English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 20, No. 3 Fall 2014

A Study on EFL College Students' Reading and Integrated Writing Ability and Their Reading Strategy Use

Pirae Kim
(Korea University)

Kim, Pirae. (2014). A study on EFL college students' reading and integrated writing ability and their reading strategy use. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 20*(3), 119-137.

This research is an investigation of the relationship between reading ability and integrated writing ability of EFL Korean university students and the differences in the use of reading strategies between upper level readers and lower level readers. The research was conducted in college academic writing classes where participants (n= 50) had to write an argumentative essay based on the reading material. One standardized test, one cloze reading comprehension test developed by the researcher, a perceived reading strategy use questionnaire, and an integrated essay were used as the instruments of measurement. A strong correlation between reading and writing ability was shown in the result of the analysis (r (df) = .709, p < .01). In regard to the reading strategy uses between upper and lower level participants through the survey questionnaire, the independent samples t-test results indicated that participants showed statistically significant difference in mining strategy use (p = .042, p < .05), while in other categories of reading strategies, no statistically significant differences between two groups were found. The study results show different features of reading strategy use involved in the reading-to-write task and provide us with some pedagogical implications in EFL writing instructions.

[**reading ability/integrated writing ability/reading strategy use/reading and writing relationship**]

I. INTRODUCTION

The interest in integrated writing has been increasing for the last two decades particularly among the L2 academic writing researchers (Carson, 2001; Plakans 2009a; 2009b; Spivey, 1984; 1990). Many of them share an agreement that integrated writing practices are critical to college students' academic success since writing using multiple

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

sources is the most frequently required writing task in the university setting (Grabe, 2002). Most college students encounter in their everyday class such tasks as summarizing texts, writing a report, or developing a research paper based on source readings (Hale et al., 1996). Furthermore, with the inclusion of integrated writing test in some standardized tests such as TOEFL iBT test, the research on integrated writing in the field of testing has also been accelerated (Plakans, 2009a; 2009b; Plakans & Geril, 2012; Plakans & Yang, 2012). Even in the EFL setting, for instance, as many university classes in Korea offer a variety of content-based English lectures, the need for EFL college students to practice integrated writing in the academic writing class and for further research on this area is ever growing.

Most of previous correlational studies on reading and integrating writing (Esmaeili, 2002; Mateos & Sole, 2009; Spivey, 1984;1991; Spivey & King, 1989) and learners' reading strategy use in processing integrated writing have been conducted in L1 or ESL context (Plakans, 2009a; 2009b; Plakans and Yang, 2012). However, research on the relationship between reading ability and the integrated writing ability and the learners' strategy use and its relationship to the learners' reading ability has been scarce within the EFL context. This study, therefore, will be an attempt to fill the gap in the study of EFL learners' strategy use in reading-to-write tasks and its relation to their reading ability. Another research question in this research will be an investigation of the correlation between reading ability and writing ability. These inquiries will provide some pedagogical implications in the L2 reading for writing classes in the university academic setting. The research questions, thus, are as follows:

1. Is there any correlation between the EFL college learners' reading ability and their integrated writing ability?

2. Are there any differences in EFL college learners' perceived use of reading strategies between two groups of students with different levels of reading ability while undertaking a reading-to-write task?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The Relationship between Reading and Integrated Writing Abilities

Reading and writing have conventionally been regarded non-interactive with each other, and thus taught and dealt with separately in a school curriculum and research. However, from the early 1980s, there has been a growing interest in looking at reading

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

and writing in connection (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001, Hirvela, 2004; Grabe, 2002; Tierney & Pearson, 1983; Tierney and Shanahan, 1991). For example, Tierney and Pearson (1983) proposed a "composing model of reading" in which they advocated that reading is basically interactive in its meaning construction. The basic hypothesis they suggested was that "readers construct the meaning through an ongoing dialogue with themselves in the same way that writers compose to represent their meaning" (Hudson, 2007, p. 264). To put this differently, readers are able to understand the content of a text through the "writer's cues" and a writer in composing a text attempts to create the meaning with the readers' expectations in mind. Along with this, many researchers have called for the need to integrate reading and writing in teaching (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Hirvela, 2004; Kim & Im, 2009; Zamel, 1992). For example, Zamel contended that in order for a reader to fully understand the reading process, writing needs to be taught together with reading. Fitzgerald and Shanahan (2000) also argued that if the reading is taught in integration, the learning in both reading and writing can be mutually beneficial.

A number of researchers conducted a correlational study between reading ability and writing ability of the learners in both L1 and L2 context, but the results are contradictory. The study carried out by Spivey and King (1989) illustrates a correlational study that explored the relationship of the sixth, eighth and tenth graders' reading ability with their discourse synthesis writing ability. They reported that L1 students' reading ability played a meaningful contribution to their writing performance. Esmaelili (2002) also examined the correlation between reading performance and writing ability with thirty-four ESL students taking a college writing class in Canada. The task in this study was thematically connected reading-to-write test module and the reading comprehension test using the same material. Esmaelili's study also investigated the types of writing strategies that the learners use, their attitude toward the use of thematic unit and topic familiarity. When the test module was thematically connected, students' performance was reported to be better. Based on the results, he contended that the reading and writing relation is interdependent and bidirectional, which means that the learners' reading and writing abilities affect each other. But the research conducted by Delaney (2008) that focused on task difference in a reading-to-write task reported different results. In her investigation on the relationship between reading ability and writing ability with the summary writing and response essay, she concluded that reading ability did not affect the students' integrated writing score.

In the EFL context, the studies on the integration of reading and writing are still in an exploratory phase and most of them are focusing on the effect of instructional interventions (Kim, 2007; Kim, 2009; Kim, 2011; Kim, 2012; Lee & Min, 2010). Kim (2012), for instance, explored the effects of the integrated reading-writing instruction on Korean college students' writing skills. The focus of her analysis in participants' writing

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

was content knowledge, organization, fluency, and grammar and spelling. The findings indicated that the writing quality in the experimental group was significantly improved, but only in their content knowledge and organization. While the current study can be a meaningful addition to the study of reading and writing connection, this research can be distinguished from previous research since it is an attempt to investigate the use of reading strategies in an integrated writing context, not the one in a reading comprehension context.

2. Reading Strategies and Integrated Writing Task

Reading strategy is a procedure when a language learner deliberately "makes use of in learning and using a language" (Richards, Platt, & Weber 1985). It can be distinguished from reading skills such as skimming, or inference making in the process of comprehending a text by its conscious engagement while reading. Hudson succinctly defines reading strategy as “an interactive process that has the goal of obtaining meaning from connected text” (Hudson, 2007, p 107). The primary role of reading strategy is, thus, to lessen the burden of working memory to facilitate the reading process. Oxford (1990) places reading strategies within a broader context of learning strategies and contends that learning strategies are one of the key factors affecting the success in L2 learning (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990). It is now well established through a vast majority of research that good readers use more reading strategies and use them more effectively than poor readers (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Hudson, 2007).

In a reading-to-write task, strategies learners employ differ from the strategies used for reading comprehension because the purpose of their reading is different (Phakiti, 2003). Several research focused on the strategies used in the reading-to-write process provide some insights into understanding the nature of particular strategies involved (Hirvela, 2004; Negretti & Kuteeva, 2011; Plakans, 2009a). For instance, in an attempt to conceptualize reading in a writing class, Hirvela (2004) proposes a variety of different strategies – “mining”, “writerly reader”, and “rhetorical reading”- for the readers to utilize. The act of reading, according to him, is likened to the act of mining in which readers, like miners, attempt to discover what they need to know with a certain purpose. He argues that mining strategy involves identifying the rhetorical, linguistic, or lexical input in the source material. In other words, readers/writers are able to recognize the organizational patterns through reading such as the location of thesis statement or topic sentence. They can also learn the linguistic features in writing such as transitional words as well as the lexical and stylistic features through reading.

Recent studies focusing on the strategy use were conducted in the test-taking context (Plakans, 2009a; 2009b; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Plakans & Yang, 2012). Plakans

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

(2009a), for example, looked into the characteristics of strategies used while conducting an integrated writing task and the sequences in which the strategies occur. The ESL learners' strategy use in the process of doing integrated writing was analyzed through the think-aloud techniques and interviews, in particular, focusing on the students' use of reading strategies in sequence. Plakans also examined the relationship between the use of reading strategies and the students' writing performance. Two integrated writing tasks were asked to the ESL international students with diverse educational background. Through the analysis of think-aloud protocols, five different types of reading strategies emerged: goal-setting for reading the source texts; cognitive processing; global strategies; metacognitive strategies and mining strategies. Among these categories of strategies, the use of cognitive strategies was found to be the highest in its frequency. In the comparison of the mean scores among three different levels of students in their writing scores, those who gained the highest score in writing proficiency were found to use far more strategies than those with the lowest scores. Furthermore, in the examination of the relation between writing ability and the reading strategy use in the reading-to-write tasks, the highest level participants made more use of global strategies and mining strategies, while those in the lowest level were found to use cognitive processing strategies most frequently.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. The Participants

The participants in this study were 50 EFL Korean university students out of total 60 enrolled students to the class, who were taking an academic writing course the researcher taught in a university in Seoul, Korea. They were selected from two classes with the same course title through a convenience sampling basis (Schuman & Kalton, 1985). The number of 50 participants was finalized as those who participated in both reading and writing tests at the beginning of the semester as well as during the semester. The participants' age ranged from 19 to 26 with diverse majors in their different year of study at the university. Since these two classes were offered as an elective course open for all years of study in the university, a heterogeneous group of students took this course. They comprised of twenty four female students and twenty six male students. There is no prerequisite to take this course, but many advanced level students take this course. When asked to self-report their standardized test score if they have any, many students reported that they received over 900 in their TOEIC scores. In the needs analysis conducted at the beginning of the semester, 35 students out of 50 reported that

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

they had experience of staying at an English speaking country. The duration of their staying in a foreign country ranged from six months to 7 years in the past.

2. Data and Procedure

1) Reading Materials

The reading material in this research was a newspaper article from *Time*, a joint newspaper in partnership with CNN, published on April 20th in 2010 (Cain, 2010). The title of the reading was "South Korea Cracks Down on Gaming Addiction" and it dealt with a controversial issue on the gaming curfew law in South Korea. According to the Flesch-Kincaid readability testing result, the grade level for this article was 12.1, which the researcher considered an appropriate level to be used as an in-class reading material for EFL college students. The reading material was used to test participants' reading ability as well as their writing ability. Students were asked to read the material during the class hour and given an essay test.

2) Reading Comprehension Tests

Two different reading tests were designed to measure students' reading ability and divide the participants into two different groups (upper and lower levels) in this research. The first type of reading comprehension test was a form of a standardized test developed as a selection from the Michigan English Proficiency Battery (2010), which was composed of a set of grammar, vocabulary and reading comprehension tests. Twenty items from the reading comprehension section were selected for the test. Another test material to measure reading ability was directly related to the newspaper article that the participants read for their essay writing during the class hour. The researcher developed a cloze test with twenty questions to measure students' comprehension of the reading. Two passages were selected out of the newspaper article with 667 words. The researcher made the blanks focusing on the content words in some sentences, which were composed of a total of 20 items.

3) Reading Strategy Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire to examine college students' perceived use of reading strategies in undertaking academic reading and writing task in this research was developed by the researcher. The reading strategy question items were made in a 5-Likert scale type: 1 (very rarely), 2 (rarely), 3 (occasionally), 4 (often), and 5 (very

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

often). Students were asked to put a check mark on the survey sheet after completing their essay. The questions were comprised of five categories of reading strategies: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, support strategies, global strategies, and mining strategies. It consisted of 37 items developed on the basis of the Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) and other strategies discussed in Plakans' study (2009a). SORS was designed to measure both L1 and L2 college learners' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies designed by Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001). Strategy types they identified were composed of 28 items with the subscales of 1) metacognitive strategies (MET) 2) cognitive strategies (COG), and 3) support strategies (SUP). The 10 items of metacognitive strategies were concerned with learners' monitoring and managing ability such as purpose of reading, previewing the text's length or organization. Cognitive strategies consist of 12 statements and they included questions on the "actions and procedures readers use" while reading. Support strategies were composed of 6 items and asked what supporting aid the readers use to comprehend the test such as "using a dictionary, taking notes, or underlining or highlighting the text" to understand the meaning of the text.

In addition to SORS, the researcher also included four items of global reading strategies (GLB) and six items of mining strategies (MIN). These two categories of reading strategies were included based on the Plakans' (2009a) research, which I believe, most appropriate to the current research context. Plakans (2009b) also asked students in her research to write an argumentative essay based on the two reading sources. Based on the results of think-aloud protocols, she divided the strategies into five categories: 1) goal-setting for reading the source texts, 2) cognitive processing, 3) global strategies, 4) metacognitive strategies, and 5) mining the source texts for use in writing. I included both the global strategies and mining strategies into my survey questionnaire since they are closely relevant to the act of reading while undertaking a reading-based writing performance.

4) Integrated Essay Writing Scores

In this study, students were asked to write an argumentative essay since it is one of the most commonly asked tasks in the academy. Students were provided with the instruction that they need to develop a six paragraph essay after reading the article. The essay question was to decide their perspective on the issue of curfew law on gaming in South Korea. In their writing they were instructed to integrate the content in the reading selections and their personal experience and take their own position. A holistic scoring method was used in grading the essay. The grading rubrics (see the Appendix A) were adapted from the one in Plakans & Gebril (2008) and Plakans (2009a)

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

5) Procedure

The reading comprehension test designed by the Michigan English Proficiency Battery was administered during the week 2 to divide participants' reading ability into two levels at random. The participants whose score ranged from 20 to 13 were grouped as the upper-level; those who scored less than 13 were assigned as the lower-level group. The cloze reading comprehension test, the survey on the reading strategy questionnaire, and the essay test were administered during the week 12, when the lessons on the argumentative essay writing were scheduled. The researcher informed students of the rationale for administering these tests as part of the in-class activities and asked them to express their agreement or disagreement to use the data for research purpose after the class. They all agreed to use their test results in my research. The students took the cloze test first for 15 minutes and the test sheet was collected. After completing the test, participants were given the time to read the newspaper for another 20 minutes. After completing their reading, they were instructed to write a 6 paragraph persuasive essay for 50 minutes. For the essay test, students were instructed to integrate the reading content to support their position on the gaming curfew regulation in South Korea. Right after their essay test, participants were asked to fill out the survey sheet along with the information on their personal history of learning English. The survey was conducted to investigate participants' perceived awareness of reading strategy use while they were undertaking the integrated writing test and it took about 10 minutes and was written in English.

In order to measure participants' integrated writing ability, the researcher and another grader were involved in the grading process. The grader is a coworker who has been engaged in teaching academic writing courses for five years in that university. Grading was based on the holistic scoring method by relying on the rubric adapted from Plakans and Geril (2008) and Plakans (2009a) used. To estimate the inter-rater reliability, 20% of writing samples were randomly selected. When Cronbach's alpha and Pearson's correlations were estimated, the inter-rater reliability indexes were .889 (α) and .803 (Pearson), respectively. Therefore, rater agreement indicated an acceptable rate.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In order to gain the measurement results, the current study ran SPSS version 22.0. The means of the two reading comprehension tests and the writing tests are shown in Table 1.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

TABLE 1

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.Deviation
MRC_score	50	3.0	16.0	11.36	2.82
RC_score	50	4.0	20.0	15.28	4.51
Writing_Score	50	5.0	15.0	11.14	2.46
Valid N (per Item)	50				

The mean score for the Michigan Reading Comprehension Test (MRC) was 11.360 and 2.8267 in the standard deviation. The lowest score was 3 out of 20 points and the highest score was 16. The cloze-type reading comprehension test (RC) results show a higher mean score and standard deviation (M=15.280; SD= 4.5177) than those in the standardized test. The minimum score was 4 and the maximum was 20. Based on the mean score (approximately 60% of reading scores) in the standardized test, the participants whose scores were more than 13 were categorized into the upper level; those who gained less than 13 were grouped in the lower level. In the cloze test, the mean value for the test was 15.520, score 17 was the dividing point. Regarding the writing score, out of total score 15, score 12 was the dividing point for grouping the participants into two groups. In addition to this, since the number of subjects who took the standardized reading comprehension test was 51, the researcher had to cull 50 from sixty participants who did not take the test at the beginning of the semester, although they participated in the reading and writing test on week 12.

1. The Correlation between Reading and Integrated Writing Ability

Pearson's correlations analysis was run to examine the relationship between reading ability and writing ability. The table 2 shows the correlation between reading ability and integrated writing ability.

TABLE 2

Correlations between Reading and Writing Ability

		RC	WS
RC	Pearson Correlation	1	.709**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	50	50
WS	Pearson Correlation	.709**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	50	50

****. (r = .709, p < 0.01) (2-tailed).**

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

As is shown in Table 3, the correlation coefficient was of r = .709, therefore, it was statistically significant. Considering that more than .4 coefficient indexes can be considered as a significant level in the correlation research in social science, the rate indicates that the participants' reading and writing abilities are closely related.

2. The Differences in the Reading Strategy Use between Upper and Lower Level Participants in Their Reading Ability

To verify the internal reliability for each item in each type of reading strategy, Cronbach's alpha was tested. For 10 metacognitive items, reliability index was .741 (α= .741); the 12 items for cognitive reading strategies, Cronbach's alpha was .775 (α = .775); for 6 items in support strategies reliability value was .736 (α = .736). For the 4 items in the global strategies, the reliability index was .671. In the reliability test for the 5 items in the mining strategies, Cronbach's alpha was .710 (α = .710). Except in the reliability index for global strategies, all question items were found to be reliable. In regard to the relatively lower reliability value in global strategy items, the researcher assumed that the reason stems from the fact that relatively small number of items in global strategy (n=4) was used than that in other types of strategies. Table 3 presents the mean score for each category of reading strategies.

TABLE 3

Descriptive Statistics for Reading Strategies

	Reading Ability	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MET_total	Lower	25	3.38	.486	.097
	Upper	25	3.50	.580	.116
COG_total	Lower	25	3.57	.424	.084
	Upper	25	3.73	.650	.130
SUP_total	Lower	25	3.18	.640	.128
	Upper	25	3.47	.825	.165
GLB_total	Lower	25	3.24	.686	.137
	Upper	25	3.54	.748	.149
MIN_total	Lower	25	3.38	.647	.129
	Upper	25	3.76	.649	.129

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

The means for all types of reading strategies are above 3.00 in both groups: for metacognitive strategies, the mean score of the lower level readers was 3.38 (*M*=3.38, *SD*=.48648), and 3.5 for the higher level participants. The mean score of the higher level participants' cognitive strategies was 3.73, while for lower level students, it was 3.57. This suggests that participants in the current study used all types of reading strategies very frequently. The biggest difference in the mean value between two groups was indicated in the mining strategies.

To measure the differences in the frequencies of reading strategy use for two groups and their relationship with their reading ability, an independent samples *t*-test was conducted for each type of reading strategy. Table 4 presents the results.

TABLE 4

Reading Strategy Use between Students with Lower and Higher Reading Ability

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		***t*- test for Equality of Means**						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Differ-ence	Std. Error Differ-ence	Std. Error Difference	
								Lower	Upper
MET ave.	1.014	.319	-.792 -.792	48 46.	.432 .432	-.120 -.120	.151 .151	-.424 -.424	.184 .184
COG ave.	4.194	.046	-1.00 -1.00	48 41	.318 .319	-.156 -.156	.155 .155	-.469 -.470	.155 .157
SUP ave.	.476	.493	-1.37 -1.37	48 45	.177 .177	-.286 -.209	.209 .209	-.707 -.707	.133 .134
GLB ave.	.011	.918	-1.47 -1.47	48 48	.146 .146	-.300 -.300	.203 .203	-.708 -.708	.108 .108
MIN ave.	.101	.752	-2.092 -2.092	48 48	.042 .042	-.384 -.384	.183 .183	-.752 -.752	-.015 -.015

The survey results indicated that in the mean difference between upper level and lower level participants' metacognitive strategy use, cognitive strategies, supporting strategies and global strategies, there was no statistically significant difference (see Table 5). However, the difference of mean values in mining strategies was .38400. This indicated the biggest difference in the mean value among the categories of reading strategy. The mining strategies showed significant difference (t= 2.092; p= .042, $p < 0.05$).

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research was planned to examine the correlation between reading ability and integrated writing ability in college academic writing classes in an EFL context and readers' perceived use of reading strategies according to two different levels of reading proficiency. The study results indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship in participants' reading and integrated writing ability (r (df) = .709, p = .000)

In regard to the differences in the readers' perceived use of reading strategies, the mean differences between upper level and lower level participants were compared through the independent samples t-test. When compared, only in the use of mining strategies, a statistically significant result was found. However, the differences in metacognitive strategy use, cognitive strategies, support strategies and global strategies were not found statistically significant.

The basic assumption in the implementation of this study was that students' reading ability to perform academic writing tasks in their academic life is critical. Therefore the attempt to answer to the questions on what reading strategies will be used and what the nature of reading is will provide some insight into our reading and writing pedagogy; however, there has not been much attention or attempt to investigate the nature of reading strategies that students use in carrying out reading-to-write tasks in EFL context. I would argue that the result in the correlation test is an evidence to assert the need to integrate reading and writing in the academic writing classes. Considering that numerous researches on the correlation between reading and writing ability have reported that the coefficient level is between .50 to .70 (Grabe, 2002), the result on the correlation between reading ability and integrated writing ability in this study is consistent with the test results shown in the previous studies.

A close relationship between reading and writing ability shown in this study implies that there is certain overlap in the cognitive processing involved in the comprehension of a text and the production through writing (Hudson, 2007). This perspective suggests that the process of writing and reading is similar in meaning construction (Tierney and Pearson, 1983). In other words, there are some overlapping points in the way a reader comprehends a text and the way a writer composes a text. The reader/writer uses the text content as background knowledge as well as the models for writing in the composition process by taking both the reader and writer's position. Furthermore, viewing reading and writing in connection, as Hudson points out, broadens "the view of reading to incorporate writing, and indeed a view of literacy that is broader than just the ability to read and write decontextually" (Hudson, p. 263).

Another interesting finding in this research was that students used mining strategies more frequently than other types of reading strategies and that the significant difference

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

between good readers and poor readers was also found in the use of mining strategies. This fact suggests that the act of reading in the context of an integrated writing situation differed from that where only the comprehension checking was needed (Plakans, 2009a). In other words, the readers in this context were keenly aware of what their "goals and plans" of reading were, and thus, they used different types of strategies in reading, that is, mining strategies to meet the task demand. Confronting different purposes of reading, in this context of reading for writing, students attempted to activate the reading strategies closely related to performing the writing task (Hirvela, 2004). The result of this research also supports Greene's (1992) view that reading in the reading-to-write process can be characterized as an act of "mining." Students' use of reading strategies in this context had more to do with producing a good writing. In doing so, the act of reading went beyond the mere comprehension level. It went further how to use and what to use as source information from the reading for writing. That is, it was closely related to their purpose of how to write a good essay. In order to undertake it successfully, they had to utilize the mining strategies. In terms of the frequencies used by the participants according to their level, this study also corroborates the results found in Plakans (2009a)'s study, where lower level students used more cognitive strategies; higher level participants were shown to use more mining strategies.

However, it should be noted that while the numerous research results have asserted that good readers use more reading strategies than the poorer, the differences between two groups of students in this research were not significant enough. They displayed high frequency in using all five types of reading strategies. This fact presumably derives from the fact that the participants in this study were actually in higher level of proficiency compared to the average students who were taking other general English courses in this university. According to the self-reported information on their background of studying English, about 60 percent of students reported that they had stayed in the English speaking countries once in their lifetime, spanning from 6 months to 7 years. This suggests that participants who belonged in lower level in this research were intermediate level rather than the actual low level students. In fact, a great many of them were highly fluent in their speaking and writing during the class activities.

This, in turn, can be one limitation in this study. In other words, if the future research can experiment with the subjects whose reading proficiency can be pertinently different, the result may be different. Another limitation in this research was that the research could have produced more solid evidence if any other measurements such as using think-aloud protocols, had been used to supplement the survey method.

The findings of the study also throw important pedagogical implications in college composition classes. Considering that reading ability and writing ability are mutually influencing, we can assume that integrating a variety of reading sources in the writing

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

classroom can produce more beneficial results in the quality of students' writings. Therefore, instructors are encouraged to bring diverse reading materials and create various tasks to connect reading and writing rather than teaching them separately. Furthermore, writing practitioners will need to activate mining strategies along with other types of strategies more systematically in an integrated reading and writing classroom in order to enhance students' reading and writing proficiency as well.

REFERENCES

Ascención Delaney, Y. (2008). Investigating the reading-to-write construct. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 7*, 140–150.

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.) (2001). *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Carson, J. (2001). A task analysis of reading and writing in academic contexts. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 246–270). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Cain, Geofrey. (2010, April 10). South Korea cracks down on gaming addiction. *Time*. (http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0, 8599, 1983234, 00. html.)

Esmaeili, H. (2002). Integrated reading and writing tasks and ESL students' reading and writing performance in an English language test. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*, 599–622.

Fitzgerald, J. & Shanahan (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35, 39-50.

Gebril, A., & Plakans, L. (2008). Investigation of source use, discourse features, and process in integrated writing tests. Ann Arbor, MI: Span. Working Papers.

Grabe, W. (2002). 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.

Green, S. (1992). Mining texts in reading to write." *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 21, 151-167.

Hale, G. A., Taylor, C., Bridgeman, B., Carson, J., Kroll, B., & Kantor, R. (1996). *A study of writing tasks assigned in academic degree programs*. (TESOL Research Report No. RR-54). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching Second Language Reading.* New York: Oxford University Press.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Kim, Ji-Eun. (2009). The effect of integrated reading and writing tasks on the English literacy of Korean EFL learners. *The Journal of Linguistic Science*, 51,41-64.

Kim, Ji-Sun & Im, Byung-Bin. (2009). Effect of using English storybooks for improving Korean English learners' reading and writing skills and their learning attitudinal factors. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 15(1), 71- 98

Kim, Sun-Young. (2007). Patterns of integrating reading and writing skills in ESL college composition classes. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 13(4), 59-85.

Kim, Sun-Young. (2011). An examination of reading-writing integration: Perspectives, practices, and literacy development. *Modern English Education*, 12(3),155-173.

Kim, Sun-Young. (2012). A study on the English reading-writing integration: an EFL college composition class. *Studies in English Education*, *17*(1), 27-64.

Lee, J. Y. & Min, C. K. (2010). A Study on the Effectiveness of Summary Writing for the Improvement of High School Students' English Reading and Writing Abilities. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society*, 9(1), 133~154.

Mateos, M., & Sole´, I. (2009). Synthesizing information from various texts: A study of procedures and products at different educational levels. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, XXIV, 435–451.

O'Malley, J.M., and A.U. Chamot (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York: Newbury House.

Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language Testing*, 20(1), 26-56.

Plakans, L. (2009a). The role of reading strategies in L2 integrated writing tasks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, DOI 10.1016/jeap. 2009.05.001.

Plakans, L. (2009b). Discourse synthesis in integrated second language writing assessment. *Language Testing*, 26, 561–587.

Plakans, L & Geril, A. (2012). A close investigation into source use in integrated second language writing tasks. *Assessing Writing*,17, 18–34.

Pressley, M. & Afflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of Reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Richards, J. C., J. Platt, and H. Weber (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics.* London: Longman.

R. Negretti & M. Kuteeva (2011). "Fostering metacognitive genre awareness in L2 academic reading and writing: A case study of pre-service English teachers." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 95-110.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Schuman, H., & Kalton, G. (1985). Survey methods. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.),. *Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 1* (pp.635-697). New York: Random House.

Sheorey, R. and Mokhatari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System*, 29, 431-449.

Spivey, N. (1984). *Discourse synthesis: Constructing texts in reading and writing*. Outstanding Dissertation Monograph. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

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

Spivey, N., & King, J. R. (1989). Readers as writers composing from sources. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24*(1), 7–26.

Tierney, R. J. and P. D. Pearson (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60, 568-579.

Tierney, R. J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Sosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, Vol.2 (pp.246-280). New York: Longman.

Yang, H. & Plakans, L. (2012). Second language writers' strategy use and performance on an integrated reading-listening-writing. *TESOL Quarterley*, 46(1), 80-102.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*(2), 165–186.

APPENDIX A

Scoring Rubric for the Integrated Writing (adapted from Plakans & Gebril 2008; Plakans, 2009a).

SCORE	TASK DESCRIPTION
15	➢ successfully presents their ideas in relation to the relevant information presented in the reading resources. ➢ is well organized with well-developed content ➢ occasional language errors that are present do not result in inaccurate presentation of content or connections.
12	➢ is generally good in coherently and accurately presenting their ideas in relation to the relevant information in the reading texts, although may have inaccuracy, vagueness, or imprecision in connection to points made in the readings. ➢ has clear organization and logical development. ➢ more frequent or noticeable minor language errors; such errors do not result in anything more than an occasional lapse of clarity or in the connection of ideas.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

9	➢ conveys some relevant connection to the reading, but only vague, global, unclear, or somewhat imprecise connection to points made in the reading. ➢ development is somewhat limited, but some specific support for their argument is provided. ➢ occasionally lacks cohesion but has a basic organizational structure. ➢ includes errors of usage and/or grammar that are more frequent or may result in noticeably vague expressions or obscured meanings in conveying ideas and connections.
6	➢ contains some relevant information from the readings, but is marked by significant language difficulties or by significant omission or inaccuracy of important ideas from the readings. ➢ lacks logical organizational coherence and development. Ideas are very general and lack specific details in support. ➢ contains language errors or expressions that largely obscure connections or meaning at key junctures, or that would likely obscure understanding of key ideas for a reader not already familiar with the topic.
3	➢ provides little or no meaningful or relevant content from the readings and does not follow an organization pattern or develop content. ➢ includes language that is so low and it is difficult to derive meaning.
0	➢ either merely copies sentences from the reading, rejects the topic, not connected to the topic, is written in a foreign language, or is blank.

APPENDIX B

Reading Strategy Survey Sheet in Integrated Writing

Name: _____ Student Number: _____

Years of Studying English: _____ Years of staying in foreign country: _____

Standardized Test Score (Toefl/Toeic/TEPS or others, if any) _____

Directions: Read each statement and indicate how often you used each strategy when writing your essay. Check the appropriate box: 1 (very rarely), 2 (rarely), 3 (occasionally), 4 (often), 5 (very often)

Example: Very rarely-Very often

I ate popcorn while I watched the movie Batman.	1	2	3	4	5
Explanation: If you ate popcorn very often when you watched the movie Batman, check 5. V					

Name	Strategy	1	2	3	4	5
MET1	I set a purpose in my mind when I read.	1	2	3	4	5
MET2	I preview the text before reading.	1	2	3	4	5
MET3	I check how the text content fits the purpose of reading.	1	2	3	4	5

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

MET4	I note the text characteristics.	1	2	3	4	5
MET5	I determine what to read.	1	2	3	4	5
MET6	I use the text features (e.g. tables)	1	2	3	4	5
MET7	I use context clues to help me better understand the reading.	1	2	3	4	5
MET8	I use typographical aids (e.g. italics)	1	2	3	4	5
MET9	I predict or guess text meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
MET10	I confirm my predictions.	1	2	3	4	5
COG1	I use prior knowledge when reading.	1	2	3	4	5
COG2	I read aloud when text becomes hard.	1	2	3	4	5
COG3	I read slowly and carefully.	1	2	3	4	5
COG4	I try to stay focused on reading.	1	2	3	4	5
COG5	I adjust reading rate when necessary.	1	2	3	4	5
COG6	I pay a close attention to reading.	1	2	3	4	5
COG7	I pause and think about the reading.	1	2	3	4	5
COG8	I visualize information that I read.	1	2	3	4	5
COG9	I evaluate what is read.	1	2	3	4	5
COG10	I resolve conflicting information.	1	2	3	4	5
COG11	I re-read for better understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
COG12	I guess the meaning of unknown words.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP1	I take notes while reading.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP2	I underline information in text.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP3	I use reference materials. (e.g. dictionary)	1	2	3	4	5
SUP4	I paraphrase for better understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP5	I go back and forth in text.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP6	I ask myself questions.	1	2	3	4	5
GLB1	I skim the gist of the reading.	1	2	3	4	5
GLB2	I try to find text structure and rhetorical cues (e.g.- topic sentence or genre type)	1	2	3	4	5
GLB3	I identify/summarize the main ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
GLB4	I respond to text with personal experience/opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
MIN1	I scan the text for ideas to use in writing.	1	2	3	4	5
MIN2	I reread the text for use in writing.	1	2	3	4	5
MIN3	I paraphrase the text content in writing.	1	2	3	4	5
MIN4	I reread the text to check plagiarism.	1	2	3	4	5
MIN5	I check the task to cite sources appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

Excerpt from Reading Material for an Argumentative Essay

...

South Korea is one of the most wired countries in the world, but that connectivity comes with a price. Since the early 2000s, occasional reports of compulsive gamers dying or murdering loved ones to satisfy their addiction have raised hackles at the industry, a domestic market valued at about $2.4 billion in which 30 million people are thought to play regularly. The government introduced the recent nighttime shutdown one month after police discovered a 3-month-old baby who starved to death while her parents were busy nurturing their virtual baby on a game at an

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Internet cafe.

The curfew also comes one month after the Korean e-Sports Players Association, a governing body of professional computer-game sports, reportedly filed charges against a group of retired StarCraft players and officials for allegedly manipulating the betting system –a testament to how seriously some Koreans have come to take the game. In February, a 22-year-old Korean man was charged with murdering his mother after she pestered him to stop playing. And in 2005, in one of the most famous cases, a 28-year-old man went into cardiac arrest and died after playing StarCraft for 50 hours straight, with only a few bathroom breaks. That was particularly bad year for the country, when 10 people died from related causes to video-game addiction. …

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Secondary/College/Higher

Pirae Kim
Department of English Education
Korea University
145, Anam-ro, Seongbuk-gu,
Seoul, Korea
Tel: +82 (10) 3290-2350 /CP: (010)-7728-3330
Email: sarangsoc0432@hanmail.net

Received in July 15th, 2014
Reviewed in August 30th, 2014
Revised version received in September 5th, 2014

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre