Searching for reading instruction methods to promote the development of EFL writing ability

Searching for reading instruction methods to promote the development of EFL writing ability

Fumiko Yoshimura

Introduction

The ability to write well in English is becoming more and more important in the current world with the advancement of technology and the globalization of research and business. It is true even in countries where English is spoken as a second or foreign language. For example, in Japan, where people learn English as a foreign language, the ability to write in English is gradually becoming recognized as an important ability for the success of individuals and the prosperity of the country. Japanese people, in general, have received English instruction focused on reading and not so much on writing up to the high school level. Therefore, as a way to promote the development of English writing ability, making use of Japanese learners' ability to read English seems to be the most effective. In this paper, I would like to search for possibilities of taking advantage of learners' English reading ability to promote their English writing ability.

Reading-Writing Connection (RWC) research (e.g., Hirvela, 2004 ; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991) has provided us with important new understanding of the connections between reading and writing abilities. For example, correlational studies have shown almost consistently that better writers tend to read more and that better readers tend to produce more syntactically mature writing than poorer readers (Stotcky, 1983). Tierney and Shanahan's review of research results (1991) shows that

(1) 43

reading and writing abilities correlate between .50 and .70 (25% to 50% overlap). Thus, moderate overlap in reading and writing abilities has been demonstrated in correlational studies. Reading supports writing and writing supports reading. Through this supportive relationship, reading and writing are drawn together as acts of composing (Hirvela, 2004).

However, our experience as English writing instructors, especially in FL situations, suggests that some learners may develop into a very competent reader without developing their writing ability very much. They represent asymmetrical development between English reading and writing abilities. Their reading ability does not seem to affect their writing ability and the discrepancy remains the same or becomes greater as they become more skilled in their reading.

Thus, we have observed mixed phenomena regarding connections between reading and writing abilities. How are reading and writing abilities connected and how do they support each other? This is the question still needs to be explored. Though we still lack a comprehensive understanding of reading-writing connections, researchers and practitioners seem to agree that reading ability is acquired earlier than writing ability. Carson and Leki (1993) note, "reading can be, and in academic settings nearly always is, the basis for writing" (p. 1). According to Ferris and Hedgcock (2005), reading becomes the basis for writing because the information acquired through reading contains print-encoded messages as well as clues about how the message's grammatical, lexical, semantic, pragmatic, and rhetorical constituents combine to make the message meaningful (p. 31). For FL learners, reading is often the main source of input for the foreign language and the FL writing properties and conventions. Therefore, it is plausible that EFL learners can draw on their English reading ability and use input from reading practice in learning about English writing.

In this paper, I would like to review previous research in order to search for reading instruction methods that promote the development

of EFL writing ability. First, reading and writing abilities are compared and contrasted to find the commonalities and differences. Secondly, the nature of writing expertise and the ways writing expertise develops are examined. Then, the possibility of L2 reading practice to promote L2 writing ability is discussed. Finally, ways of readings which are likely to promote the development of learners' writing ability are concretized in checklist questions and directions.

How reading and writing abilities are connected

Common features between reading and writing abilities

Krashen (1984) claims that "it is reading that gives the writer the 'feel' for the look and texture of reader-based prose" (p. 20). Hirvela (2004) agrees with Krashen by saying that reading supports writing through "meaningful input". Meaningful input can not only be facts but how writers think through the problems they are addressing (Bolch & Chi, 1995), and specific components that constitute writing (Hirvela, 2004). The components that reading and writing share identified by Hirvela are "common *rhetorical* or *organizational* patterns in target language writing (e.g., location of such staples of writing in English as thesis statements and topic sentences)", "*linguistic* features of writing (e.g., transitional words and phrases, the frequency of certain verb tenses in specific kinds of situations)", and "examining *lexical* as well as *stylistic* characteristics of writing (e.g., the use of informal and formal vocabulary in different circumstances)" (p. 115).

If one considers the constructs reading and writing abilities share, it is plausible that practice in reading can promote the development of writing ability by giving practice in the underlying constructs and cognitive processes.

In addition, reading can support writing by changing conceptualization of the acts of reading and writing from mere decoding or encoding into "acts of composing" (Hirvela, 2004). Flower et al. (1990), promi-

nent advocates of Constructivism, conceptualize reading and writing as processes to compose "mental representations" of texts (p. 146). Through reading, learners learn how to select, connect, and organize information from a source text and prior knowledge to create a new representation of meaning. Writers, on the other hand, generate a number of representations that may grow in purpose, fullness, and coherence as an idea develops. The creation of such representations involves similar cognitive processes, such as selection, organization, and connection of ideas. Thus, by using similar cognitive processes to reading, learners can conceptualize writing in a more sophisticated way.

Shared constructs and cognitive processes may explain the positive relationship between reading and writing abilities. It is possible for the components and cognitive processes learned through reading to support the development of writing ability. However, the possibility is not always realized.

Differences between reading and writing abilities

The 25% to 50% overlap between reading and writing abilities in Tierney and Shanahan's review of research (1991) can be interpreted that there is room for differences between the abilities. Skill acquisition theory predicts that comprehension skills and production skills develop separately and empirical research by DeKeyser and Sokalski (1996) supports the prediction. Their research suggests that input practice is better for comprehension skills and output practice is better for production skills. This line of research explains the asymmetry between reading and writing abilities in some FL learners who have received a great deal of reading practice and insufficient amount of writing practice.

Grabe (2001) points out two important differences between reading and writing modalities. First, while reading requires more automaticity of subprocesses, writing requires more deliberate awareness.

Second, while a goal for good reading is to reflect on the meaning rather than the language, a goal for good writing requires reflection on the language choices made (p. 20). These differences may also explain why practice in reading does not automatically lead to the development of writing ability. These differences are discussed further in the following sections.

Deliberate awareness

Even if a reader has developed automaticity of subprocesses and orchestrating related skills and processes in the act of reading, he or she may not be able to apply the skills and processes to writing because he or she may no longer call them into conscious awareness in writing. Krashen (1984) contends that competence in writing develops the same way as competence in second language develops. Krashen distinguishes second language acquisition from second language learning by saying that the former is a subconscious process similar to first language acquisition while the latter is a conscious process. Acquisition is responsible for our ability to use language in both production and comprehension, while conscious learning serves only as an editor or monitor. Because Krashen believes that acquisition is a far more important process than learning, he recommends extensive exposure to print through reading to acquire writing ability. Though his explanation supports the positive relations between reading and writing abilities to a certain extent, if writing requires deliberateness, the very fact that related skills and processes have been acquired subconsciously in acquisition may make them difficult to be called into conscious attention and be accessed in the act of writing.

Reflection on language

Another difference between reading and writing which is pointed out by Grabe (2001) is the focus of reflection. While the main goal of reading is to reflect on meaning, one of the important goals of writing

is to reflect on language to make sure the ideas are expressed appropriately. Though both reading and writing require attention to both meaning and language, the focus of reflection may be different. This difference may be one of the reasons why reading ability does not automatically transfer to writing ability. In fact, research by VanPatten (1990) reveals that it is difficult to attend to both meaning and language form in incidental learning mode. In such a case, adults tend to prioritize meaning over language form. Thus, in reading for comprehension, which is the most common reading mode, it is unlikely that sufficient attention is directed to language, though it should be the focus of reflection in the act of writing.

Clark and Clark (1977) argue that native-speaker comprehension is probabilistic in nature and would not rely on a thorough parsing of the utterance concerned. Native speakers use a variety of means to maximize the chances to reconstruct the intended meaning in comprehension. According to Anderson and Lynch (1988), comprehension depends on three main sources of knowledge: schematic, contextual, and systemic. Schematic knowledge is made up of background knowledge and procedural knowledge. Contextual knowledge is made up of knowledge of situation and knowledge of co-text. Systemic knowledge consists of syntactic, semantic, and morphological knowledge. These knowledge sources are drawn on, interactively, to achieve comprehension. Swain (1985) contends that because of a wide range of knowledge sources utilized, the underlying interlanguage system may be untouched in comprehension. In L2 reading, learners may be likely to rely on other knowledge sources rather than systemic (language) knowledge because of the limitation of systemic knowledge. Thus, research on language processing and language acquisition has suggested that comprehension alone may not be sufficient for interlanguage change and L2 development, which may later become available for production.

In summary, reflection on language or shifting sufficient attention

to language form is something which lacks in a common mode of reading, i.e. reading for comprehension.

Reading for comprehension versus reading for revision

What we learn from reading practice differs based on our purpose of reading and our involvement into a specific reading task. Though Grabe (2001) found two main differences between reading and writing modalities, i.e. deliberateness and focus of reflection, what he meant by reading was "reading for comprehension". Some other ways of reading may have the characteristics important for learning about writing.

One such reading is "reading for revision". Hayes (1996) compared reading for revision with reading for comprehension and found that when people read to revise, they treat text quite differently from reading to comprehend. In reading for revision, people attend to text problems such as bad diction, wordiness, and poor organization. In this process, texts are closely examined to identify problems or to make sure meanings are effectively conveyed by language. As Kennedy and Smith (2006) suggest, even if we know grammar conventions thoroughly, we will make mistakes in initial drafts because our primary focus is on getting thought down on paper. In revising drafts, writers pay close attention to language problems and try to fix them.

Revision also provides opportunities to consider the effectiveness of expressions and alternative word choice. This process may push their interlanguage development by mapping form and meaning. Considering the effectiveness of expressions requires deliberateness and reflection on language, both of which are important in the act of writing. Possibility of reading for revision to contribute to the development of writing ability has a theoretical support from Krashen's theory of learning (1984), which claims that consciously learned ability is useful in editing and monitoring our output. This kind of reading is especially suitable for L2 learners who have "learned" not "acquired" the second language and L2 literacy.

Another important difference of reading for revision is that readers are also writers who experience the text production process. They are the ones who know the intentions and ideas to express. They are the ones who will be evaluated by the produced writing. They are the ones who should improve the text they have produced. They try to assume the responsibility as writers in their own reading process. Because of this responsibility, readers tend to be involved in reading texts more deeply.

To sum up, reading for revision has important features which cannot be found in reading for comprehension: i.e. deliberateness, attention toward language, and the experience of the text production process. If these features are incorporated in reading, the possibility of transfer of reading ability to writing ability may increase. The problem in implementing this reading, however, is that learners do not assume text problems or effectiveness of language expressions in their usual reading because in most cases texts are written by experts and already edited and proofread for publication. Learners tend to treat reading texts as autonomous. This attitude toward reading texts can be changed by manipulating goals of reading. The corollary is that instruction can make a difference. An important implication from Hayes' research (1996) is that reading behavior and the resultant learning changes depending on the purpose of reading and attention allocation.

Writing expertise

The concept of writing ability is in itself difficult to define because of the integration of various skills, knowledge, and processes and inclusion of linguistic, cognitive, and social dimensions. Conceptualization of writing expertise is also difficult because it is an elusive concept. However, it is essential to consider the concept of writing expertise and what it is made up of so that we can have a better

understanding of how reading ability can contribute to the learning of writing ability. In order to consider writing expertise, an influential writing model by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), empirical studies comparing expert and novice writers, and expertise in academic writing are investigated.

Bereiter and Scardamalia model (1987)

To distinguish expert and novice writers, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) propose a distinction between "knowledge telling" and "knowledge transforming". Knowledge telling preserves the straight-ahead form of oral language production and requires no more planning or goal-setting than an ordinary conversation. In contrast, knowledge transformation requires much more effort and skill. In knowledge transformation, the process of writing is one in which the thoughts come into existence through the composing process itself (pp. 9-10). At the initial stage of the knowledge transformation, problems are analyzed and writing goals are set. They are followed by problem-solving activities in two domains, called the content problem space and the rhetorical problem space. Knowledge is dealt with in the content problem space, while in the rhetorical problem space writers attempt to tackle with how to achieve the goals of a writing task. The solutions to the content and rhetorical problems become the input for the actual text production. According to this model, the difference between expert and novice writers lies largely in the pre-writing planning stage.

Empirical studies comparing expert and novice writers

Empirical studies reveal detailed description of differences between expert and novice writers. For example, Cumming (1989) conducted research using learners in an English-French bilingual program. In the research, learners were classified into professionally experienced writers, average student writers, and basic writers. They were asked to write a narrative text, an argumentative text and a summary in

English, which is their L2. The analysis revealed a significant difference between more and less expert writers.

While less expert writers exhibited a lack of control, more expert writers approached their composing with a clear notion of what it should entail, knowledge of how it should be organized as discourse, and concerned for how it might be best expressed in language. They formed good rhetorical plans to guide their decision-making. Because they were able to reach major decisions about the gist and organization of their compositions with facility and confidence, they subsequently devoted much of their attention to evaluating their intended expression at the level of wording and phrasing. In contrast, most of less expert writers formulated their gist in progressive but constrained steps, focused exclusively at the level of a single phrase, sentence, or thought. Less expert writers seldom had definite notions nor did they monitor their production of writing. Less expert writers wrote almost all of their thought spontaneously without reflection or modifications.

Expert writers considered both the form and content of expressions. Their concerns ranged from brief considerations of preposition usage to lengthy searches for words. In contrast, the less expert writers showed very little concern for the qualities of word choice. Even if they did, they attended locally to surface features of the language they were using, applications of grammar rules, and verifications of spellings. Thus, behaviors of more expert writers are qualitatively different from those of less expert writers. In monitoring their language use while writing, more expert writers tended to search for language which could best communicate their intended meaning, considering the connotations, appropriateness, and purposes of their expressions, as well as their linguistic accuracy, while less expert writers focused almost exclusively on its grammatical accuracy and neglected its semantic or pragmatic dimensions.

Other research (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1980 ; Hayes & Flower, 1980 ; Hirose & Sasaki, 1994 ; Raimes, 1985 ; Zamel, 1982, 1983) also

indicates that more expert writers spend more time in planning and revising their work than less expert writers, and tend to edit their writing for content and organization rather than making surface changes to the text. Thus, empirical studies have suggested that more expert writers' conceptualization of the act of writing or task schema seems to be more sophisticated than that of less expert writers and their attention is directed to various aspects of writing.

Expertise in academic writing

If the ability to write can vary depending on the discourse community, it is important to think what constitutes academic literacy in order to consider expertise in academic writing. After entering a university, learners' writing is judged not so much by their English writing ability per se, but by their thinking ability as a member of the research community (e.g., Spack, 1988).

Performance of academic writing depends heavily on learners' performance as readers of academic texts. However, reading academic texts is difficult for most learners because the content is abstract and difficult, the text organization is different from what they are familiar with, and learners are expected to assume a different role from what they are used to. Since the content of academic texts is abstract and theoretical, it is very difficult for learners to make connections between the text content and their own prior knowledge. Learners need to make an extra effort to be active readers in reading academic texts. The fact that text organization is different from what learners are familiar with is another reason for difficulty in comprehending academic texts. Most readers are familiar with chorological order which narrative texts use. However, academic texts are written with a variety of text organizations depending on the purpose for writing. More importantly, in reading academic texts, learners are expected to read them "critically". Reading texts critically means paying attention to "what authors are doing as well as saying" (Kennedy & Smith,

2006, p. 22). Charney (1993) contends that the more professionally advanced readers tend to treat texts rhetorically. Since they know the details of text production process very well as insiders of the research community, when they read works of other researchers, they try to resist the codification of the contexts of production. Bazerman (1988) notices that the scientists he observed paid careful attention to methodological details. By paying attention to such methodological details, the scientists tried to deconstruct the seemingly smooth virtual experience the text laid out for them. Instead, they tried to construct what they considered to be a more accurate representation of the actual laboratory procedure. In this way, researchers read texts critically and try to reconstruct the contexts in which texts were produced. Thus, learners are expected to assume the persona of a researcher in an academic community and evaluate texts for their credibility when they read academic texts. Considering such expectation from members of a target discourse community is important in developing expertise in academic writing.

Thus, writing expertise can vary from one discourse community to another. To be an expert writer in a field, learners need to consider expectations and conventions of the field.

Development of writing expertise

To acquire writing ability, one should practice writing. According to DeKeyser and Sokalski (1996), practice is skill-specific. In their experiment, learners who had received comprehension practice improved more in comprehension, and learners who had received production practice improved more in production. DeKeyser and Sokalski (1996) argue that these results lend support to a model of skill acquisition that predicts that declarative knowledge changes into procedural knowledge, which then is automatized within the same components. However, writing expertise does not develop by means of writing

practice alone. Writing ability can develop by having an appropriate representation of writing that expert writers in a target discourse community have and by receiving input from various sources.

One of the sources is spoken language. Weissberg (2006) contends that there is general agreement among applied linguists and composition theorists that children learn to read and write based on their prior knowledge of spoken language and on their experiences with social interaction. In the case of L1 literacy development, a natural progression from speaking to writing can be assumed. In the case of L2 writing, however, the picture is more complicated. According to Weissberg's observation, some learners use both spoken and written modalities to drive the acquisition of L2 writing skills forward. Some learners tend to give preference to either spoken or written modality over the other as the primary engine for their acquisition of new linguistic information, which may or may not be transferred to the weaker one.

Another source is through exposure to written language. Research to date generally supports the important role of extensive and self-initiated exposure to print in order to acquire writing ability. Flower and Hayes (1980) contend that good writers demonstrate significant amounts of tacit knowledge concerning conventional and formal features of written text learned through the act of reading. Input acquired unconsciously through extensive reading supports learners' ability to write. Thus, important input seems to come from extensive exposure to written language in both L1 (e.g., Belanger, 1987 ; Stotsky, 1983) and L2 (e.g., Krashen, 1984, 1993).

Regarding L2 writing, another important source that provides input for writing is transfer from L1 literacy. Cummins (1984) made an important claim about the notion of an underlying common proficiency across languages. Cummins explained the distinction of language skills in terms of basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP). BICS

is defined as "the manifestation of language proficiency in everyday communicative contexts", whereas CALP is defined as "the manipulation of language in decontextualized academic situations" (pp. 136-137). According to Cummins, there is an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency that is common across languages which allows the transfer of literacy-related skills across languages. Thus, learning to be literate in a second language may be affected by literacy capabilities in the first language. However, the mediation of L2 proficiency makes the picture of literacy transfer complicated.

Carson et al. (1990) explored relations across L1 and L2 languages and reading and writing modalities using Chinese and Japanese ESL learners. The results indicate that the literacy skills are related across languages, but that the pattern of relationship varies for the two language groups and for the two modalities. The table below illustrates the correlations by language groups for L1 and L2 reading and writing tasks.

The results suggest that reading ability transfers from L1 to L2 more easily than does writing ability, if it is transfer that occurred in their experiment and if transfer occurred in the direction Carson et al. (1990) assumed. Another important relationship can be drawn from the results. Reading and writing abilities are related in both L1 and L2 significantly or moderately. Thus, the results also suggest possible transfer across reading and writing modalities within the same lan-

Table 1. Correlations by language groups for L1 and L2 reading and writing tasks

	Chinese ($n=48$)	Japanese ($n=57$)
L1 reading × L2 reading	$r=.366$**	$r=.509$**
L1 writing × L2 writing	$r=-.019$	$r=.230$*
L1 reading × L1 writing	$r=.271$*	$r=.493$**
L2 reading × L2 writing	$r=.494$**	$r=.271$*

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$ Carson et al. (1990, p. 256)

guage.

Possibility of L2 reading practice to promote L2 writing ability

Though Krashen (1984) emphasizes a far more important role acquisition plays than learning in developing writing ability, he also admits the usefulness of consciously learned ability in editing and monitoring our output under certain conditions. Some of the conditions he gave as examples are when the performer knows the rule well and when the performer is consciously concerned with accuracy. Though most L2 learners may be disadvantaged because of a lesser amount of exposure to spoken or written language, some may be advantaged because they have learned the second language and L2 literacy explicitly and deliberately. In writing, monitoring and editing skills are as important as language generation skills, especially at the advanced level, where careful attention toward language and writing conventions are necessary. Even though L2 writers may not be able to generate language as fluently as L1 writers, they may have stronger monitoring and editing skills.

Weissberg (2006) observes that some L2 learners develop and refine their writing skills without a strong basis in the spoken language. Weissberg assumes that such learners may rely on their expertise in L1 writing to support their L2 writing. They may have learned sophisticated and effective editing skill through L1 literacy training. For these learners, writing may be easier than speaking. In fact, Harklau (2002) suggests the possibility of learning a second language through written language. Harklau's assumption is that learners' L1 literacy first facilitates their acquisition of L2 literacy, which in turn pushes their second language acquisition process. It is possible for such learners to learn new lexical and syntactic information through L2 reading practice rather than speaking and listening practice. In addition, Harklau (2002) points out the insufficiency of acquiring basic morpho-syntax

and phonology through spoken language and the importance of acquiring a wide range of sophisticated language use through written language in order to be considered proficient in most domains. For some L2 writers and for writers beyond a certain level of learning, conscious awareness of rules and processes deliberately learned in L2 reading practice can assist L2 writing especially in monitoring and editing stages. In this way, theoretically it is possible for L2 reading to serve for better L2 writing performance. To increase the possibilities, special ways of reading have been proposed by some researchers. They are rhetorical reading, writerly reading, mining and rhetorical reading strategies. The following are the brief explanations of them.

Rhetorical reading

In rhetorical reading, learners are first taught about the main rhetorical organizations of the texts in the target language and then asked to use that knowledge in their own reading of those texts. Research by Carrell and Conner (1991) suggests that explicit training in rhetorical structures for ESL reading facilitates ESL writing. Considering differences in text organization across cultures as demonstrated by research in contrastive rhetoric (e.g., Carrell, 1984, 1985, 1992 ; Kaplan, 1966, 1987) and providing explicit training in rhetorical organization in L2 reading is likely to promote L2 writing performance.

Writerly reading

The reader of writerly reading takes on the persona of the writer of the text being read. Smith (1983) wrote, "To read like a writer we engage with the author in what the author is writing. We anticipate what the author will say, so that the author is in effect writing on our behalf, not showing how something is done but doing it with us" (p. 563). Through this process, readers gain greater sensitivity to and understanding of what happens during writing. This way of reading gives learners opportunities to experience text production procedure

and therefore learners are expected to be involved in text processing more deeply.

Mining

Mining is an analogy of reading process as miners exploring their sources to gain valuable input for writing. Greene (1993), an advocate of mining, explains it as follows, "Whereas teachers often encourage a critical reading of individual texts as an end in itself, mining is part of an ongoing effort to learn specific rhetorical and linguistics conventions. The strategies students observe in reading can become part of their own repertoire for writing on different occasions" (p. 36). In mining, therefore, learners are expected not only to passively decode the text meaning, but to actively engage in the text to dig up valuable input for their own writing. By providing the kinds of information learners should look for in advance and offering guidance while reading, teachers can ensure that learners encounter the elements of L2 writing they need exposure to in order to bring those elements into their own writing repertoires.

Rhetorical reading strategies

This approach helps learners analyze and learn from the rhetorical situation in which a text has been written. Learners are asked to look closely at the situation in which the writer produced his or her text and then to study the strategies adopted by the writer.

The idea is explained by Haas and Flower (1988) as follows :

> *Rhetorical strategies* take a step beyond the text itself. They are concerned with constructing a rhetorical situation for the text, trying to account for an author's purpose, context, and effect on the audience. In rhetorical reading strategies, readers use cues in the text, and their own knowledge of discourse situations, to recreate or infer the rhetorical situation of the text they are reading (p. 176).

This idea is reflected in text-based syllabus design (e.g., Fees, 1998) and curriculum design that advocates of genre approach are trying to promote (e.g., Hyland, 2004 ; Paltridge, 2001).

These ways of reading have characteristics which are missing in reading for comprehension, i.e. deliberateness, attention toward language, and the experience of the text production process. And these characteristics can be found in reading for revision (Hays, 1996). Therefore, they are promising ways of reading to support the development of writing ability.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to search for reading instruction methods which are likely to promote the development of EFL learners' writing ability. Previous research has suggested that reading and writing are connected (e.g., Tierney & Shanahan, 1991), reading is the basis for writing (e.g., Carson & Leki, 1993 ; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005) and some ways of reading are likely to promote the development of writing ability (e.g., Carrell & Conner, 1991 ; Greene, 1993 ; Haas & Flower, 1988 ; Smith, 1983). These ways of reading, however, are too theoretical and abstract ; consequently, it is difficult to see how they work and to discuss their effects. Somehow these ideas need to be concretized. The following checklist was created by synthesizing and concretizing the proposed ways of reading.

Checklist to read English academic texts

Before you read : Survey the title, headings, and the beginning and ends of the paragraphs and ask yourself the following questions.

1. What do you think the text is about ?
2. Call up your prior knowledge and feelings about the topic.

1st reading : Read the text paragraph by paragraph in order to find the

overall structure.

3. Where is the thesis statement in the introduction?
4. What does each paragraph tell you? Check your understanding after each paragraph.
5. Find claims and data in each paragraph.
6. How has the author organized his or her ideas? How are the paragraphs related to each other?
7. What is the conclusion?

2nd reading : Read the text carefully in order to understand the details.

8. Read the text phrase by phrase. Check your understanding after each phrase.
9. Check for the predicate verb and the subject in each sentence.
10. Check your understanding after each sentence.

3rd reading : Take your time and check the language form. Consult a dictionary if necessary.

11. Find the key words to understand the text.
12. Find words which show the development of the text and relationships between sentences.
13. Check for the word choice.
14. Check for the word form and grammatical structure.
15. Check for the verb tense and verb voice.
16. Check how the words are combined with each other (collocation). e.g. verb and preposition, verb and noun, adjective and noun, preposition and noun, etc.

After reading : Identify the rhetorical context of the text and your own reading.

17. For whom do you think the author is writing the text?
18. For what purpose do you think the author is writing the text?
19. Do you have any opinions about the ideas presented in the text? How are your opinions similar to or different from the author's?
20. If you wrote a paper about the issue presented in the reading material, what would you write about?

The effects of the checklist were tested empirically (Yoshimura, In Press). Refer to the article for the effects. Questions and directions need to be further changed, rephrased, or supplemented to increase the possibility for learners to learn about English writing from them.

Acknowledgement

References

Anderson, A., & Lynch, T. (1988). *Listening.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge : the genre and activity of the experimental article in science.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Belanger, J. (1987). Theory and research into reading and writing connections: A critical review. *Reading-Canada-Lecture*, 5, 10-18.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bolch, J., & Chi, L. (1995). A comparison of the use of citations in Chinese and English discourse. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language : Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 231-274). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Carrell, P. L., & Conner, U. (1991). Reading and writing descriptive texts. *Modern Language Journal*, *73*, 121-134.

Carrell, P. L. (1984). The effects of rhetorical organization on ESL readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *18*, 441-469.

Carrell, P. L. (1985). Facilitating EFL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*, 727-752.

Carrell, P. L. (1992). Awareness of text structure: Effects on recall. *Language Learning*, *42*, 1-17.

Carson, J. E., Carrell, P. L., Silberstein, S., Kroll, B., & Kuehn, P. A. (1990). Reading-writing relationships in first and second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *24* (2), 245-266.

Carson, J., & Leki, I. (1993). Introduction. In J. G. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom : Second language perspectives* (pp. 1-7). Boston : Heinle & Heinle.

Charney, D. (1993). A study in rhetorical reading : How evolutionists read "The Spandrels of San Marco." In J. Selzer (Ed.), *Understanding scientific prose* (pp. 203-231). Madison : University of Wisconsin Press.

Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. (1977). *Psychology and language.* New York : Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning, 39* (1), 81-141.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education.* San Diego, CA : College Hill.

DeKeyser, R. M., & Sokalski, K. J. (1996). The differential role of comprehension and production practice. *Language Learning, 46* (4), 613-642.

Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design.* Sydney NSW : Macquarie University.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition : Purpose, process, and practice.* Mahwah, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The dynamics of composing : Making plans and juggling constraints. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive process in writing* (pp. 31-50). Hillsdale, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flower, L., Stein, V., Ackerman, J., Kantz, M. J., McCormick, K., & Peck, W. C. (1990). *Reading-to-write : Exploring a cognitive and social process.* New York : Oxford University Press.

Greene, S. (1993). Exploring the relationship between authorship and reading. In A.M. Penrose & M.M. Sitko (Eds.), *Hearing ourselves think : Cognitive research in the college writing classroom* (pp. 33-51). New York : Oxford University Press.

Grabe, W. (2001). Reading-writing relations : Theoretical perspectives and instructional practices. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies : Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 15-47). Ann Arbor MI : The University of Michigan Press.

Haas, C., & Flower, L. (1988). Rhetorical reading strategies and the construction of meaning. *College Composition and Communication, 39*, 167-183.

Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 329-350.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive process in writing* (pp. 31-50). Hillsdale, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Searching for reading instruction methods

Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing : Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hirose, K., & Sasaki, M. (1994). Explanatory variables for Japanese students' expository writing in English : An exploratory study. *Journal of second language writing, 3* (3), 203-229.

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

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing.* Ann Arbor, MI : The University of Michigan Press.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning, 16*, 1-20.

Kaplan, R. B. (1987). Cultural though patterns revisited. In U. Conner & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages : Analysis of L2 texts.* Reading, MA : Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Kennedy, M. L., & Smith, H. M. (2006). *Reading and writing in the academic community* (3rd ed.). New Jersey : Pearson Education.

Krashen, S. (1984). *Writing : Research, theory, and applications.* Oxford, UK : Pergamon.

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

Paltridge, B. (2001). *Genre and the language learning classroom.* Ann Arbor, MI : The University of Michigan Press.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write : A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19* (2), 229-258.

Smith, F. (1983). Reading like a writer. *Language Arts, 60*, 558-567.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community : How far should we go ? *TESOL Quarterly, 18*, 649-670.

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

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence : some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition.* Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House.

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

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to form and content in the input : An experi-

ment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 287-301.

Weissberg, R. (2006). *Connecting speaking & writing in second language writing instruction.* Ann Arbor, MI : The University of Michigan Press.

Yoshimura, F. (In Press). Effects of connecting reading and writing and a checklist to guide the reading process on EFL learners' learning about English writing. To appear *Procedia Social Sciences.*

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing : The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16* (2), 195-209.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students : Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*, 165-187.