensure that there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of their overall writing and speaking ability.

The course was two consecutive classes and met once a week over a 15 week term. After taking a pretest, the learners of the experimental group received writing explanations during the first two weeks: how to organize, paraphrase, summarize and express opinions based on the text book. The students of the control group read passages of the textbook and practiced exercises similar to those in any typical English class in Korea. The textbook exercises include a variety of activities compatible with vocabulary and grammar structures of the targeted unit. From the fourth week, the students of the experimental group were asked to complete the tasks during the first period: reading passages of the model writing, summarizing the reading, describing some pictures chosen from the model writing, and writing their stories based on what they read. After they wrote their story, they gained the feedback from their peers. During the second period, the students of both two groups were asked to read journals selected from the newspaper. After reading, the students of the experimental group discussed and summarized what they read, and wrote their opinions to offer solutions in responding to the journals, whereas the students of the comparison group completed activities to check up reading comprehension. The instructor had the students of the experimental group work in a group for their writing because writing in English is not easy to those who are at elementary levels. After that, one student of each group in the experimental group was assigned to email the completion of their writing for feedback from the instructor.

In Week 15, the participants of each group took a post-test and it was 20 minutes long. The research procedure is summarized in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

The Procedure of the Experiment

	Experimental (Reading-Writing Integration)	Control (Reading Only)
Week 1	Pretest: Speaking (3 Questions) / Writing (30 min)	
Week 2-3	-Teaching a writing explanation	-Reading stories in the model writing
Week 4-14	-Reading stories in the model writing -Writing students' own story based on what they read about -Reading journals -Writing summary of the journal and opinions - Peer and teacher feedback	-Completing exercises in the textbook -Reading journals -Doing activities in the textbook
Week 15	Posttest: Speaking (3 Questions)	

4. Data Analysis

In order to measure the development of the participants' speaking ability, a pretest and a posttest were administered. The tests were adapted from *New OPIc SOS* (Credu, 2014) and from newspaper journals, *Korea Herald.* The pretest was used as a diagnostic tool to determine the participants' speaking and writing proficiency level whereas the posttest was used to measure the progress that each student had made. The pretest consisted of speaking and writing questions divided into two parts according to the research purpose. The speaking section consisted of all three questions asking to describe places and express opinions to solve problems.15 minutes were allotted to this speaking section. In the writing section, the students were asked to summarize a short journal with familiar topics and write their opinions without limited length. They were allowed 30 minutes to complete the writing. After the treatment, the same types of speaking questions as the pretest were given to the participants of each group for the posttest.

The speaking and writing test were scored by two English native speakers. They were English professors and have been teaching English for more than 10 years at college in Korea. One is now in Ph.D. program and the other finished the doctoral courses, both majoring in English Education. The inter-rater reliability between the two raters was relatively high (r=.90) in scoring the students' writing and speaking samples. In this study, their writing samples were analyzed and scored by the criteria adopted from the analytic scoring (Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormouth, Hartfiel, & Hughey, 1981), and the rubric partly adapted from both Jacobs et al.'s (1981) and Brown (2001) was used to analyze their speaking samples. The perfect score of writing test was 100 points, but the speaking test was 300 points for all three questions. The rubric utilized for the current study to assess speaking performances is summarized as follows. It is composed of five major components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use and fluency, and each category has four different ranges of scores from 'very poor' to 'excellent to very good.'

The data was analyzed using SPSS 22 for descriptive analysis and an independent samples t-test was used to see the differences between the integrated reading-writing instruction and non-integrated.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

An independent samples t-test was conducted to ensure that two groups had similar writing and speaking abilities at the onset of the data collection. No significant difference was found between the control group (M=3.00, SD=1.89) and the experimental group (M=3.93, SD=2.87; t= .999, *p*= .327) in terms of their writing

proficiency. The results also indicated that there was no significant difference between the control group (M=110.67, SD=16.70) and the experimental group (M=125.17, SD=17.05; t=979; *p*= .332) in terms of their speaking proficiency at the beginning of the term before the treatment. The descriptive statistics of their scores and t-test results in both writing and speaking pre-test are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Results of Speaking and Writing Pre-Test

		Pre-test		*df*	t	*p*
		Mean	SD			
Writing	Control	3.00	1.89	22	.999	.327
	Experimental	3.93	2.87			
Speaking	Control	110.67	16.70	22	.979	.332
	Experimental	125.17	17.05			

p<.05

1. Results of Independent Samples t-test for Speaking Proficiency

An independent samples t-test was utilized to investigate if there are significant differences of the speaking proficiency between the integrated reading-writing and non-integrated instruction on the post-test. Table 3 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of speaking post-test between the two groups. The mean score of the experimental group was 163.75 (SD= 24.27) and that of the control group was 130.83 (SD= 18.71). The experimental group performed better on the post-test than the control group (t= -2.78; *p*= .011). It means that the integrated instruction was significantly more effective for an elementary level of EFL college students to improve their speaking proficiency than the non-integrated instruction. This also provides empirical evidence that reading-writing integration is beneficial for improving students' speaking ability.

TABLE 3

Results of Independent Samples t-test for Speaking Proficiency

Group	Posttest		*df*	t	*p*
	Mean	SD			
Control	130.83	18.71	22	-2.78	.011
Experimental	163.75	24.27			

p<.05

2. Results of Independent Samples t-test in Domains

The post-test results of both groups in five domains of speaking tests were compared

by an independent samples t-test to see if there are any significant differences of speaking proficiency between the integrated and non-integrated instruction. Table 4 shows t-test results of two groups' scores in five domains of speaking post-test. As indicated in Table 4, the students in the experimental group performed better than those in the control group in all the five domains of speaking post-test: content, organization, vocabulary, language use and fluency. As shown below Table 4, the mean score of the control group was 46.67 (SD=6.03) and those of the experimental group was 50.75 (SD= 6.54) in the content of five language domains. In the organization domain, the mean score of comparison and experimental group was 27.41 (SD=3.04) and 36.08 (SD=5.40) respectively. The mean score of control group was 28.50 (SD= 3.28) in the vocabulary, 29.26 (SD=4.04) in the language use, and 7.92 (*SD*=1.16) in the fluency. The mean score of experimental group was 34.0 (SD=4.14) in the vocabulary, 36.75 (SD=4.14), 36.75 (SD=5.72) in the language use, and 10.25 (SD=2.16) in the fluency. Furthermore, Table 4 presents that the mean differences were statistically significant in all five language areas. The mean differences were 4.08 in the area of content (t= -2.79, *p*= .011), 8.67 in the area of organization (t= -4.87, *p*= .000), 5.5 in the area of vocabulary (t= -2.68, *p*= .012), 7.49 in the area of language use (t=-4.93, *p*= .000), and 7.49 in the area of fluency (t=4.40, *p*= .000). Overall, the experimental group students outperformed in all areas of speaking compared with the control group.

TABLE 4

Results of Independents Samples t-test in Five Domains

Domain	Group	Post-test Mean	Post-test SD	t	*p*
Content	Con	46.67	6.03	-2.79	.011
	Exp	50.75	6.54		
Organization	Con	27.41	3.04	-4.87	.000
	Exp	36.08	5.40		
Vocabulary	Con	28.50	3.28	-2.68	.012
	Exp	34.00	4.14		
Language Use	Con	29.26	4.04	-4.93	.000
	Exp	36.75	5.72		
Fluency	Con	7.92	1.16	-4.40	.000
	Exp	10.25	2.16		

$p<.05$

The results of this study show that the integrated reading-writing instruction had an effect on improving students' speaking proficiency and all five domains were found significantly different in the pre-and post-test of the experimental group. The following highlights the discussion on the effects of the integrative instruction. First, the students' speaking proficiency of the experimental group was considerably improved in the

content of five domains. This result could be due to writing own stories based on the narrative readings. It may have possibly helped students develop their ideas that lead to more precisely and clearly speak about the assigned topic. Moreover, reading materials with familiar topics may have given students opportunities to learn how to narrate or describe their daily lives and naturally learn the syntactic structures. All of the integrating reading-writing activities may guide students to speak in an appropriate way. Second, the integrated reading-writing was effective in learning how to organize paragraphs. Similar to the results of content domain, there was an obvious improvement in organization. The mean score of the experimental group students in the post-test shows an apparent improvement (t=-14.56, p<.05). In general, the results indicate that the integrative instruction also assisted the students to learn organization skills of speaking. Third, writing activities based on reading such as summarizing journal articles and writing opinions in a pair group would have contributed to the students' increased vocabulary knowledge and would have helped appropriate use in accordance with the various contexts. Moreover, while creating a composition together in a pair group, the students were allowed to use a bilingual dictionary and it could have helped to increase their vocabulary knowledge. Consequently, they achieved higher scores in the vocabulary domain. On the basis of the results, all these writing activities connected to reading seemed helpful for the students to expand their vocabulary knowledge for their better speaking. Fourth, feedback was given to every written work by the instructor and it seemed beneficial for the students to reduce grammatical errors. Besides, peer feedback before submitting their writing could play a huge role in self-correction. As a result, the students of the experimental group (t= -9.70, p<.05) achieved higher scores in the post-test than those of the control group (t= -1.35, p<.05) in terms of language use. Lastly, regular writing practice with reading integrated in the treatment was seen as crucial for the students' fluent speaking. The participants of the experimental group were exposed to a variety of writing activities and they put their efforts to express their ideas clearly through the writing. This may support Brown's (2001) statement that writing practice can assist learners to store whatever they learn in their long term memory including learning vocabulary, grammar and patterns.

Based on the results of this study, it can be interpreted that the integrated reading-writing is beneficial in speaking enhancement at the elementary levels of language proficiency and the experimental group benefited from the integrated instruction in improving speaking proficiency. Writing activity is thus assumed to be an influential factor in improving the speaking ability of the experimental group. The result of this study seems to uphold the findings of the previous studies (El-Koumy, 1998; Kim, 2000; Lee, 2006; Na & Kim, 2014; Zhu, 2007). As revealed in the current and previous studies, the studies concerning the relationships between writing and speaking have pointed out

that writing and speaking are closely co-related and affect learners' speaking skills.

V. CONCLUSION

The current study primarily aimed to explore if reading-writing integration has an impact on speaking performance of college level students, considering the effectiveness of reading and writing on speaking. It was found that the speaking proficiency of the both control and experimental group students was improved. However, the students in the experimental group were excelled to those in the control group, and significant differences were also found in all language domains. Based on the results of this study, this may imply that reading-writing integration is effective in speaking improvement at the elementary level of language proficiency. Such a result may be because writing activity in connection with reading positively affected their speaking performance. A variety of writing practices seem to be influential to promote their speaking ability. It is consistent with the results of the previous studies on writing and speaking (Kim, 2000; Lee, 2006; Lee & Yoon, 2010; Na & Kim, 2014) and their findings suggested that speaking can be taught with various writing activities. Based on the results of this present study concludes that although reading could also affect speaking abilities positively, the reading integrating writing was more effective in improving speaking proficiency of Korean EFL college students.

On the basis of the findings, pedagogical implications can be drawn in EFL contexts. Speaking is teachable in EFL settings through the reading-writing integration, and writing activities based on reading could be an alternative instructional method to improve speaking skills. Therefore, language teachers could apply reading-writing integration into their curriculum as to enhance speaking skills of L2 learners. Furthermore, the findings of this study suggest that reading materials and writing tasks should be appropriate for the L2 learners' proficiency levels. As Schleppegrell and Colombi (2002) mentioned learners acquire linguistic features through the reading and then they practice using what they learned from the reading in their discourses to promote their speaking skills. Although integration of reading into writing offers opportunities for L2 learners to delve into features of the text, if reading and writing tasks are not proper to them, it may not elicit the improvement of their language proficiency. Thus, instructors should consider the proficiency level of learners and their interests in designing classroom lessons to develop students' speaking skills and to implement effective reading-writing integration tasks.

It is meaningful that this current study was first attempted to discover a new way to teach speaking by investigating the effects of reading-writing integration on speaking.

However, there are some limitations to this study. One limitation is that more materials with diverse text types and complex writing tasks may produce a different result. Another limitation concerns the small sample size and thus this study cannot be generalized for a larger group. More participants may lead to a result that can be generalized to a broader range of classrooms. Lastly, students' performances may vary at their language proficiency level, in other schools and other countries. Therefore, the results may not be directly applicable to other contexts due to the unique context of this case study.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Cho, K., & Krashen, S. (1994). Acquisition of vocabulary from the Sweet Valley Kids series: Adult ESL acquisition. *Journal of Reading*, *37*(8), 662-667.

Choi, J. (2012). A case study of Korean EFL students: The development of speaking proficiency through reading children's literature. *Teaching English Literature*, *16*(1), 179-204.

Choi, J. (2014). *Developing speaking ability through extensive reading of children's literature: A study on Korean college-level EFL students.* Doctoral Dissertation, HanYang University, Seoul.

Cleland, A. A., & Pickering, M. J. (2006). Do writing and speaking employ the same syntactic representations? *Journal of Memory and Language*, *54*(2), 185-198.

Credu, H. (2014). *OPIc SOS skills of speaking*. Seoul: Credu.

Davies, P., & Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

El-Koumy, A. S. A. (1998). Effect of dialogue journal writing on EFL students' speaking skill. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED424772).

Grabe, W. (2004). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Grabe, W., & Zhang, C. (2013). Reading and writing together: A critical component of English for academic purpose teaching and learning. *TESOL Journal*, *4*(1), 9-24.

Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching second language reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hughes, R. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Speaking* (2nd ed.). New York:

Routledge.

Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karen, B., & Christine, R. (2003). *A first composition text* (3rd ed.). London: Pearson Education.

Kim, J. M. (2000). The effect of writing activity on listening, speaking, reading and writing. Unpublished master's thesis. Yonsei University, Seoul.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1989). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lee, E. H. (2006). A comparison of Korean EFL learners' oral and written production. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *12*(2), 62-85.

Lee, Y. N., & Yoon, H. S. (2010). The effects of writing as a speaking activity on the college students' speaking performance. *English Language Teaching*, *22*(3), 143-166.

Linda, L. (2005). *Composition practice* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of writing research*. New York: Guilford Press.

Moon, K. Y. (2013). A study of the effects of narrative texts on high schools students' English proficiency. Unpublished master's thesis. Korea National University, Cheongju.

Na, E. J., & Kim, T. E. (2014). The effects of learning English through writing to learn and the elementary students' perceptions of writing to learn. *Foreign Languages Education, 21*(3), 155-186.

Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge.

Newton, J. (1995). Task-based interaction and incidental vocabulary learning: A case study. *Second Language Research*, *11*(2), 159-176.

Schleppegrell, M. J., & Colombi, M. C. (2002). *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages meaning with power*. Trenton, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, *36*, 39-50.

Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. *Language Arts*, *60*, 627-642.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weissberg, R. (2006). *Connecting speaking and writing in second language writing*

instruction. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Zhang, Y. (2009). Reading to speak: Integrating oral communication skills. *English Teaching Forum, 47*(1), 32-34.

Zhu, X.-h. (2007). What do we know about the relationship between speaking and writing in college-level ESL students? *US-China Foreign Language, 5*(3), 31-40.

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable levels: Elementary and Secondary Level

Suzy Kim
511-301 Tranchae-maeul apt. Ssangyong-dong, Seobuk-gu,
Cheonan, Chungnam 31161, Korea
Email: k.suzy810@gmail.com

Hae Sung Sohng
182, Sinkwan-dong, Kongju, Chungnam, 314-701, Korea
Email: songhs@kongju.ac.kr

Michael Diehl
Language Institute
Woosong Information College
Jayang-dong, Dong-gu, Daejeon, 34606, Korea
Email: goldrick2000@yahoo.com

Received in April 14th, 2017
Reviewed in May 26th, 2017
Revised version received in June 5th, 2017