The Role of Reading in an Integrated Reading-to-Write Task: A Think-Aloud Study of EFL Undergraduate English Language Students in a Saudi Context

Ahmed Abdullah Alshehri

Doctor of Philosophy

University of York

Education

October 2021

Abstract

Whilst reading and writing are taught separately in certain EFL contexts, recent research shows that reading and writing are interdependent skills (Kuzborska, 2015). Students are often asked to read and then write for their assignments in various academic contexts. Second-language reading processes could play an important role in eliciting integrated writing performance (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). Although much of the focus of previous research has been on the writing aspect of the reading-writing connection, a review of the literature shows that studies on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks have been increasing (Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). There is therefore still a need for more research on the role of reading in tasks.

Saudi undergraduate EFL Students are required to perform reading-to-write tasks, particularly in the final years of their studies. However, a review of the research in the Saudi EFL context shows that there has been only one empirical study which has investigated the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks (Alhujaylan, 2020), and another study which only discussed the topic theoretically (Al-Omrani, 2014).

This case study was therefore designed to bridge this gap and focused on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in a Saudi university. Ten undergraduate students completed a reading-to-write task to determine the reading processes they used when undertaking the task in order to compare the differences in the use of reading processes between high- and low-scoring writers and to explore the factors affecting the students' reading and writing performance. This study used the think-aloud protocol, pre- and post-protocol interviews, and students' essays to answer the research questions.

The results of this study show that comprehension processes were almost absent from students' reading. All of the students, both high- and low-scoring writers, mostly used linguistic processes. Some comprehension reading processes (such as monitoring and text structure) were only used by high-scoring writers, and the most used linguistic processes such as propositional meaning formation, lexical access and syntactic parsing were used by both high- and low-scoring students. The findings suggest that the formation of propositional meanings, rather than the focus on individual words, might contribute to writing performance. The findings also suggest that beliefs play an important role in reading and writing performance. Beliefs guide students' reading and writing behaviour and can negatively influence their reading and writing outcome. These findings carry valuable recommendations for teaching reading-to-write tasks in the Saudi context.

Table of Contents

Abstract..2
List of Tables..8
Acknowledgements..10
Chapter 1: Introduction..12
1. Introduction 12
1.1 Significance of the study 14
1.2 Outline of the chapters in the thesis 21
Chapter 2. Literature Review..24
2. Introduction 24
2.1 The definition of reading 24
2.2 Lower-level reading processes 25
2.3 Higher-level reading processes 32
2.3.1 Goal Setting 32
2.3.2 Comprehension monitoring 34
2.3.3 Inferencing 36
2.3.4 Background knowledge activation 38
2.3.5 Text comprehension and reader interpretation 41
2.4 Understanding the Connection between Reading and Writing 46
2.4.1 Directional Perspectives in reading and writing connection 49
2.5 The role of Reading in Writing 51
2.6 Factors that might affect the performance of the reading-to-write task 69
2.6.1 Students' Beliefs 69
2.6.2 The role of readers' beliefs in reading 70
2.6.3 The role of readers' beliefs in writing 76
2.7 Factors affecting the English reading and writing abilities of Saudi L2 undergraduate students 83
2.7.1 External factors affecting Saudi L2 students' reading and writing performance 83
2.7.1.1 Instructional factors 83
2.7.1.2 Socio-cultural factors 91
2.7.1.2.1 The use of L1 Arabic as a Medium of Instruction 91
2.7.2 Internal factors affecting Saudi L2 students' reading and writing performance 95
2.7.2.1 The role of motivation 95
2.7.2.2 The role of language anxiety 97
2.8 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks 99

2.8.1 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in English language preparation courses 101
2.8.2 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in naturalistic contexts 115
2.9 Factors affecting the performance of the reading-to-write task 127
2.9.1 The role of literacy expertise, language proficiency and educational levels on reading and writing performance 127
2.10 Summary 136
Chapter 3: Methodology……………………………………………………………..141
3. Introduction 141
3.1 Philosophical underpinnings 142
3.1.1 Research Paradigm 142
3.2.2 The multiple case-study approach 147
3.3 Study Setting 152
3.3.1 The aims of the English department in the Bisha context 152
3.3.2 The curriculum of the English-language programme in the UB English department153
3.3.3 The importance of English reading and writing in the UB English department 153
3.4 The participants and the sampling techniques of the study 159
3.4.1 Demographic information of the participants 160
3.5 Data collection methods 162
3.5.1 The think-aloud protocol 163
3.5.2 Pre- and post-protocol interviews 168
3.5.3 The reading-to-write tasks 170
3.6 The pilot study 172
3.6.1 Pilot study data collection procedure 173
3.7 Adjustments to the process of the data collection 175
3.7.1 Verbalisation issue 175
3.7.2 The issue of think-aloud during writing 177
3.7.3 Timing issue 178
3.7.4 Student retention issue 179
3.8 Data collection procedure in the main study 179
3.9 Data analysis in the main study 190
3.9.1 Data preparation, familiarity and organisation 190
3.10 The analysis of think-aloud protocols 193
3.11 The analysis of the interviews 198
3.11.1 Themes from the pre-protocol interviews 200
3.11.2 Themes from the post-protocol interviews 202
3.12 The analysis of the students' essays 203

3.13 Ethical considerations 208
3.14 Trustworthiness of the study 210
3.15 Credibility 210
3.16 Transferability 211
3.17 Confirmability 212
3.18 Dependability 212
3.19 Summary 213
Chapter 4: Results……………………………………………………………………215
4. Introduction 215
4.1 The reading processes used by Saudi EFL undergraduate students in a reading-to-write task 215
4.2 Lower-level reading processes 217
4.3.1 Propositional meaning reading processes 218
4.3.2 Lexical access reading processes 220
4.3.3 Syntactic parsing and word recognition reading processes 222
4.3 Higher-level reading processes 223
4.2.1 Monitoring 225
4.2.2 Creating a text-level structure 226
4.4 The differences in the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring student writers 228
4.4.1 The differences in the use of lower-level reading processes by high- and low-scoring students 228
4.4.2 The differences in the use of higher-level reading processes by high- and low-scoring students 229
4.5 The reading processes employed by high- and low-scoring student writers 231
4.6 Factors affecting students' reading and writing performance 234
4.6.1 Students' perceptions about reading 234
4.7 Students' perceptions about writing 238
4.8 Missing the purpose of the reading-to-write task 241
4.9 Summary 242
Chapter 5: Discussion……………………………………………………………..244
5. Introduction 244
5.1 The reading processes used by high- and low-scoring writers 245
5.2 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks 248
5.3 Factors affecting the students' reading and writing performance 251
5.3.1 Reading and writing perceptions in reading-to-write tasks 251
5.3.2 The impact of language proficiency on reading and writing performance 257
5.3.3 The impact of the lack of motivation 261

5.3.4 The impact of language anxiety 263
5.3.5 Reading and writing teaching methods at the school level 265
5.3.6 Reading and writing teaching methods at the university level 267
5.3.7 The use of L1 Arabic as a medium of instruction 275
5.4 Summary 278
Chapter 6: Contributions, Implications, Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research……………………………………………………………………………...280
6. Introduction 280
6.1 Contributions and teaching implications 280
6.2 Limitations and directions for future research 284
References………………………………………………………………………………286
Appendices……………………………………………………………………………...325
Appendix A. Applied Linguistics course description 325
Appendix B. Research Methods course description 332
Appendix C. The study plan in the English Department 340
Appendix D. Pre-protocol interviews 343
Appendix E. Post-protocol interviews 345
Appendix F. Reading-to-write tasks given to the English Department students at the University of Bisha 347
Appendix G. The reading-to-write tasks used in this study 349
Appendix H. Think-aloud protocol practice task 353
Appendix I. The video link of the think-aloud protocol demonstration 355
Appendix J. The participant consent form 356
Appendix K. Think-aloud protocol transcription example 360
Appendix L. High-scoring student’s writing example 365
Appendix M. Low-scoring student’s writing example 366
Appendix N. The inter-rater reliability scores 367
Appendix O. HOD consent form 368

List of Tables

Table 3.1 *Study Plan for the Undergraduate English Programme, Department of English, UB*..........157

Table 3.2 *The Profiles of theParticipants*..........161

Table 3.3 *Students Time Slots in the Reading-to-Write Task and Interviews*..........189

Table 3.4 *Data Collection Procedure*..........190

Table 3.5 *The Analytical Framework of Reading Processes*..........19 4

Table 3.6 *Initial Codes in the Interview Analysis*..........200

Table 3.7 *Pre-protocol Interview Themes and Sub-themes*..........202

Table 3.8 *The Scoring Rubric for the Students' Writing*..........205

Table 3.9 *Students' Essay Writing Scores*..........207

Table 4.1 *Lower-Level Reading Processes Frequency Counts*..........217

Table 4.2 *Higher-Level Reading Processes Frequency Counts*..........224

Table 4.3 *The Frequency and Percentage of the Lower-level Reading Processes Employed by High- and Low-Scoring Student Writers*............229

Table 4.4 *The Frequency and Percentage of the Higher-level Reading Processes Employed by High- and Low-Scoring Student writers*............ 230

Table 4.5 *The Frequency and Percentage of the Reading Processes Employed by High- and Low-Scoring Student Writers*.............233

Table 4.6 *Students' Perceptions of Reading and their Total Occurrences*…………….236

Table 4.7 *Students' Perceptions of Writing and their Total Occurrences*…………….240

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I thank Allah the Almighty for providing me with happiness, blessings and patience while writing this thesis.

I need to thank the University of Bisha for providing me with a scholarship to study in the United Kingdom. I hope that the present thesis contributes to the educational system in Saudi Arabia in general, and the University of Bisha in particular, and to the Saudi vision 2030. I also need to thank the University of York for giving me the opportunity of undertaking my research at a supportive and welcoming environment.

My deepest gratitude goes to my thesis advisor, Dr Irena Kuzborska, for her guidance, encouragement, and valuable feedback throughout the course of this work. I am also grateful to Dr Khaled El Ebyary for his inspiring suggestions and valuable comments. I also would like to thank Dr Sarah Olive for her feedback, inspiration and support. I thank Dr Ursula Lanvers for her feedback and guidance. I also thank Professor Leah Roberts for her support and guidance.

Finally, I am forever grateful to my honourable parents Abdullah and Sharifa, my treasured wife Noor, and my beloved daughter Sereen, who have been extremely supportive throughout the process of research.

Declaration

I, Ahmed Alshehri, declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work and I am the sole author. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, University. All sources are acknowledged as References.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Introduction

Reading-to-write, according to Grabe (2001), is an activity in which writers return to academic resources and read them in multiple ways based on their reading purpose as they search for specific information and use reading processes "to match task expectations for the writing" (p. 22). The idea that language is seen as a unitary component is the foundation for integrating reading and writing. According to the Whole Language Approach, teaching writing and reading together makes learning more effective. Rigg stated that "if language is not kept whole, it is not language anymore" (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Whole language is a theory that was originally developed for young children but has been extended to ESL. Research has shown that currently, reading-to-write tasks are common in academic settings (Flower *et al.*, 1990; Kuzborska, 2015; Kuzborska & Soden, 2018; Nesi & Gardner, 2012; Zaho & Hirvela, 2015). Students in higher education are frequently required to carry out reading and writing concurrently (Plakans, 2009). While writing, for example, they engage in reading many source texts using different reading processes and reading the instructions for the task, and sometimes they have to evaluate, revise and edit their work. They take on the role of both producing and consuming text (Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Hayes, 1996). In other words, readers construct meaning from the writers' hints presented in reading texts in order to understand their meanings and intentions (Tierney & Pearson, 1983) and they also consider task expectations in order to perform the whole task successfully.

Reading-to-write activities involve different reading processes such as lower-level reading processes and higher-level reading processes. These reading processes are considered equally substantial in the reading activity as readers can use them for various purposes, including reading for writing (Kuzborska, 2010; 2018).

Lower-level reading processes represent more automatic linguistic processes, which are referred to as language-oriented skills (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). Linguistic reading processes include word perception (identifying form), syntactic parsing (chunking into phrases using grammatical information) and semantic proposition formation (constructing clause-level meaning from word meanings and grammatical information).

Higher-level reading processes include comprehension processes which include specific component abilities performed under the control of a reader. These component abilities include readers' ability to achieve reading goals, monitor their reading, make various inferences, use prior knowledge or a so-called schema, form attitudes about the author and/or the text, and critically evaluate the information they read (Birch, 2007; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Kuzborska, 2018; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). (See Chapter 2 for a detailed explanation of these reading processes).

The reading-to-write activity can be looked at from two angles: theoretical and pedagogical. The theoretical viewpoint is more directly linked to the underlying abilities which learners demonstrate when completing reading-to-write tasks. From the theoretical angle, there are three hypotheses or models for the reading-writing connection: (1) the directional hypothesis, which states that

reading improves writing, (2) the non-directional hypothesis, which suggests that information can be transferred in either direction: from reading to writing or from writing to reading, and (3) the bi-directional hypothesis, which postulates that development in reading affects writing proficiency and vice versa (Eisterhold, 1990) (see Chapter 2 for a detailed explanation of these models).

1.1 Significance of the study

Although studies on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks have been increasing, much of the focus has traditionally concentrated on the writing side of the reading and writing relationship (Ferris & Hedgcock 2004, Grabe, 2003; Carson 1990; Cassany 1989); therefore, there is still a need for more research on the role of reading tasks. In addition, it has been argued that reading is the basis of writing development. For example, Carson and Leki (1993, p. 1) stated that "reading might be the foundation for writing" and that "reading can be, and in academic settings nearly always is, the basis for writing". The current study is therefore designed to examine the relationship from a reading-to-writing standpoint. Furthermore, the reading-writing link notion will be examined in this study using the reading-to-writing directional model, which emphasises the importance of reading as a source of information for the writing process (Eisterhold, 1990; Eckhoff, 1983; Taylor & Beach, 1984). (See Chapter 2 for a detailed explanation for the reading-writing directional model).

A review of the reading and writing literature shows that some previous studies have focused solely on the role of reading in writing-only tasks (tasks with merely writing prompts). In other words, they focused on reading texts that are not linked thematically to a writing task. For example, the majority of previous studies

have focused on the impact of integrating reading into writing instruction (Al-Dosari, 2016; Almansour & Alshorman, 2014; Alqadi, 2013; Christiansen, 1965; Flahive & Bailey, 1993; Mekheimer & Al-Dosari, 2013), or on the impact of reading-aloud teaching on the writing abilities of young learners (Michener,1985). Additionally, previous research has been concerned with comparing reading and writing scores in the first and second languages in order to determine the impact of reading on writing-only tasks (Carson *et al.*, 1990) or on theoretically discussing the link between reading and writing in second language instruction (Alghonaim, 2018; Almalki & Soomro, 2017; Pysarchyk, & Yamshynska, 2015; Tsai, 2006; Zaiter, 2019). These previous studies are important, especially those which were conducted in the Saudi EFL environment, which is the context of the current research, in explaining the reading and writing connection in this context. However, the purpose of the current study is to look into the reading and writing connection from a 'reading-to-write' perspective. I will focus on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks, which includes reading texts which are thematically related to a writing activity, a focus which was not covered in these prior studies (see the literature review chapter for a detailed discussion of these previous studies).

There have been several studies which have focused on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks (Alhujaylan, 2020; Al-Omrani, 2014; Cumming *et al.*, 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gabril, 2012; 2013; Shi, 2004; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015) (see the literature review chapter for a detailed discussion of these studies).The majority of these previous studies (Cumming *et al.*, 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Gebril & Plakans,

2009; Plakans & Gabril, 2012; 2013; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013) have found no conclusive evidence of the role of reading in integrated writing. It is nevertheless worth noting that, with the exception of Plakans (2009), these studies linked students' reading scores with their writing without taking into account any specific reading processes and their distinct contributions to writing. Plakans (2009) investigated some specific reading processes, such as word-level, mining and global reading processes (which is obtaining precise information from a text in order to achieve a particular goal), but did not investigate the various range of reading processes, such as higher- and lower-level reading processes. For the tasks, Delaney (2008) used one reading text. Previous studies were also conducted in English language preparation classes using ESL placement tests in timed reading-to-write tasks, which might have significantly influenced students' performance in the reading-to-write tasks.

Some previous studies on reading-to-write tasks, however, found that reading appears to play a role in integrated writing (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). However, Zhao and Hirvela (2015) focused on specific reading processes such as rhetorical reading processes (text organisation techniques which provide a foundation for text analysis), but they did not examine the full range of reading processes, including lower-level and higher-level reading processes.

Furthermore, the type of evaluation and the manner in which the tasks were evaluated varied. Some of the previous researchers (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015) used a questionnaire or synthesis to assess students' writing skills, whereas others (Shi, 2004) asked students for their comments on the texts and used

a summary of their comments to assess their writing. In addition, none of the previous studies recruited undergraduate Arab students majoring in English or other subjects.

To the best of the researcher's knowledge, only one previous empirical study of the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks has been undertaken in the Saudi setting (Alhujaylan, 2020). Although that study was important in terms of examining the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in the Saudi context and portraying students' performance in such tasks, it only provided students' writing scores before and after the teaching intervention, with no information given about their reading or writing processes in either reading-to-write or writing-only tasks. Furthermore, because a quantitative methodology was used dealing only with numerical data, even though the researcher provided the students' pre- and post-test scores in the reading-to-write as opposed to writing-only tasks, it is impossible to tell what factors (for example, task demands, individual or socio-cultural factors) had influenced the students' performance in such tasks. That study was also not conducted with English majors at the undergraduate level.

In addition, in the Saudi context, Al-Omrani (2014) considered the importance of reading in the writing process, and after reviewing past studies on the reading-writing connection in both L1 and L2 contexts, concluded that the reading-writing relationship is critical in academic settings. Although Saudi undergraduate EFL students are obliged to complete academic reading-to-write tasks, especially in their final two years of study, he noted that nothing was known about how effectively they accomplish these tasks. As a result, there is an obvious gap in the literature which necessitates a focus on the previously unexplored role

of reading in reading-to-write tasks. According to Alshamrani (2003), Mekheimer and Aldosari (2013), Almansour and Alshorman (2014), Al-Omrani (2014), Al-Dosari (2016), Alghonaim (2018) and Alhujaylan (2020), empirical studies in Saudi Arabia are needed to address the reading-writing connection and the impact of reading on reading-to-write tasks, particularly on the different types of reading processes used in such tasks, such as high-level and low-level reading processes. The purpose of this current study is therefore to fill this gap in the literature by looking into the reading processes which Saudi EFL students use when completing integrated reading-to-write academic tasks, determining how these processes relate to the writers' resulting performances, identifying differences in the reading processes used by high-level and low-level students, and investigating the factors which influence their performance in reading and writing.

The aim of the current study is to explore the role of reading in integrated reading-to-write academic tasks in an EFL context at the University of Bisha (UB) in Saudi Arabia. Reading-to-write tasks are often expected in English language classes in the third and fourth years of undergraduate study at the English Department (Al-Omrani, 2014). Students are required to read different kinds of texts such as books and articles and then write an evaluation (for example, critically judging the pros and cons of a theory), a comparison and contrast (for example, discussing similar aspects of two topics and the differences between them) and a synthesis (for example, summarising and connecting ideas from different reading texts in order to form an argument supporting their stance) (see Appendix A for a description of the Applied Linguistics course). To perform such tasks successfully, students therefore need to make important decisions during the reading-to-write tasks, such as identifying significant and relevant information, deciding how much

information to use, and transforming and representing it in their own words. For the reading part specifically, they are also required to utilise relevant reading processes depending on the task expectations. If, for example, they are asked to produce a recall of events, the focus on the factual information of the text would be important, but if they are also expected to evaluate the events, the use of their background knowledge would be also essential. (see Section 3.3 for a detail explanation of the study settings).

The current study used a reading-to-write task which was not restricted by time, as this would have adversely affected the Saudi EFL students' performance in the task due to different factors such as language proficiency and anxiety (Alghammas, 2020; Al-Khairy, 2013; Alrabai, 2014; 2016; Alrashidi & Phan, 2015; Ansari, 2012) (see Chapter 2 for a detailed explanation of these factors).

Two subject specific reading texts were selected for the task. The texts were similar to the materials with which the students were familiar in class; more specifically, they were about 'Foreign students and foreign methodologies' by Holliday (1994) and 'A pedagogy of particularity' by Kumaravadivelu (2001) (see Section 3.5.3 for the reading-to-write tasks). This present study used the think-aloud protocol (a method for gathering data which involves asking a person or group of people to express their thoughts while performing a specific task such as reading) to uncover students' thoughts while reading (see Section 3.5.1 for the think-aloud protocol). Ten male EFL participants were recruited, with a detailed description of their demographic profiles, the context and the data collection process to improve the study's reliability (see Section 3.4 for the participants and the sampling techniques). A comprehensive rubric was also used to evaluate their

writing by looking at the reading purpose, organisation, development and use of language (see Section 3.12 for the scoring rubric). In all of these ways, the current study was designed to fill the identified research gaps and benefit future research on the topic by providing information about the reading processes used in reading-to-write tasks and by examining the factors affecting students' reading and writing performance when conducting reading-to-write tasks.

Furthermore, the current study will contribute to English-language teaching (ELT) and learning in Saudi Arabia and other contexts. Given the widespread use of reading-to-write tasks in the Saudi academic setting and the limited number of empirical studies, the findings of the current study will enhance the knowledge of English-language teachers and learners about reading for the purpose of writing in the Saudi context and other contexts. They will provide information about the types of reading-for-writing processes which EFL Saudi undergraduate students use in reading-to-write tasks, the differences between high- and low-scoring students (students who scored high or low in their essay writings) in using reading processes when conducting reading-to-write tasks and the Saudi undergraduate students' perceptions of reading and writing. In addition, it will enable Saudi English language teachers to develop an in-depth understanding of the kinds of reading-for-writing processes which EFL Saudi undergraduate students use. It will therefore help them to improve their professional and pedagogical skills concerning teaching reading and writing.

The purpose of the present chapter is to give a brief introduction to the main parts of the thesis. It introduces the background of the study and an outline of the chapters.

1.2 Outline of the chapters in the thesis

The thesis is divided into six chapters. This first chapter is an introductory chapter describing the background to the study, the significance of the study and the study's aims.

The second chapter offers a thorough explanation of reading as it is currently understood by reading researchers, with a focus on lower-level and higher-level reading processes. I will then explain the purpose of the reading-to-write activity and potential impacts of reading on writing are then discussed. I then present a discussion of factors which might influence how well a reading-to-write activity is accomplished, with a focus on reading and writing beliefs and the context in which the task is completed. I also provide a summary of earlier studies that looked into students' reading-for-writing processes, reading's function in reading-to-write tasks, and the variables influencing task performance. I then set out the research questions in detail as the final part of the chapter.

Chapter 3 presents a detailed explanation of the research design of the study. I explain, describe and justify the current study's methodology, and discuss the philosophical and methodological assumptions which support it. I then explain why I adopted a mixed methods research approach for the study and a multiple case-study design. In addition, I give detailed information about the research setting, the students who participated and an explanation of the data collection methods employed, including the think-aloud protocol, pre-protocol and post-protocol interviews and students' writings analysis. I explain why and how these methods were used. I also describe the data-collection procedure used in a pilot study and the changes which were subsequently made to the data-collection process

and the reasons for those alterations. The limitations of the data-collection process used in the study will also be discussed. In addition, a detailed explanation of the data analysis process used in the main study is given. The analytical framework used in the think-aloud protocol analysis is explained, as well as the themes and sub-themes which emerged from the pre-protocol and post-protocol interviews and the findings on the students' writings. There is also a discussion of the trustworthiness of the study as well as the ethical considerations involved in the study.

Chapter 4 sets out the results of the study. The results of each research method (think-aloud protocol, pre- and post-protocol interviews, and students' essay writings) are explained in detail. The results of the think-aloud protocol answered the first research question, which was about the reading processes that Saudi university EFL undergraduate students employ when performing an integrated reading-to-write task, and the results from the interviews answered the second and third questions, which were about the differences in the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring writers and the factors affecting Saudi EFL undergraduate students' reading and writing performance in an integrated reading-to-write task. Also, the results from the students' writings answer the first question. The results were triangulated to ensure the trustworthiness of the study: the answers from the interviews and the students' writings confirmed the results obtained from the think-aloud protocol and vice versa.

Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the results. I explain and justify the results and compare them with those of previous studies. Also in this chapter, I

discuss the factors which affected the Saudi students' reading and writing performance.

The final conclusion Chapter 6 summarises the study, assesses the contributions of the findings, considers its limitations, suggests directions for future research, and makes some practical recommendations for Saudi teachers.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

2. Introduction

The present study is an investigation of the reading processes used in reading-to-write tasks in an EFL context, the role of the reading processes in writing, and the factors affecting the reading-to-write task. Thus, the chapter first presents an explanation of reading as it is understood currently by reading researchers, specifically focusing on lower-level and higher-level reading processes. It then discusses the meaning of the reading-to-write task and the possible effects of reading on writing. The chapter then proceeds with a consideration of the factors which might affect the performance of the reading-to-write task, especially beliefs about reading and writing and the context in which the task is performed. It also gives a review of the previous studies which have investigated students' reading for writing processes, the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks, and the factors affecting the performance of the task. The research questions are then presented as the final part of the chapter.

2.1 The definition of reading

Reading allows people to gain knowledge and information; it is an important skill that has numerous benefits for people's personal development and success in educational and professional settings. Most previous research exploring the nature of reading abilities and improving this skill has concentrated on the cognitive features of reading, that is, the readers' use of cognitive processes to aid comprehension when engaging in different reading tasks. The current study adopted the cognitive reading perspective, since understanding reading from the cognitive viewpoint is regarded as an essential base of knowledge for students to

be successful in their academic studies (Raphael et al., 2014; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). The significance of cognitive reading is also reflected in the vast and impressive body of knowledge that has been established in the fields of psychology and education sciences (Helder et al., 2013; Kendeou et al., 2014; Paris and Hamilton, 2014; Pressley, 2000).

In general, reading is described as "a combination of text input, appropriate cognitive processes, and the information that we already know" (Grabe, 2009, p. 74). In other words, reading is thought to include a variety of component processes and knowledge bases which are organised in various ways. These reading processes and knowledge bases are typically classified into two groups: lower-level processes, also referred to as decoding processes, and higher-level processes, referred to as comprehension processes (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). These two groups of processes are equally significant for understanding the reading process (Kuzborska, 2010) and the use of them will depend on reading purposes. In the following sections, I explain these key processes in detail and also underline the complexity of their interaction in reading a text and when reading for a specific purpose.

2.2 Lower-level reading processes

Lower-level processes embody "the more automatic linguistic processes", which are described as more language-oriented skills (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 22). These linguistic processes encompass rapid and automatic word perception (identifying form), rapid and automatic syntactic parsing (chunking into phrases utilising grammatical information), and semantic proposition formation

(constructing clause-level meaning from word meanings and grammatical information) (Kuzborska, 2018).

To start with, word recognition is an automatic and rapid process as reading comprehension cannot be sustained for a lengthy period of time without the capability of recognising words rapidly (Grabe, 2009). This is because rapid and effective processing is thoroughly linked to a reader's working memory or short-term memory. Pressley (1998, p. 61) explained that "automatic word recognition consumes very little capacity, and thus frees short-term capacity for the task of comprehending the word and integrating the meaning of the word with the overall meaning of the sentence, paragraph, and text". Another fundamental component of word recognition is accuracy. Word recognition must be accurate and complete because, as Grabe (2009, p. 291) commented, "without word-reading accuracy, comprehension would quickly become degraded". During the word recognition process, readers match the orthographic form of a word (a grapheme or symbol) with the phonological form (a phoneme or sound), identify grammatical categories of words and their roles (such as nouns operating as objects, verbs operating as actions), use the internal structure of a word (its affixation), and access a word's meaning by memory (from a mental lexicon) (Kuzborska, 2018). For instance, readers understand (decode) the letter shapes of a word and match (recode) them to English sounds; for example, /kuk/ stored in the memory while reading the word 'cook', as in 'the cook arrived'. This enables readers to mentally construct a visual and auditory picture of the word. Simultaneously, readers recognise the word as a noun rather than the verb 'to cook', interpret it as the clause subject and an animate object which will be followed by an occurrence summary, 'arrived'. They unconsciously activate all the words in their memory with related visual and sound

features through visual processing of word forms and then decide the most likely meaning of triggered word forms in any given context.

In addition to word recognition, syntactic parsing is the ability that a fluent reader uses to identify phrasal groupings, word ordering information, subordinate and superordinate relationships between clauses, and what a definite article or pronoun refers back to in the preceding text (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007). Grabe and Stoller (2002, p. 22) explained that it allows readers "to clarify how words are supposed to be understood". In addition, as with word recognition, syntactic parsing also occurs rapidly without conscious attention or much effort (Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Urquhart and Weir (1998) provided an explanation of how grammatical knowledge is constantly involved in reading comprehension. The following sentence becomes difficult to understand when all of the feature words, all of the inflectional morphemes and the order of the words are jumbled:

begin several it recogniser module machine digital pass record speech

('The machine begins by digitally recording the speech and passing it to several recogniser modules').

The syntactic parsing process therefore aids readers in grouping words into phrases and clauses, recognising subordinate and superordinate relationships between clauses, understanding word order in clauses, and deciding what pronouns and definite articles are related to in the previous text (Kuzborska, 2018).

The third lower-level reading process is semantic proposition formation, which is the process of combining word meanings and structural information into

basic clause-level meaning units. In this process, a reader integrates information in a meaningful way which makes sense with the reading which has taken place before, considering that a reader integrates the information after identifying words and grammatical forms. In this process, meanings are linked, and if they are recapped or reactivated, they become active in the memory (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007). For example, when processing the sentence 'The dog chased the cat', a reader focuses on the semantic predicate 'chased' as well as the two arguments 'dog' and 'cat'. A predicate often indicates the sort of situation or event that a sentence is about, and a predicate's arguments identify the participants in the situation or event which the predicate specifies. Therefore, when a reader reads the statement 'The dog chased the cat', he/she understands that there was an event of 'chasing' involving a dog as the chasing animal and a cat as the pursued animal. Predicates are most typically verbs, although they can also be adjectives, prepositions or nouns. A predicate's arguments can be categorised based on the thematic roles (the theta roles) which they play in the event or scenario which the predicate determines. In this case, the dog is the chaser and the cat is the chased; or, in another case, the dog is the agent, performing the action, and the cat is the theme or patient, receiving the action (Kuzborska, 2018).

As the explanation of the lower-level reading processes shows, reading comprehension demands the improvement of multiple language-processing abilities. Students should be able to use a huge vocabulary and to improve this capability they should practise constantly the recognition of words. Grabe and Stoller (2002) stated that automaticity and prompt processing, along with word recognition accuracy, demand lengthy reading practice, and Grabe (2009) recommended that practice can be achieved through extensive reading exercises

which draw attention to (a) letter-sound correspondence; (b) words and word parts; (c) quick word recognition; and (d) a variety of fluency activities such as partnered reading, reading with an audiotape, readers' theatre, and opportunities to re-read texts several times for various objectives.

When considering students who are older and already have L1 literacy abilities, Grabe (2009) suggested that teachers should be less worried about accuracy and effective word perception. Instead, with high-frequency words, he recommended increasing automaticity with word recognition in such settings.

In addition to reading word recognition for learners, knowledge of syntax also plays an essential role in the reading process. For the purpose of reading comprehension, Grabe (2009, p. 217) recommended that grammar instruction needs to be viewed more as "a discourse-analysis activity taught as needed rather than as a decontextualised structural activity, focusing on a set of arbitrary rules and structures to be learnt". Language instructors should assist learners to recognise "that any form has many possible meanings depending on its context of use" (Hyland, 2006, p. 12). By inspiring students to discover the meanings in texts and to recognise similarities and dissimilarities, teachers can assist "students to understand that communication involves making choices based on the ways texts work in specific contexts and that the discourses of the academy are not based on a single set of rules" (Hyland 2006, p. 14).

Along similar lines, Wallace (1992; 2003) suggested that language instructors need to teach grammar clearly, concentrating on the basic evaluation of linguistic selections which appear in texts. According to Wallace (1992), texts include discourses which are "ways of talking or writing about persons, places,

events, or phenomena which relate to conventional beliefs or ways of doing things which are, in turn, associated with a society's key institutions" (p. 14). Linguistic choices created in texts are therefore associated with various discourses of which they embody the aims and values. Consequently, Wallace (1992) recommended that teachers need to make sure that students are aware of the social features of texts and how texts are created. Finally, extensive reading exercises, even for beginner readers, are also effective and helpful (Day & Bamford, 1998; Grabe, 2009). Grabe (2009) confirmed that extensive reading provides typical grammar knowledge and offers readers complex differences gradually.

The growth of readers' vocabulary knowledge is also a sign of effective reading. Thus it is essential to possess and understand a wide range of vocabulary in order to be a good reader. To know a word properly, readers need to know "(a) a word's phonological and orthographic form; (b) the multiple meanings for a word form; (c) the morphological affixes that go with a word form; (d) the collocations of a word and the words it commonly associates with in terms of topic and register; and (e) the level of formality of a word" (Grabe, 2009, p. 105). Nonetheless, university students' instruction needs to include more than the teaching of individual words and lexical phrases. In that context, it is recommended that language teachers help students to discover "the uses of language that carry clear disciplinary values as a result of their frequency and importance to the communities that employ them" (Hyland 2006, p. 12). In other words, similar to grammar instruction, vocabulary instruction needs also to apply a discourse-based method, raising the awareness in learners of how isolated words have various occurrences and meanings in various regulations and genres and how contextual elements are essential to language choices. The utilisation of language corpora, which Hyland

(2006) defined as a collection of normal word frequencies in texts using the study of linguistics, is considered to be an effective help for students in this particular awareness.

An effective technique for increasing vocabulary can also be the extensive reading of interesting texts. Research on extensive reading has demonstrated that an enormous amount of vocabulary is studied and acquired incidentally through effective communication with the text (Day & Bamford, 1998; Grabe, 2009). Word recognition and extensive reading in a number of contexts can offer a recurring emphasis on learning words and also opportunities to create a deeper knowledge of words. Therefore, although following this process can take a lengthy period of time, Grabe (2009) recommended that it is the most effective method for increasing vocabulary.

Having explained the implications which demonstrate the necessity of word recognition, grammar knowledge and vocabulary, teaching reading should therefore concentrate on these language abilities. Although there is no doubt that these language skills are essential for reading comprehension, they are not the only factors needed for it. The instruction of reading comprehension also demands awareness of many comprehension problems and the whole reading comprehension system. That is, lower-level reading processes are significant for reading comprehension, but they are not sufficient. Reading comprehension requires the use of different higher-level comprehension processes. A detailed explanation of the higher-level comprehension processes is provided in the next section.

2.3 Higher-level reading processes

Higher-level processes commonly embody comprehension processes and are typically described as including particular component abilities carried out under a degree of control by a reader. These component abilities incorporate readers' ability to achieve reading purposes, monitor their reading, make inferences of many kinds, employ prior knowledge, called a schema, form attitudes about the author and/or the text and critically evaluate the information which they read (Birch, 2007; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Kuzborska, 2018; Urquhart & Weir, 1998).

2.3.1 Goal Setting

Goal setting is a cognitive process which plays a key role in all human actions. Grabe (2009, p. 51) stated that "goals provide reasons for action and provide causal explanations for what other people are doing or what they want to see done". Good learners regard goal setting as a higher level of conscious awareness. Setting goals and conscious awareness, in turn, have a positive impact on comprehension (Grabe, 2009; Horiba, 2000; Linderholm *et al.*, 2004; Perfetti, Landi & Oakhill, 2005). With goals, readers determine the kind of information to which they should pay attention. For example, reading for general understanding will demand less attention to the details in the text than reading a text to identify the main points. Reading for writing in an academic context usually requires readers to engage actively with the reading texts by making inferences, using prior knowledge of the topic and forming opinions about the author of the text (Horiba, 2000; Kuzborska, 2018; Linderholm *et al.*, 2004; Perfetti, Landi & Oakhill, 2005). In other words, the reader's purpose in reading-to-write tasks is demonstrated in the writing prompts which are provided by, for example, the teachers. The reader in such tasks

is usually required to set his/her own goals for the reading-to-write tasks based on these writing prompts and then engage actively with the reading text by using higher-level reading processes to construct meaning and make arguments in his/her writing.

On the reader's purpose, Rosenblatt (1994), divided the complete spectrum of possible reading goals into two stances which she called 'efferent' and 'aesthetic'. She suggested that readers always take a position when reading and that this attitude influences their interactions with texts during the reading process. She explained that the efferent and aesthetic stances "reflect the two main ways of looking at the world", with the efferent stance focusing on "the cognitive, the referential, the factual, the analytic, the logical, the quantitative aspects of meaning", and the aesthetic stance focusing on "the sensuous, the affective, the emotive, the qualitative" (Rosenblatt, 1994, p. 1068). She insisted that texts are neither efferent nor aesthetic in and of themselves and that it is our reason for reading them which dictates which posture we choose. She asserted that an efferent stance involves "a process of more strict narrowing of the focus of attention", whereas the aesthetic stance necessitates "an opening of the shutter, so to speak, to permit a larger field of consciousness" (Rosenblatt, 1994, p. 23). According to Rosenblatt, readers restrict their focus to discovering particular information when they read texts in order to extract information such as facts in a biology text or directions in a product's user manual, or to pay attention to the structural form or logic of an argument in reading for writing tasks. When readers read aesthetically, on the other hand, they allow their brains to open and feel their cognitive and emotional interaction with the material. She went on to say that readers take a stance depending on how they believe a text should be read and understood.

2.3.2 Comprehension monitoring

Comprehension monitoring is defined as an essential human cognitive process; all human beings monitor their own language communication and comprehension from childhood (Grabe, 2009). In reading, comprehension monitoring exemplifies the way in which readers evaluate their text comprehension and assess their achievement (Garner, 1994; Cox, 1994). Reading comprehension "entails keeping track of one's ongoing comprehension success, ensuring the process continues effectively, and taking remedial steps when necessary" (Baker & Brown, 1980, p. 1). Readers frequently are unaware of their own reading comprehension (Woods, 1980). They read automatically until a comprehension barrier forces them to consciously concentrate on understanding what they are reading (Brown, 1980). This idea was demonstrated by an example employed by Trabasso (1980). When reading 'Mary had a little lamb' and 'Its fleece was white as snow', the reader may not consciously evaluate the location or the definition of 'had' or 'lamb'. But when reading 'Mary had a little lamb' and then 'She spilled gravy and mint jelly on her dress', the reader may feel uncomfortable or unfamiliar and he/she may need to consider the definitions of both 'had' and 'lamb' and their situational context.

Readers can make conscious efforts to understand some types of reading material, such as scientific or technical reading texts, by asking themselves questions to ensure their comprehension (Anderson, 1980). These inquiries might concern vocabulary, sentence coherence, the main idea and how new information compares to prior knowledge. The reader's and the text's characteristics influence whether one comprehends at the subconscious or conscious level. Readers' cognitive styles, for example, might cause them to actively monitor or passively

read (Good-enough, 1976; Kagan, Moss & Sigel, 1963). Reading for a task, such as reading-to-write, which requires higher-level reading processes such as monitoring (Plakans, 2009), as opposed to reading a magazine, will influence the way readers read a text (Baker, 1979). Readers will also pay more attention to texts that contain new information than to texts with which they are already familiar. As a result, Winograd and Johnston (1980) viewed comprehension as a continuum, with word-for-word attention at one end and an act of routine at the other. Fluent readers can place themselves anywhere along the continuum (Baker, 1979).

Readers will use their monitoring processes whenever an obstacle prevents them from understanding. Brown (1980) referred to these barriers as “triggering events”, which can be unfamiliar notions or unverified preconceptions (Baker & Brown, 1980). The individual reader establishes the criteria for determining whether comprehension is adequate (Baker, 1979) and then decides what corrective action to take, if there is any. Anderson (1980) believed that critical comprehension is the ability to know when and how to take corrective action. Teachers should thus understand who is likely to have such skill and how to assist those who do not.

Comprehension monitoring includes different processes which can assist with understanding the text (Ehrlich, 1996; Trabasso & Bouchard, 2002). Grabe (2009) proposed various processes which could be utilised for comprehension monitoring such as deciding a goal for reading, understanding the text structure, recognising key ideas of the text, relating text information to background knowledge, recognising how the text is relevant to the reading goals, attending to text difficulties and clarifying ambiguous points in the text. Therefore, the skills of

comprehension monitoring are essential when reading a text, particularly in educational settings (Kuzborska, 2010; 2018).

2.3.3 Inferencing

Grabe (2009, p. 68) defined inferencing as "one of the fundamental cognitive mechanisms that connect what we are currently attempting to understand with memory resources that provide our background knowledge". In text comprehension, inferencing plays a critical role; it allows text information to be linked to the information stored in the memory. Readers make inferences because texts contain numerous unstated notions which are assumed to be known by readers. Furthermore, readers' natural need to connect concepts compels them to provide information which is not explicitly mentioned in the text (Kuzborska, 2018). The following story from Rumelhart is a good example of how inferences are made:

Mary heard the ice cream man coming down the street. She remembered her birthday money and rushed into the house .... (1977, p. 265).

Readers unconsciously seek to develop a cohesive interpretation of the text and draw different conclusions when reading. Readers could believe, for example, that Mary is a little girl who wants to purchase an ice cream; an ice cream costs money; Mary had her birthday money in the house; Mary only had a limited time to obtain some money before the ice cream man arrived; the ice cream man arrived in a van rather than walking.

In reading, two major types of inferencing have been identified: bridging and elaborative inferences (Zwann & Rapp, 2006). Bridging inferences, also called

backward inferences, help with consistency between a sentence which has been just read and a sentence which was read previously (Eysenck & Keane, 2005; Schmalhofer, McDaniel & Keefe, 2002). Elaborative inferences, also called forward inferences, are based on knowledge elaboration or materials which have just been read. Elaborative inferences occur when text information is connected with readers' background knowledge and involves their evaluations of or predictions about the text. For instance, when reading a text, readers predict events, evaluate the effects of particular actions or anticipate upcoming actions (Eysenck & Keane, 2005; Schamlhofer *et al*., 2002).

In educational contexts, it is suggested that inferencing should be developed at a conscious level so that readers are aware of the process and can apply it skilfully in relation to their specific reading purposes, reading situation and task (Grabe, 2009).

Previous research on discourse comprehension has shown that inferencing tasks strongly match reading comprehension skills and that they need to be practised (Perfetti, Landi & Oakhill, 2005; Cain & Oakhill, 2007). Carrying out inferences of these kinds is claimed to be crucial in the teaching of reading comprehension (Perfetti, Landi & Oakhill, 2005). Therefore, previous research on discourse comprehension recommends that learners should obviously be instructed on how to make different kinds of inferences. Grabe (2009) stated that "making inferences to create a coherent interpretation of academic texts or to understand new information or explanations can be a very demanding skill, one that begins by explicitly learning academic inferencing as a strategy".

Inferencing tasks might include uncovering the writer's purposes, distinguishing facts from fiction, expressing own thoughts, making connections between different subjects, ideas or conclusions, or proof synthesis from multiple texts to develop the principal reading comprehension skills (Urquhart & Weir, 1998; Grabe, 2009).

2.3.4 Background knowledge activation

The explanation of the two higher-level processes (text comprehension and situation interpretation) shows that the background (prior) knowledge of readers and inferencing are important when considering reader interpretation. Background knowledge is another key process of reading comprehension (Grabe, 2009; Kuzborska, 2018). Koda (2007) stated that effective comprehension can be established through the interaction between the reader's background knowledge and the text information. Background or prior knowledge, also called a schema (the plural is schemata), is a cognitive notion which helps to categorise information in the long-term memory (Widdowson, 1983). In other words, the schema theory suggests the existence of a prearranged network of information kept in the minds of readers and this information "provides a framework into which new knowledge or newly formed structures can be assimilated" (Singhal, 2006, p. 11). When readers process a text, word or clause, this triggers a thought; this triggering activates schemata and therefore helps with understanding the concept or situation (Grabe 2009; Kuzborska, 2018). There are two main kinds of schema, content and formal, which are used in reading.

Content schema refers to content and cultural knowledge which represents events, situations, items or places. Commonly, cultural knowledge includes

realistic knowledge and conventions about the world, beliefs, values and cultural assumptions, whereas content knowledge refers to information about topics and particular expertise (Grabe, 2009).

Studies of cultural schemata have shown that background knowledge has an impact on readers' comprehension skills. Background knowledge can facilitate comprehension because readers who already have an elaborate schema can effortlessly link the information received from the text to the schema and consequently have a better comprehension of the text (Alderson, 2000; Hudson, 2007). In addition, texts which involve common cultural topics and contents are more likely to be read faster and recalled better by readers.

The implications which could be drawn from these studies are that background knowledge needs to be offered by teachers and that readers need to comprehend texts in a better way. Normally, schema activation is very beneficial when included in reading instruction. Background activation can be established through multiple pre-readings and reading exercises. Grabe (2009), for example, recommended the use of reading guides and text previews with more challenging reading texts to highlight important details and force connections to prior knowledge, the introduction of the main vocabulary and concepts from the text before reading and the making of pertinent connections between significant concepts and the main idea of the text and the explicit linkage between prior knowledge and the details of the text. Additionally, using authentic reading texts rather than edited materials can offer readers various linguistic and rhetorical processes, which might help them to become more accustomed to original reading texts.

The second kind of schema is the formal schema, also called textual schema. This refers to knowledge about structural forms, that is, the techniques used to organise information in a text as well as rhetorical structures in a text. There are between twelve and fifteen different forms of rhetorical pattern in English, including description, definition, cause-effect, comparison-contrast, problem-solution and classification division. Previous studies of formal schema and comprehension have shown that language learners have default conceptions about the way a text operates, the way a cohesive text is constructed, and what a text structure is. Readers' endeavours to process a text are strongly affected by this default knowledge and being aware of this kind of knowledge helps them to understand and recall texts better (Alexander & Jetton, 2000; Duke & Pearson, 2002; Kuzborska, 2018). Therefore, a skilled reader is aware of such patterns and has the ability to approach texts with an understanding of how specific texts are organised (Kuzborska, 2018).

The literature on reading details three main kinds of text structure teaching: first, teaching the use of text structure signalling in a text; second, teaching the use of graphic organisers to present rhetorical constructions; and third, teaching the use of comprehension techniques which refer to structure awareness (Grabe, 2009). Furthermore, in a curriculum, students need to be exposed to a number of texts and teachers need to inspire them to read topics extensively. This instruction technique will encourage students to examine the ways in which texts are organised and the way that signalling operates in text organisation (Grabe, 2009).

Knowledge of the genre is a recent emphasis in the literature and has been defined in various ways. In this study, 'genre' refers to socially accepted patterns

of using language. It is a term used to group texts together and describe how authors respond to and construct texts for recurrent situations using language. More specifically, a genre is founded on the premise that members of a community generally have little problem detecting similarities in the texts which they use regularly and can draw on their recurrent experiences in particular contexts to read, analyse and maybe easily compose the text which occurs in them. Individuals form relationships, build communities and get things done by the repeated use of conventionalised forms and communication practices: genres thus not only embed but also shape social realities. This places social relations at the centre of language usage since every effective text demonstrates the writer's understanding of its environment and its readers (Hyland, 2009; Johns, 1997; Swales, 1990).

Therefore, the implications that could be highlighted from reading instruction are that in the genre, direct instruction is required and effective. Hudson (2007) stated that readers who differ in language and culture need to understand and accept probable rhetorical structural differences and their causes. Instruction designed to establish this knowledge should involve students in investigating the text and its aims (Hudson, 2007).

The reading literature also states a third kind of schema, linguistic schema or language schema, which embodies the structure of a sentence, the inflexions of grammar and vocabulary knowledge. Nevertheless, this knowledge processing and schema are normally linked to lower-level processes.

2.3.5 Text comprehension and reader interpretation

In terms of the levels of understanding of a text, it is common in reading theories to discuss the comprehension process. An explanation of reading comprehension

and interpretation as including the levels of text understanding is significant as it incorporates different ways of reading a text. Grabe and Stoller (2002, p. 29) stated that "readers read in different ways based on different reading purposes". There are two basic levels of text comprehension which are generally distinguished in the reading literature. These two levels of understanding are equally significant in the reading process as they can serve different purposes for readers, including reading for writing (Kuzborska, 2010; 2018). The first level refers to the text model of comprehension, which is about the understanding of the text itself, what the text is pointing out or what the author means in the text being read. The second level is called the situation model of interpretation and it is about the reader's construction of text meaning by linking previous knowledge with the information provided in the text (Alderson, 2000; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Urquhart & Weir, 1998; Wallace, 2003). In the interpretation process, the prior knowledge of the reader when processing a text becomes essential. This prior knowledge can encompass the purposes of the reader in the reading process, predictions of what the text means or conveys, the reader's awareness of the genre and discourse structure, the reader's evaluation of the information signs and the reader's attitudes and feelings towards the text, task and author (Grabe, 2009). Grabe and Stoller (2002, p. 28) emphasised that "the ability of fluent readers to integrate text and background information appropriately and efficiently is the hallmark of expert reading in a topical domain".

The active role of the reader in the meaning construction and interpretation of a text was emphasised by Fish (1981), Tierney and Pearson, (1983) and Bakhtins (1981; 1984). For example, Fish (1981) highlighted the active role of the reader in the meaning construction and interpretation of a text by seeking to prove that

readers are not just reading a text, rather they reshape and reconstruct the text in the process of reading it as the text is no longer provided and determined by the author. Fish's idea is known as 'reception aesthetics' and suggests that a text is not simply passively absorbed by the reader, but rather that readers interpret a text's meanings based on their own goals which entail their cultural background and life experiences.

In essence, the meaning of a text is formed by the interaction between the text and the reader, not by the text itself. The focus of description, according to Fish, should be the meaning construction which is dependent on the reader's goals and experiences, not any structures on the page. Also, as the role of the reader is becoming more prominent, the reading text not only contains meaning but a set of clues and directions for meaning construction: "Thus, the meaning of a literary text is not a definable entity but, if anything, a dynamic happening" (Fish, 1981, p. 4).

In this regard, Bakhtins (1981; 1984) argued that the reader and the writer are in a negotiation and that a word or utterance does not come out of thin air, but instead is an aspect of a larger dialogue or continuing discourse. In other words, readers and writers collaborate to negotiate the meaning of a text until they make sense of it. Tierney and Pearson (1983) asserted that "there is no meaning on the page until a reader decides there is" (p. 569). Therefore, a text is not complete until it is read and interpreted by the reader and for this reason, the reader is a crucial and indispensable component of literary texts because texts come into being only when there is a reader. For example, in a literary work such as a novel, the author's narrative voice is not present to the reader in the characters' dialogue, but the author allows the characters to reveal various realities for the reader to construct. Thus,

the reader does not see simply the author's reality, but rather how this reality is presented by every character in the novel. In other words, the reader not only can realise a single reality offered by the author but rather many realities can appear in the text and be constructed by the reader. From this point of view, the text is viewed as an interaction of different thoughts and perspectives which enable the reader to construct different views about the text, and sometimes disagree with the author. The author's role is therefore essentially changed since she/he cannot control the meaning's power any longer.

It seems that interpretation is used more than comprehension in the reading process; nevertheless, reading includes both processes working together. Grabe and Stoller (2002) described how when a text model of comprehension is being built by the reader, he/she likewise instantly begins to interpret the information in the text based on his/her own prior knowledge. In this way, readers will be able to consider a text with regard to both what the writer intended to deliver to the readers and what the readers think of the text and the writer (Grabe 2009). This dualism of understanding likewise describes the way in which a reader summarises and provides a critique of a text.

In a more detailed explanation of how the reading process operates, it is important to note that reading will constantly demand more or less focus on one of the processes, either comprehension or interpretation. Grabe (2009, p. 46) stated that "different levels of reading ability, different purposes for reading, and different types of texts (or text genres) being read will also lead to more emphasis either on a text model of comprehension or a situation model of interpretation". Therefore, for example, textbooks, technical documents, manuals and scientific texts will

usually focus on comprehension, whilst literary texts, news editorials and historical narratives will demand, to some extent, more emphasis on situation interpretation (Grabe, 2009). It is also important to note in this connection that, as Grabe (2009) stated, texts which are written for the purpose of learning should construct and strengthen text comprehension as a primary goal. However, the reader's interpretation should be emphasised if the reader has extensive background knowledge on the subject and if the writer has an evaluative stance towards the anticipated text (Grabe, 2009).

To sum up, this review of reading processes shows that reading is a complicated activity which includes a variety of abilities and knowledge processes organised in very complex and rapid ways. Three main processes, lexical access or word recognition, syntactic parsing, and semantic proposition formation have been explained as lower-level processes which happen automatically in a fluent reader. Readers use words and analyse them grammatically and make meaning for a short period of time in the working memory. As the working memory retains data for only one to two seconds, readers need to quickly combine the data to create a text meaning. The speed of processing is crucial because failure to carry out lower-level processing fluently hinders cognitive resources from being utilised for comprehension. Therefore, given the importance of these skills, readers need to learn how to read texts quickly and accurately, how to parse sentences correctly and how to build text meaning from words and sentences. Higher-level processes or comprehension processes have been explained as involving a range of cognitive abilities and knowledge resources which are needed to create text comprehension. Readers need to understand how to use comprehension processes and how to engage with them skilfully. They need to activate background knowledge, know

how to use inferencing and how to process discourse structure in texts. Both of these processes are crucial in reading and are used interactively and in accordance with specific reading purposes, reading situations and text types. When reading for writing, for example, readers will need to use a higher-level reading process such as goal setting, monitoring, inferencing, prior knowledge or text structure knowledge to engage successfully with reading texts.

2.4 Understanding the Connection between Reading and Writing

Theorists, practitioners, and academics have paid close attention to the relationship between reading and writing (Meyer, 1982; Tierney & Pearson, 1983; Shanahan, 1990). The relationship between reading and writing has frequently been described in simple terms: good readers make good writers (Al-Dosari, 2016; Almansour & Alshorman, 2014; Alqadi, 2013; Tudor & Hafiz, 1989). The concept of combining reading and writing was examined early in the L1 context. Several researchers such as Krashen (1982), Carson (1993) and Eisterhold (1990) claimed that sustained reading is a prerequisite for writing proficiency. This view was extended to the L2 context by Krashen (1982). In his 'reading input theory', which was an extension of his 'comprehensible input' theory, Krashen (1982) asserted that pleasure and self-directed reading in the target language will impact the writing style and proficiency (Flahive & Bailey, 1993).

Krashen (1982, p. 20) argued that "writing competence, or the abstract knowledge the proficient writer has about writing, comes only from large amounts of self-motivating reading for interest and/or pleasure". This suggests that writing proficiency is acquired unconsciously through reading tasks during which readers

are completely unaware of the acquisition process of writing ability. Krashen's (1982) theory about L2 acquisition is set out in three hypotheses: first, the acquisition/learning hypothesis, second, the input hypothesis, and third, the affective filter hypothesis.

The acquisition/learning hypothesis proposed that there is a difference between language acquisition and language learning in the development of second language (SL) or foreign language (FL) competency. Krashen defined language acquisition as an unconscious process of language growth akin to children's acquisition of their L1. In this scenario, the acquisition is accomplished through comprehending the language which is utilised for communication. Language learning, on the other hand, refers to the conscious development of rules for a language, and learners are directly and formally given this rule knowledge.

The second hypothesis, the input hypothesis, referred to comprehensible input. This hypothesis suggested that learners understand language which is somewhat above their present level of proficiency. Krashen (1982) also highlighted the significance of "context or extra-linguistic information" (p. 21) in assisting acquirers to comprehend the message which is tailored to their level of competency. Krashen similarly argued that speaking skill is not something which can be learned but is the product of comprehensible input. On the other hand, Krashen (1982) felt that comprehensible input is necessary for L2 learning, but that acquisition might be hindered by the affective filter hypothesis.

The third hypothesis, the affective filter hypothesis, argued that particular characteristics might have a positive or negative impact on the acquisition of the comprehensible input. These characteristics involve inspiration, self-confidence

and anxiety. Depending on the level of the effective filter, these affective factors can develop, hinder or block the input required for acquisition. Acquirers with a low affective filter, according to this hypothesis, get more input and acquisition is therefore more likely to occur.

According to Krashen (1982), because speech is the consequence of comprehensible input, extensive reading is the source of writing. He argued that writing is therefore not learned but acquired through comprehensible input obtained from reading texts in which “all the necessary grammatical structures and discourse rules for writing will be automatically presented to the writer in sufficient quantity” (p. 23). Krashen (1982) believed that this occurs if the reader is open to the input, if the reader’s affective filter and anxiety are low, and if the reader is completely focused on the meaning which he/she is reading.

However, Carson (1993) suggested that the relationship between reading and writing is even more complicated than Krashen suggested. Carson (1993) used the plural term ‘connections’ to imply that this connection is made up of various variables. Carson’s conclusions confirmed those of Eisterhold (1990), who said that the reading-writing interaction is complicated because it involves several relationships which alter as language develops. Eisterhold (1990) emphasized the complexity of the connection between reading and writing by stating that the reading and writing connection could be understood through three domains: directional, non-directional and bi-directional. This will be explained in more detail next.

2.4.1 Directional Perspectives in reading and writing connection

In the directional hypothesis: Eisterhold (1990) took a different approach to studying the relationship between reading and writing. He proposed three hypotheses which he sometimes referred to as 'models' after becoming convinced of this association based on research evidence. The directional hypothesis, the non-directional hypothesis and the bi-directional hypothesis were the three models. These labels describe the reading-writing interaction in terms of how input is viewed as moving from one domain to another.

The directional hypothesis, according to Eisterhold (1990), held that because reading and writing have structural similarities, whatever is learned in one domain can be employed in the other. The ability to detect patterns such as comparison in reading, for example, implies the ability to reproduce it in writing. Because the transfer of structure happens in just one direction, from reading to writing, this hypothesis is called directional. Reading-to-write, according to Eisterhold (1990), is the most prevalent directional approach. The argument was that reading has an impact on writing and that writing does not always improve reading. Eisterhold (1990) argued that there was strong research evidence to back up the reading-to-write directional approach. That is, most of the previous research on the reading-writing connection supported the directional model (Al-Dosari, 2016; Alghonaim, 2018; Alhujaylan, 2020; Almalki & Soomro, 2017; Almansour & Alshorman, 2014; Al-Omrani, 2014; Alqadi, 2013; Christiansen, 1965; Cumming *et al.*, 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Mekheimer & Al-Dosari, 2013; Michener,1985; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Plakans &

Gebril, 2012; 2013; Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015; Shi, 2004; Tsai, 2006; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zaiter, 2019; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015).

In the non-directional hypothesis, Eisterhold (1990) claimed that the reading and writing relationship is non-directional. He suggested that the transfer can happen in either direction, from reading to writing or from writing to reading. According to Eisterhold (1990), this approach was based on the idea that reading and writing are limited by a person's underlying competence and proficiency. The "cognitive process of constructing meaning" (p. 90) which reading and writing share, he suggested, is the common underlying thread which binds them together. As a result, any cognitive ability which underpins reading and writing is more likely to develop both reading and writing. Despite the fact that the majority of empirical studies support the directional hypothesis, Eisterhold (1990) referred to several studies which suggested the non-directional reading-writing relationship. He mentioned, for example, Gordon and Braun (1982) who looked at the impact of story schema training on fifth-grade students. Students in an experimental group utilised story schema with both associated reading and writing tasks, according to the researchers. When employing such a schema, pupils, for example, remembered and created more text structures.

The bi-directional hypothesis, according to Eisterhold (1990), is the most complicated model because it assumes that reading and writing are both interactional and interdependent. Shanahan and Lomax (1986) had anticipated Eisterhold's (1990) assessment of the model's complexity. According to them, the reading-writing relationship should be viewed as a "constellation of interrelated processes that draw on a variety of knowledge sources" (cited in Eisterhold, 1990,

p. 92). In a nutshell, his model focused on the various processes (for example, comprehension) and relationships which comprise the reading-writing interaction.

The reading and writing relationship has more typically focused on the writing side of this relationship (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2004; Grabe, 2003; Carson, 1990; Cassany, 1989); therefore, the understanding of the role of reading in the task is still limited. Furthermore, reading is thought to be the foundation of writing development in academic environments. For instance, Carson and Leki (1993) asserted that "reading might be the foundation for writing", and that "reading can be, and in academic settings nearly always is, the basis for writing" (p. 1). The current study is therefore focused on the relationship from the reading-to-write perspective. Additionally, the reading-writing connection concept, in this research, will be viewed from the reading-to-writing directional model point of view since this model suggests the important role that reading plays as an information source in the writing process (Eisterhold, 1990; Eckhoff, 1983; Taylor & Beach, 1984; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015).

2.5 The role of Reading in Writing

A group of empirical studies concentrated on the correlations and interdependencies between reading ability (such as comprehension and quickness) and writing proficiency. Early L1 research (Zeman, 1969; Evanechko, Ollila & Armstrong, 1974) backed up the belief that good writers spend a lot of time reading and that reading comprehension is linked to writing ability.

Some previous studies have suggested that reading can have a greater impact on writing than writing practice alone. Grobe and Grobe (1977) who used

a standardised test to measure the impact of reading skill on writing ability. The students who took part were freshmen in writing classes. They were placed into three groups based on their placement test scores. Their compositions were examined by two raters, with a third consulted if required. The McGraw-Hill Basic Skills System Reading Test (1970) was used to assess reading comprehension. At the 0.01 confidence level, the results revealed that reading has a positive effect on writing with a coefficient of 0.50, which was deemed to be statistically significant.

DeVries (1970) also examined reading's impact on writing activity. She divided L1 students in fifth grade into two groups. In class, one group performed traditional essay writing. The other group was given a nine-week writing break but was required to do significant reading both in and out of class. The reading group produced better writing samples than the writing group. The reading group outperformed the writing group in terms of content, mechanics, organisation, grammar and sentence structure.

Glazer (1973) investigated the impact of literature exposure and text style discussion on fourth- and sixth-grade students. She divided the students into three groups in each grade. The first group had no literature programme prepared; the second group read aloud and listened to some chosen reading materials, and the third group read some chosen literature, read aloud and discussed with the instructor aspects of the stories such as narrative, character and "general emotional quality" (Glazer, 1973, p. 1). She discovered that fourth-grade students in the group which listened to and discussed the reading materials scored higher in their writings than the other two groups. Despite the fact that the students in the group without a structured literature programme were exposed to reading books, they were not

compelled to read carefully chosen literature based on their literary merits, and the amount of reading they had to do was not tracked or scheduled. The findings suggested three possible explanations for the third group's major differences: first, they were open to new thoughts, second, they were in an informative state, and third, they spent a considerable amount of time discussing the reading materials.

Evanechko, Ollila and Armstrong (1974) independently examined the role of reading on writing. They investigated 118 sixth-grade students in a school in Victoria, British Columbia. The students' reading ability was linked to the syntactic complexity of their writing samples. Transformational Grammar Theory was used to determine the degree of syntactic complexity in the written product. The researchers found that reading had a positive effect on writing.

McNeil (1976) studied reading's impact on writing using young learners. His research was conducted in the 'Hooked on Books' correctional programme, which lasted for two years. The students were exposed to paperback books, newspapers and magazines; periodicals were widely marketed to the participants. Throughout the initiative, a literacy campaign called 'English in Every Classroom' was used to stress the importance of literacy. The students continued to keep weekly journals. In comparison with a pre-treatment test, the researcher noticed some improvements in the students' writing performance. Also, the students' self-esteem improved, their attitudes and sentiments about literacy improved, their ability to generate ideas improved, and the number of words used in their writings increased by 20%.

Eckhoff (1983) studied the effect of second-grade students' reading on their writing samples. Seventeen students were given primary youths' literature to read

(Basal 'A') and twenty were given simplified reading texts (Basal 'B'). The two types of reading texts, according to the researcher, had different language structures, styles and formats. Basal A was more complicated in every case, with longer sentences, more complicated verbs, subordinate clauses, and infinitives. She analysed samples of the students' written products and reported that students who read Basal A used more sophisticated structures than students who read Basal B. Subordinate clauses, participial phrases and longer T-unit sentences were among the structures used by Basal A readers. On the other hand, Basal B readers wrote shorter sentences. In addition, Basal A readers used more complicated verbs (verb + auxiliaries) such as 'might run'. Basal B students, on the other hand, utilised basic verbs (present or past tense) such as 'climbs' and 'gave'. These results suggest that primary reading texts had a greater effect on the students' writing samples than simplified ones.

Within the L2 context, the majority of the previous studies on the role of reading in writing primarily attempted to test Krashen's theory of L2 acquisition as a theoretical background to explain the L2 reading-writing relationship. For instance, Carson *et al.* (1990) carried out a similar study to evaluate the link between reading and writing across languages and modalities of L2 reading and writing. They examined four connections: (1) the connection between first and second language reading abilities; (2) the connection between first and second language writing proficiency; (3) the connection between reading and writing in the students' first language; and (4) the connection between reading and writing in the students' second language. The participants were 48 native speakers of Chinese and 57 native speakers of Japanese. Their writing samples were graded on a six-point scale.

The researchers found that “L2 literacy development is a complex phenomenon for already literate adult L2 learners” (p. 261). They also found that reading and writing proficiency levels affected the students’ performance in reading and writing tasks. Other researchers have looked into the impacts of guided pleasure reading on ESL learners’ writing skills in comparison with unguided pleasure reading as measured by questionnaires.

Within the EFL context, Alqadi (2013) explored the impact of extensive reading on developing the writing performance of Arab EFL freshmen learners at Al-al-Bayt University (a public university in Mafraq city in Northern Jordan). The study looked at how a reading-into-writing strategy and extracurricular extensive reading helped students to improve their paragraph-writing grammatical correctness.

The study sample comprised sixty male and female students divided into two equal groups: an experimental group and a control group. The two groups were chosen at random as samples of the entire population of 158 freshman students. The students in both groups were given a writing exam in which they had to write a brief paragraph. The researchers then began to offer many lengthy reading assignments on a variety of themes. The experimental group read and summarised their readings in written form. Both groups were given the same exam after a six-week period in which they wrote a brief essay on the problems which they experienced in their university life. The researchers examined the outcomes of the pre and post exams to determine the influence of the extensive reading on the students’ written grammatical correctness. In each group, the mean values and standard deviations of the scores were determined. The results showed that

extensive reading had improved the grammatical accuracy of the students. Specifically, the findings showed that extensive reading had a favourable impact on the learners' paragraph-level writing as well as their grammatical accuracy. The good effect was related to the learners' ability to read and deal with texts of varied structures, word forms and referential terms.

Tsai (2006) emphasised the significance of integrating reading and writing in college EFL classes postulating that reading might play a significant role in writing development. Although students are more likely to benefit from an education which integrates reading and writing, teachers of English as a second or foreign language have a habit of teaching reading and writing separately. The researcher recommended that teachers need to consider the requirements of their students, to be aware of the benefits of the reading/writing relationship and to carefully plan their teaching methods. Given that in EFL contexts, students perceive reading as a decoding process and writing as only a task of constructing grammatically correct essays, it is especially important for EFL teachers to provide students with ample opportunities and resources to help them to become reflective readers and writers through the reading/writing connection. More significantly, students must be taught reading and writing as inextricably linked behaviours which serve communication objectives.

Pysarchyk and Yamshynska (2015) investigated the effect of connecting reading and writing in EFL instruction. They examined writing activity development using the integrated skills approach in teaching reading and writing. They argued that this approach is often regarded as the most successful form of language instruction in the modern world and added that for both teachers and

students, teaching and learning English is a difficult endeavour which requires a high degree of English proficiency. They discussed the formation and effectiveness of integrating reading and writing skills for learning a foreign language, as well as the definitions of the various skills of writing, speaking, reading and listening, the stages of the writing process, and the efficiency and advantages of integrating reading and writing skills in enhancing the latter. They also discussed the history of the integrated-skills method, the contrasts between spoken and written language, and specific reading processes which can help in improving writing activity.

The researchers emphasised the importance of connecting reading and writing in schools to improve students' reading and writing skills. They asserted that incorporating specific reading techniques in the language-learning process can improve writing efficiency. They also described the educational approaches for combining reading and writing abilities, as well as the benefits of a skills-based approach. The influence of mixing reading and writing in the classroom on English language learning was also investigated in that study. The findings showed that the students performed better in a post-test of their academic reading and writing abilities, especially the latter. The researchers also discussed contemporary perspectives on skill integration and integrated curriculum designs, as well as frequent problems and obstacles associated with integrated education of reading and writing.

In the Saudi context, Mekheimer and Aldosari (2013) investigated the effectiveness of reading on writing instruction using an integrated holistic teaching approach for reading and writing. They investigated the effectiveness and applicability of an Oxford® set of courses selected for study in the lower- to upper-

intermediate levels of learning EFL, namely Well Read 3 and Effective Academic Writing 2. The participants were chosen from a population of students at a Saudi institution in the south-west of the country. In the academic year 2011-2012, 52 male intermediate level English students at King Khalid University, College of Languages and Translation who were on average 18-20 years old were recruited. The Oxford® course sets listed above were delivered to all participants in both the control and the experimental groups. Participants were randomly assigned to a teacher and a course section through the regular university registration process. Since different teachers participated in the study, it was necessary to test for variables such as teaching style and personality, thus determining whether an individual teacher produced a direct or interactive effect on the dependent measures.

To assess the instructional efficiency of the integrated holistic teaching technique, the researchers used a pre-test, post-test control group design in a quasi-experimental method. The performances of the two groups of students were analysed. The experimental group (n=27) were taught language skills using an integrated method in the second semester of the academic year 2011/2012). The control group (n=25) undertook the same skills courses as the experimental group but with no emphasis on skill integration.

The results showed that the integrated skills treatment had a substantial impact on students' performance in the reading and writing skills taught in an integrated, holistic manner. The experimental group participants improved their scores on the evaluated language ability of writing in comparison with the control

group. The effectiveness and suitability of the integrated approach for teaching EFL skills were confirmed by quantitative data from a follow-up questionnaire.

Almansour and Alshorman (2014) explored the impact of an extensive reading programme on Saudi EFL university students' writing skills, and found that extensive reading had a good impact on their writing accomplishments and eventually led to the development of all areas of language competency, including writing. EFL undergraduate university students in Saudi Arabia are required to produce reports, research papers, summaries and essay exams to demonstrate that they comprehend new information in their own ideas. The effectiveness with which meaning is delivered determines their success. Their academic achievement is therefore enhanced by their ability to produce well-written essays.

The participants were all male Saudi EFL students at King Saud University in the first semester of the 2013-2014 academic year. The sample consisted of 48 students picked at random using SPSS's statistical package's random sampling procedure. They were divided into two equal groups, an experimental group and a control group. The researchers devised an extended reading programme and a writing test to address the research question. There were two degrees of treatment: the extended reading programme technique and the conventional method alone. The experimental group received the first level of treatment and the control group received the second. For the two months of the trial, the experimental group were exposed to the extensive reading programme four times a week for 50 minutes each. The control group students were not exposed to the programme. A writing pre-test was given to both groups immediately before the experiment began, and the same test was given as a post-test immediately thereafter. The control group

was instructed by a regular teacher under the supervision of the researchers, whereas the experimental group was instructed by the researchers.

Four modules made up the extended reading curriculum. Each unit comprised four lessons which included reading and writing exercises appropriate to the students' needs and skills after they had practised various reading subjects. Narrative, argumentative, descriptive, scientific and expositive texts were included in the programme. The content was chosen by the researchers based on the proficiency level of the pupils. The curriculum was created to assist the students in better understanding and engaging in the active reading process so that they might become better writers. A panel of three English language university professors, two evaluation and assessment professionals, and two educational psychologists from King Saud University then assessed the results of the extensive reading programme. The findings showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group. This suggested that an extensive reading programme might have a considerable positive impact on students' writing abilities.

Al-Dosari (2016) similarly investigated the impacts of extensive reading on writing in an integrated manner during the teaching process of EFL students studying writing at King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia. The researcher looked at pedagogical methods of reading which are likely to encourage the development of writing through the integration of reading and writing skills for EFL reading ability. The researcher argued that although prior research on the reading and writing relationship has recognised the significance of the role of reading in the development of writing skills, there was little empirical evidence supporting the

purported benefits of an integrated approach to language instruction among Arabic speakers.

Al-Dosari (2016) used a quasi-experimental approach to investigate the impacts of linking reading and writing as well as the effects of the former on the latter. The sample consisted of male students in the Department of English aged between 20 and 22. To address the question 'How can we help EFL learners develop their writing ability?', the students were divided into two groups containing students from two different writing classes, an experimental group and a control group. Reading and writing abilities were taught in an integrated method to the experimental group (n=27); the control group (n=25) took the same courses but with no focus on the integration of these two abilities. The two groups were therefore basically two sections taught by the same teacher at the College of Languages and Translation at Abha, King Khalid University, who taught Writing III and Reading III to the same level of EFL college students. The single teacher was chosen simply to eliminate teacher-related factors.

The researcher employed the integrated teaching approach which used two models of skill integration: content-based instruction and task-based instruction. A pre-test and a post-test in both skills were given to both groups. The written and reading examinations each lasted for one hour. Questions on composing sentences, constructing a paragraph and editing were included in the writing competence assessments. Tests on literal and interpretative comprehension and forming inferences were among the reading skill assessments. Students' performances in all skills were compared using t-tests to analyse the scores from both groups. Between pre-test and post-test, each participant's improvement (or gain in achievement or

skill acquisition and development) was calculated by subtracting the pre-test score from the post-test score (gain score=post-test minus pre-test). In this way, the gain score compensated for individual variances in pre-test results.

The findings showed that integrated instruction in the extensive reading activity had a direct influence on the quality of writing because it had benefited literacy development and helped the students to consider the genre of writing effectively in the learning process. It was found that the experimental group's performance had improved in both writing and reading comprehension, which could be linked to the emphasis on presenting writing skills in conjunction with other skills and sub-skills in both reading and writing abilities. The significance of linking reading and writing was therefore highlighted and it was shown that the use of integrated skills in instruction could improve students' total language proficiency in reading and writing activities, particularly the latter.

Almalki and Soomro (2017) explored the extent to which Saudi EFL teachers understand, use and support the integration theory of teaching reading and writing, taking into account the substantial role of reading on writing development. Ten EFL Saudi teachers were recruited. The researchers designed two teaching lesson plans; one using the integration theory of teaching reading and writing and the other using the traditional method of teaching reading and writing individually, in order to see which lesson plan the participants chose to teach writing. Data were gathered through structured and semi-structured interviews in order to establish the significance of the findings. An important part of the data analysis was to look at not only teachers' qualitative responses to questions about what they knew about the integration of reading and writing, how they taught writing and what they

thought about teaching philosophy, but also to see which of the two approaches would be preferred. There were a number of commonalities in the design of the two lesson plans to reduce some of the superfluous factors in the choice of lesson plan. Both were concerned with relative clauses, both defining and non-defining. As a result, rather than being impacted by the focus on language, the teachers were influenced by the overall instructional strategy. Furthermore, the quantity of paperwork for the two lesson plans was made comparable so that neither lesson plan appeared to be longer or more difficult.

The main findings were that the majority of the respondents said that they usually taught writing as a separate skill from reading, and the written responses to the open-ended questions also showed that the teachers taught writing in the traditional way. The replies also revealed that almost none of them had heard of the notion of merging reading and writing for the purposes of teaching writing. However, the majority agreed that integrating reading into the instruction of teaching writing skills is a good concept to enhance students' writings, and when offered a choice of lesson plans, most instructors picked the integrated plan.

In a similar but more recent overview of the ESL/EFL context, Alghonaim (2018) explored the explicit effect of reading on writing. He focused on the utility and efficacy of the two language skills in ESL/EFL situations, as well as the need for an explicit relationship between them. In other words, he discussed the close connections between reading and writing and how reading can improve L2 writing activities. He suggested that L2 writing involves more than merely transferring new codes into the target language. Rather, it necessitates the mastery of some talents. This was predicated on the premise that academic language abilities, unlike

conversational language skills, should be taught and trained. This demonstrates that writing requires extra work in the classroom. He also argued that teaching academic writing even to native English speakers sounds difficult. He added that previous studies of L2 writing had shown that L2 writers confront a variety of challenges which must be addressed and underlined. One significant component which can assist ESL/EFL students in approaching the hard work of writing is to apply various reading processes often and effectively.

On the L1 versus L2 schemata in writing, he argued that some topics which exist in both languages can conjure up distinct pictures in ESL/EFL students from various backgrounds, so when ESL/EFL students write about any topic, their thoughts, organisations and structures are likely to be similar to those of their native language. As a result, reading in the target language helps learners to create stronger structural or organisational schemata. Reading has a significant impact on the formation or modification of students' L1 schemata.

That study contrasted Arabic and English rhetoric as two diametrically opposed linguistic systems. Because the two languages show distinct rhetorical contrasts, Arabic learners of English have to confront an explicit difference between their native language and English. The researcher argued that the contrastive rhetoric suggests that various languages imply distinct rhetorical patterns and structural arrangement of the text, so ESL students should be presented with reading texts which enable them to develop a sense of formal writing schemata.

The study sought to link various challenges in natural settings in Saudi Arabia to the condition of reading and writing in real classrooms, as well as the

tactics used by writing teachers. Additionally, it discussed the role and competence of composition teachers in making this explicit relationship meaningful to ESL writers. Because the use of explicit ESL reading as part of the writing process is still in its infancy, the researcher explained that the study was simply a theoretical assessment of the issue. Even so, it encouraged teachers and students to use this notion in ESL/EFL writing. Its major goal was to draw L2 students' and teachers' attention to the explicit reading-writing link and how this relationship might help them to develop ESL/EFL writing competence. The researcher raised a number of issues which researchers and teachers should investigate further, including the role of teachers and students in the classroom, the amount of reading, the level of reading, the types of reading texts: authentic (written with real, living language in order to engage and attract readers) or pedagogical, and the types of reading activities which might help improve writing skill.

Along similar lines, Zaiter (2019) emphasised the significant role of reading on writing instruction. The researcher narratively reviewed the teaching methods used at both the university and high-school levels and made different recommendations for developing the teaching methods employed in high schools in Saudi Arabia.

He highlighted the importance of teaching reading and writing jointly as reading might play a significant role in writing development. He argued that connecting reading and writing in instruction could help students in building thinking skills, constructing logical and convincing arguments, and enabling them to reflect on and re-evaluate their ideas when writing.

The researcher concluded that teaching reading and writing concurrently is a very challenging activity for teachers at the university level and recommended that teachers in high school need to consider the connection between reading and writing in their teaching methods. There are several ways to address these issues. Bridging the gap between high school and college learning is quite beneficial; in the first week or two of teaching reading and writing, unlearning incorrect notions from past knowledge will be equally important. These abilities are intertwined and should be taught as if they were a single subject rather than two separate courses; this technique is used for remediation and evaluation. The researcher warned that teachers in a school or college, whether they are teaching English as an EFL or ESL, will face numerous issues, such as those listed above, which they must address or remedy. The curriculum should then be revised to address these issues and offer solutions which can be added if new demands arise as the area of education evolves.

Despite the fact that previous research found a positive correlation between reading and writing and that reading might have an effect on writing development, a few studies nevertheless did not discover a positive connection. For example, Christiansen (1965) contrasted two groups of freshmen students in a semester-long writing class. One group had to create eight themes and read selected prose and the other had to produce 24 themes throughout the semester without undertaking any reading activities. The results showed that the writing of the two groups had improved, although no substantial changes were reported.

Michener (1985) explored the effect of reading aloud on third-grade students' work. The 47 participants came from low- and middle-income

backgrounds and were split into two groups. Teachers read aloud from a variety of children's literature selections to the students in the experimental group. Over a twelve-week semester, each session of reading aloud lasted for fifteen minutes. The students in the control group continued with their classwork without participating in the reading aloud sessions. Both groups were asked to submit writing examples at the end of the course. The findings showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups.

Flahive and Bailey (1993) tested the hypothesis that ESL readers who read extensively are more likely to be better writers. The participants were 40 ESL students from twelve different countries who spoke twelve different first languages and who were enrolled in a composition course for international students or in an ESL programme. Flahive and Bailey (1993) used a series of measures to assess the participants' reading and writing abilities. They used one questionnaire designed to assess the respondents' reading practices in L1 and L2 and a second questionnaire to assess reading ability. The CELT, a commonly used exam for L2 grammar, was also used to assess the respondents' grammatical skills. The participants were also required to produce an argumentative essay on one of many topics of their choice. Two experienced judges used a 1-9 scale to evaluate the writings holistically. The findings showed no link between the amount of reading done by the participants and the quality of their writing. A modest association was found between reading comprehension and overall writing scores. The researchers also found that the amount of extensive reading showed no positive link with the students' CELT results, despite the fact that it was unrelated to writing scores.

The studies discussed above which did not find a substantial link between reading and writing were all quantitative in nature. As they simply worked on statistics, it is hard to establish why they did not find any links. Flahive and Bailey (1993) warned their readers about the limitations of the quantitative data in their research paper. The present study therefore employed a think-aloud protocol, which will be explained in more detail in the methodology chapter, to investigate the reading processes which Saudi EFL undergraduate students use when conducting reading-to-write tasks.

To sum up, the present study investigates the reading and writing connection from the 'reading-to-write' perspective. More specifically, it focuses on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks which entailed reading activities which were thematically related to writing tasks. The previous studies reviewed in this section studied the role of reading in writing-only tasks in different ways; for example, most of them focused on the effect of integrating reading into writing instruction (Al-Dosari, 2016(; Almansour & Alshorman, 2014; Alqadi, 2013; Christiansen, 1965: Flahive & Bailey, 1993; Mekheimer & Aldosari, 2013), the effect of reading-aloud instruction on young learners' writing performance (Michener, 1985), the role of reading in writing-only tasks by correlating reading and writing scores in L1 and L2 (Carson *et al.*, 1990), or the reading and writing connection in L2 instruction (Alghonaim, 2018; Almalki & Soomro, 2017; Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015; Tsai, 2006; Zaiter, 2019).

These studies are instructive and valuable in clarifying the relationship between reading and writing in the L2 context. Furthermore, the studies carried out in the Saudi EFL context, which is the context of the current study, are significant

to the present research in explaining the reading and writing relationship in this context, particularly in describing the reading and writing performance of Saudi EFL undergraduate students.

2.6 Factors that might affect the performance of the reading-to-write task

2.6.1 Students' Beliefs

Students' beliefs are regarded as important characteristics which can affect their reading and writing performance. In education, that research on students' attitudes and beliefs has received much attention. Listening to students' experiences on whatever issue is being researched is an important part of studying their views and attitudes. Students on the one hand and instructors, educators and textbook designers on the other are affected by these beliefs and attitudes. They benefit students because when they express their beliefs, they have a greater cognitive awareness of their achievements (Hasan, 1985). Similarly, teachers, educators and textbook designers need to know what students believe and how they feel about their education so that they can understand what helps or hinders the students' educational process.

To stimulate students' beliefs and experiences, they must be provided with the opportunity to express themselves in beliefs which represent their experiences, whether positive or negative. Looking back at the previous studies discussed earlier in this chapter, it is clear that the beliefs of the student respondents had no impact on the findings. This is because, as Leki (2001, p. 17) pointed out, the majority of the research was based on 'public transcripts', referring to the easily seen conduct in the public transcript. He believed that researchers can always access public

transcripts. On the other hand, 'hidden transcripts' depict off-stage behaviour which could be used to characterise students' challenges and successes.

Despite the importance of public transcripts which simply discuss students or their work, Leki (2001) suggested that it is important for researchers to engage with students about how they view the study. He also argued that "a great deal occurs in the hidden transcript" (p. 20). Such studies are important because they are likely to provide information regarding students' perceptions of the ongoing research. This knowledge enables researchers to understand what hinders or helps students to complete the reading or writing tasks at hand.

Other researchers (Thesen, 1997; Ruddock, 1993) have looked at students' beliefs as a way to bridge the gap between individual expectations and social institutions. Ruddock (1993) stated that beliefs remind us of the uniqueness which underlies institutional systems. In any pedagogical structure, Thesen (1997) similarly saw students to be at the centre of change. What is vital, according to Kress (1989), is to view language as a complex system which is always in motion, sometimes contradicting itself and sometimes moving in a single direction. Individuals have a critical role in all of these processes. Education is a social institution concerned with the change and advancement of its clients toward mainstream culture, as well as its classifications. The institution of education is based on a framework which emphasises the concepts of change and advancement (Thesen, 1997).

2.6.2 The role of readers' beliefs in reading

In the field of reading, researchers have recognised the role of readers' beliefs in reading comprehension (Aunario, 2004; Fader, 1976; Kara-Soteriou, 2007; Logan

& Johnston, 2009; McNeil, 1976). They argued that readers' beliefs about reading can affect their reading comprehension. For example, Fader (1976) created the 'Hooked on Books' programme, or 'English in Every Classroom'. This curriculum was a method of learning to read and write founded on saturation and diffusion. Saturation referred to resources being available in each classroom, whereas diffusion referred to each teacher's obligation to teach English in each classroom. Textbooks, workbooks, newspapers, magazines and paperbacks were among the reading resources. Students were simply required to write journals, and the only criterion for evaluation was quantity. According to Fader (1976), this approach piqued the interest of researchers across the literacy spectrum. Despite this, however, "almost no work at all has been done in the vast area of testing *attitudes* toward reading and writing" (p. 78).

As a result, McNeil (1976) was eager to examine Fader's hypothesis that children "could learn to like to read and write" (p. 148). Unlike other researchers and psychologists who examined Fader's hypothesis by using conventional intelligence measures to assess attitudes, McNeil (1976) was mainly interested in measures and techniques which would directly measure literacy in order to determine what was occurring to the learners exposed to English in each classroom. The responses offered by psychologists were flawed, according to McNeil (1976), since research methodologies such as intellectual exams such as the IQ test, were insufficient to evaluate changes in views. McNeil (1976) also stated that the issue needed to be re-examined in order for researchers to "discover who got hooked, where the hook found its mark, and the depth to which it penetrated" (p. 151). He also considered that the research methods which acquire too much objective data might not disclose anything about young people's views, regardless of how

excellent or awful their test results are. In other words, despite the problems which they might face, young people can benefit from pleasure reading.

McNeil (1976) therefore divided the participating students into two groups to examine their feelings towards Fader's curriculum. He argued that assessing children's progress and beliefs toward reading and writing required the use of a control group and an experimental group. The experimental group consisted of young learners who attended a Boys' Training School and the control group comprised boys who attended another training school. In terms of their social history and motivation to read and write, the students in both institutions were identical. The Boy's Training School students were aged 15 years and 7 months whilst those in the control group were aged 12 to 17.

McNeil (1976) felt that intelligence assessments such as the IQ test might be used to assess a person's fundamental mental aptitude. He therefore adapted, adjusted and modified a typical instrument to evaluate the students' attitudes regarding reading and writing instruction in schools. He devised a set of study tools based on psychological and behavioural phenomena. Behaviour evaluation sheets on which instructors explain students' dissatisfaction, self-control and self-esteem were one of these devices. A Teachers' Behaviour Rating Sheet, a Teachers' Evaluation Form, a 'How Much Do You Like' Form and a Behaviour Rating Form were used. Other research methods were employed to get information from the students' perspectives, two of which were 'How Do You Feel About Things in Class?' and the Verbal Proficiency Test. These two methods were employed to compare what happened to the experimental group's attitudes with those of their peers in the control group.

The results showed that the self-esteem of the experimental group students was not significantly different from that of the control group students at the start of the trial. The experimental group, on the other hand, showed better self-esteem at the end of the school year than the control group. In addition, students in the experimental group reported more favourable feelings about their own appearance than those in the control group. McNeil (1976) reported that the students' attitudes towards literacy were initially indistinguishable, but that after only a short amount of exposure, the experimental group outperformed the boys in the control group. These shifts, according to McNeil (1976), were due to "a change in feeling generated by methods and materials employed in the teaching of English" (p. 190). These results show that a positive attitude towards literacy might affect students' reading comprehension.

Aunario (2004) investigated the relationship between reading attitudes and short story scores. Using a validated questionnaire based on Mathewson and McKenna's reading attitude acquisition models, the researcher found a positive and moderate connection between reading attitudes scores and short story scores. In the several subscales of the questionnaire, she observed a substantial difference in attitudes towards reading between young and older elementary students, between male and female participants, and between those with high and low reading proficiency.

Kara-Soteriou (2007) categorised two broad kinds of beliefs about reading: passive beliefs, which are compatible with the passive view of reading, and active beliefs, which are consistent with the active view of reading. The active and passive beliefs about reading of fourth and sixth graders, as well as their relationships with

grade level, gender and reading comprehension, were investigated using a Reading Beliefs Inventory. The results of the reading comprehension score on the Degrees of Reading Power test showed that high scorers on reading comprehension had significantly lower scores on passive beliefs than students with average reading comprehension and poor reading comprehension. Those readers who had passive beliefs about reading were not able to consider the author's purpose or recognise the text types and ideas.

Similarly, Logan and Johnston (2009) looked into gender variations in reading aptitude, reading frequency and attitudes towards reading and school. Their respondents were 232 ten-year-old children (117 males and 115 females) who completed a reading comprehension test and a questionnaire to measure the frequency of reading, attitude toward reading, attitude toward school, competency beliefs, and perceived academic aid (from peers and teachers). The girls were found to have higher reading comprehension scores, to read more often and to have a more positive attitude towards reading and education than the boys. However, there were more gender disparities in attitudes and reading frequency than in reading ability. It was also discovered that reading ability was linked to reading frequency and competency beliefs in both boys and girls. As a result, only boys' reading abilities were linked to their attitudes about reading and education. Gender differences were largely seen in the relationships between components, rather than the elements themselves.

It is worth noting that the previous studies were insightful and valuable in explaining the effect of beliefs on reading comprehension, but they had used young learners to examine the impact of their beliefs on reading comprehension

performance, which raises the question of whether the same conclusions would hold true in adult learners.

For instance, Schraw (2000) was the first to investigate the function of transmission and transaction beliefs in the production of meaning from a highly interpretable narrative text. Transaction beliefs refer to the reader's own input to the process of comprehension since a text might have different meanings for different readers, regardless of the author's intentions. Transmission beliefs, on the other hand, refer to the notion that the meaning of a text is the author's intended meaning, which is transmitted to the reader by the ideas provided in the text. Schraw recruited a group of undergraduate students to explore two orthogonal belief dimensions and investigated their impact on a multiple-choice comprehension test, interpretive replies and holistic understanding of the text. He identified thirteen sub-categories in interpretative reactions, which were then merged into three larger categories: thematic, critical and personal. Thematic answers were declarations of the text's thematic substance, critical remarks concerning the author's intent and the organisation of the book dominated the critical replies; individual emotions such as curiosity, engagement and the link between the concepts presented in the text and reader experience were referred to as personal responses. The findings showed that transaction beliefs influenced the readers' responses favourably, particularly in their thematic and critical reactions, as well as their overall interpretation. Transmission beliefs, on the other hand, were unrelated to any measure of text comprehension.

The previous studies, conducted with either young or adult undergraduate learners, highlighted that the students' beliefs about reading could affect their text

comprehension. That is, some readers had positive beliefs about reading which encouraged them to question the author and consider the reading purpose and the text type when attempting to understand a text. Others, on the other hand, held negative beliefs about reading which affected their ability to consider the writer's purpose, the text type, or ideas. Thus, in the reading process, students with passive beliefs might have difficulty comprehending texts. Furthermore, readers' strong transaction beliefs had a positive impact on their replies, notably in the form of thematic and critical reactions, as well as their overall interpretation, whereas transmission beliefs had no notable effect on the readers' text comprehension. In addition, the previous studies found that language proficiency level was a significant factor which might affect students' performance and beliefs.

2.6.3 The role of readers' beliefs in writing

Previous research on the role of readers' beliefs in writing has looked at whether beliefs about writing are related to writing performance and its recognised correlates, writing self-efficacy (beliefs about one's own writing abilities) and apprehension (writing anxiety). Unlike writing self-efficacy beliefs, writing beliefs address what excellent writing is and what good writers do. Graham, Schwartz and MacArthur (1993, p. 246) stated that "The knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs that students hold about writing play an important part in determining how the composing process is carried out and what the eventual shape of the written product will be". These beliefs, according to Mateos *et al.* (2011, p. 284), "filter[s] leading students to represent the task of ... writing to themselves in a particular way", with the various models of writing created by these beliefs leading to "different engagement patterns".

Beliefs about writing have been investigated by educational psychologists. One of the first empirical investigations to investigate them was conducted by Palmquist and Young (1992), who looked into the belief that writing is an innate ability which some people have and others do not. Undergraduate students who believed that writing is an innate ability were less confident about becoming good writers, had lower estimations of their writing skills (a belief similar to self-efficacy) and were less anxious about writing. The authors concluded that those who believe in innateness "appear to make an important, though largely unacknowledged, contribution to a constellation of expectations, attitudes, and beliefs that influence the ways in which students approach writing" (Palmquist and Young, 1992, p. 159). They found a link between self-appraisals and anxiety, as well as the belief in innateness. The belief in the innateness of writing ability was highly linked with writing apprehension among students who had low assessments of their own writing, but the belief in innateness was not related to apprehension among students who had good assessments of their own writing. The authors suggested that low-scoring writers with significant writing anxiety would rationalise their poor performance by believing in innateness.

Lavelle (1993) studied students' writing approaches, a wide concept which includes writing beliefs, writing self-efficacy, writing objectives and writing processes. A factor analysis of survey responses from college students identified five methods which were divided into two categories: deep and surface. The elaborationist method, which emphasises personal and emotional engagement, and the relative-revisionist approach, which emphasises reader awareness and in-depth revision, were the deep approaches. The low self-efficacy method, with its lack of writing processes; the spontaneous-impulsive approach, with its one-step

procedure and lack of personal significance; and the procedural approach, with its dependence on tactics, were the surface approaches. Deep approach writers had a better understanding of the readership and rewrote more often, both internationally and locally. Surface-level writers were less involved in their writing, employed fewer writing methods and were less conscious of their readers and the writing process.

Similarly, White and Bruning (2005) investigated whether two well-known reading beliefs, transaction and transmission (Schraw & Bruning, 1999), had an impact on students' writing. They argued that writers who have strong transaction beliefs are psychologically and cognitively engaged in their writing: they regard writing as a way to gain a better grasp of the topics which they are writing about as well as their personal perspectives. In contrast, those with high transmission beliefs regard writing as a means of reporting what authorities think. These authors stick to the facts and arguments which they discover in well-known sources. Writers with strong transaction beliefs obtained considerably higher grades for written work whereas students with high transmission beliefs received significantly worse grades. Transaction was positively associated with writing self-efficacy but not with writing apprehension. The researchers suggested that these beliefs affect writing performance through emotional (for example anxiety), cognitive and behavioural writing abilities.

Mateos *et al*. (2011) expanded on White and Bruning's (2005) work by investigating writers' adherence to transaction and transmission beliefs, as well as their support for the epistemic beliefs (people' beliefs about the origin, organisation and certainty of information, as well as the management and speed of learning)

investigated by Schommer-Aikins (2004). They found that transaction was positively connected to academic success whereas transmission was adversely related to achievement. Furthermore, transaction was inversely associated with fixed ability (intelligence is defined, not flexible), simple knowledge (knowledge is made up of isolated facts rather than complex, conceptual frameworks), and quick learning (learning happens immediately or not at all). Transmission is connected to simple knowledge.

In the Saudi EFL context, Alshamrani (2003) explored nine EFL students' beliefs about the extensive reading of authentic literature on writing in a qualitative study. The participants were classified as 'low advanced' and 'advanced' after they had completed an extensive reading course in a three-month ESL programme called Reading Club. Alshamrani (2003) focused on the students' attitudes towards authentic reading texts, extensive reading challenges and improvements, reading processes, vocabulary growth and motivation toward future extensive reading, and overall language proficiency when describing the students' beliefs and experiences with extensive reading. It was found that the students' reading and writing skills had improved. One of the students stated that she had begun to include new terms in her writing. In relation to vocabulary use, Ali, a member of the low-advanced group, said that he felt that extensive reading had an impact on his writing: "When writing, I love to use a new word because I now know its meaning. This has happened to me especially with conjunction words like 'furthermore', 'moreover', 'however'. This has helped me to connect paragraphs, sentences, and thoughts with each other. I saw how the author uses some words in this book, and then I tried to use them when I write" (Alshamrani, 2003, p. 170).

Alshamrani (2003) also noted that the students thought that they were familiar with grammatical structures, technical forms and new terminologies as part of their general English growth. As a result, they thought that their work was impacted by their familiarity. These findings appear to indicate that students' positive opinions and attitudes concerning the influence of extensive reading on writing had helped them to improve their writing performance.

It is worth noting that Alshamrani's (2003) study focused on the role of the students' reading beliefs on their writing performance, unlike the previous studies discussed above (Al-Dosari, 2016; Almansour & Alshorman, 2014; Alqadi, 2013; Tudor & Hafiz, 1989), which looked at the impact of extensive reading on writing. For example, in Alshamrani's (2003) study, the students were asked to discuss how they felt about a writing difficulty in general and briefly, but they were not asked to give extensive information on how they engaged with and managed this issue in their writings.

Fageeh (2003) investigated Saudi EFL students' perceptions of their writing difficulties, linguistic challenges, composing processes and understanding of the rhetorical differences between English and Arabic. It was found that students' understandings and beliefs about writing significantly affected their writing performance, and that language proficiency level played an important role in the students' writing beliefs and performance.

Some of the studies discussed above focused on the transaction and transmission reading models devised by Schraw and Bruning (1999). In the transmission model, as explained above, a text's meaning is the author's intended meaning which is communicated to the reader through the ideas in the text. Because

the reader is supposed to grasp the meaning of the text without making any modifications to the author's substance, reading driven by transmission beliefs is reconstructive rather than productive. Because a book can have different meanings for different readers regardless of the author's intentions, transaction beliefs highlight the reader's own contribution to the process of understanding the text. The reader, the text and the author form a dynamic inter-relationship system which is called meaning formation (Rosenblatt, 1994). Meaning is the personal creation of each reader interacting with the text on the basis of his or her aims and intents, rather than being confined to the text or the author *per se*. Because the reader produces his or her own meaning, reading motivated by transaction beliefs is constructive rather than reconstructive (Schraw, 2000; Schraw & Bruning, 1999). Convictions regarding the reader's participation in meaning production during reading can affect the comprehension of highly interpretable narrative texts. It is reasonable to suggest that transmission beliefs aid the understanding of important facts and ideas in a text since the reader approaches the text with the goal of grasping the author's message. Transaction beliefs, on the other hand, can aid personal responses to the text and emotional involvement, leading to the production of different interpretations depending on individual responses.

As an alternative to the underlying conventional reading philosophies of transaction and transmission, Rosenblatt (1978) introduced the idea of 'literary transaction', which establishes an epistemological distinction (the philosophical understanding of the nature, origins and limits of human knowledge) in her view of the reading phenomena. According to Rosenblatt (1978), interactive theories are founded on a "dualistic, mechanical, linear, interactional vision" in which the reader and the text are viewed as two independent entities acting on each other, but

without experiencing any ‘organic’ alteration as a result of their interaction (p. 1981). Instead, transactional theory views the interaction between the reader and the text as an exchange of experience between the author and the reader, through which a transformation in the shape of a literary work of art emerges (pp. 1978-1985).

Both transactional and interactional theories were classified as information processing theories by Koenke (1984, p. 116) because they both deal with comprehension as “an interaction between the processing of the text and the use of the reader’s experiences and expectancies”. In response to Koenke’s classification, Rosenblatt (1985, p. 98) claimed that “transaction and interaction are reflections of conflicting paradigms” and that “the transactional theory of reading is divorced from information processing and interactive processing”.

Despite conceptual and paradigmatic differences, there is a common denominator between transaction and interaction. Both consider reading to be an interactional process in which the reader and the text are equally active participants. Interactionist theories are more concerned with what happens throughout the reading process, that is, at the level of the brain’s cognitive structures. Transactional theory, however, is concerned with the aesthetic outcomes of the encounter between the reader and the text; that is, the reader’s own reaction to a text as a result of a lived-through experience with it.

To sum up, the review of previous studies of writing beliefs has shown that the participants’ writing beliefs were related to their writing self-efficacy, apprehension and performance, and that they predicted distinctive variations in the students’ writing grades. Participants with strong writing self-efficacy had low

writing anxiety and were motivated to write more, whereas those with low writing self-efficacy were more worried about writing and were less motivated. Participants who were more anxious earned lower grades on their writings, whilst those with strong writing self-efficacy obtained higher grades. Also, writers who held high transaction beliefs achieved substantially higher grades in their writings whereas writers with strong transmission beliefs received significantly worse grades.

2.7 Factors affecting the English reading and writing abilities of Saudi L2 undergraduate students

There are several factors which can have an effect on Saudi EFL reading and writing performance. These factors can be categorised into two key types: internal factors, which are described as within the learner's control (psychological factors), and external variables, which are defined as being outside the learner's control (socio-cultural factors).

2.7.1 External factors affecting Saudi L2 students' reading and writing performance

External variables can influence the reading and writing abilities of Saudi L2 students (Alrabai, 2016). They encompass instructional factors as well as social and cultural factors.

2.7.1.1 Instructional factors

There are various issues which EFL undergraduate Saudi students face as a result of the excessive dependence on traditional teaching methods such as the grammar-translation method (GTM) and the audio-lingual method (ALM) (Alqahtani, 2019;

Al-Seghayer, 2011; Assulaimani, 2019). Since the 1940s, the GTM has been the most popular method of teaching English in Saudi Arabia (Alqahtani, 2019). The focus of this technique is on translating texts from the target language into the native language, with Arabic, the students' native language, serving as the internal communication medium. Students must learn lists of vocabulary and grammatical principles, which they must subsequently apply in various exercises presented by teachers in the classrooms (Alqahtani, 2019; Al-Seghayer, 2011). The emphasis has been on practising proper grammar patterns and correct sentence constructions. In other words, one of the most essential factors for evaluating good reading and writing in the country is the end output. Teachers are the primary source of knowledge and guidance in the GTM as it is primarily teacher-centred, and pupils are only required to perform tasks assigned by the teachers. As a result, the GTM method of teaching English has been criticised for failing to focus on the development of pupils' communicative abilities. Because the GTM method failed to enhance students' speaking abilities in Saudi Arabia, the focus was shifted to oral skills, and the GTM was replaced with the ALM in the 1950s. Using this approach, students learned the target language's phonology, morphology and syntax, and compared it to their own language (Alqahtani, 2019). It was assumed that by improving pupils' listening and speech abilities, they would be better able to read, write and learn. As a result, reading and writing abilities were not valued in this method, and the order of the four skills in education was switched to listening, speaking, reading, and finally writing (Alqahtani, 2019). Short conversations and drills were used primarily to introduce grammatical concepts in school textbooks. Until recently, the ALM method of teaching English in schools has remained the most popular (Alharbi, 2019). Students were able to learn

conversations by focusing on repetitious approaches, but they were unable to participate in real-life discussion. According to Fareh (2010), memorising and rote learning have an effect on Saudi students' critical thinking and problem-solving abilities. He went on to say that EFL students prefer to think in their original language and then translate their thoughts into English, resulting in incomprehensible compositions. According to Ali and Ramana (2018), EFL Saudi students place great weight on memorising and copying to pass examinations, whereas the language element receives less attention. They went on to say that one of the reasons leading to Saudi students' poor reading and writing skills is a lack of reading and writing activities which meet their needs and interests, as well as opportunities for students to practise English in real-life situations.

The dominance of the GTM and ALM teaching methodologies, as well as their poor impact on students' English competency, prompted a shift to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Alqahtani, 2019). The MOE launched a new curriculum in 1981 to move the emphasis away from grammatical structure and towards real-life communication. The CLT teaching method emphasises the necessity of improving students' capacity in using the target language in a range of situations, while also assisting them in understanding the language's functioning (Al Asmari, 2015). However, due to a lack of opportunities for pupils to engage and communicate, the technique was not particularly effective when it was applied in Saudi schools.

In Saudi Arabia, great effort has been invested into modifying teaching methodologies to increase students' English language ability in recent years. The Saudi Tatweer initiative revised the government's educational programmes and

policies in 2013 as part of Saudi Arabia's educational revolution (Assulaimani, 2019). It was to be executed over a ten-year period, from 2013 to 2023, with the goal of improving public education in Saudi Arabia. According to Assulimani (2019), the new goals and strategies included establishing teaching approaches based on the findings of current research conducted by local and foreign higher education institutions. To move away from traditional teaching methods, the Tatweer initiative encouraged the use of information and communication technology (ICT) to improve learning in all courses, including TEFL, with the goal of increasing learners' autonomy, intellectual capabilities and communicative capacities. Within the new Saudi vision, the Tatweer project considered redefining the roles and responsibilities of teachers, and providing them with training programmes which would shift their traditional role as the primary source of information and equip them with teaching practices which would encourage student participation. In addition to the improvements made in the public school system, higher education is also undergoing changes, with new teaching methodologies being used. Traditional techniques for teaching English are no longer successful for students in higher education, according to the Saudi 2030 vision's education system. The goal is to combine several methods to develop cross-cultural competency, enabling students to properly engage effectively with individuals from many cultures (Aldegether, 2020). With the current focus in Saudi Arabia on developing teaching approaches, research on EFL Saudi students' reading and writing abilities emphasises the importance of introducing a new approach to teaching reading and writing skills, as current practices still do not meet students' needs or help them to improve their reading and writing competency (Alkodimi & Al-Ahdal, 2021).

One of the major reasons for students’ poor reading and writing achievement is their poor English language proficiency level. That is, most Saudi high school graduates have a low level of English proficiency, so they have a difficult time completing schoolwork or connecting with their peers and teachers in their first year of university (Alghammas, 2020; Al-Khairy, 2013). Ansari (2012) claimed that more than half of Saudi university students are unable to read or write in English. This depressing figure highlights a substantial impediment to pupils' academic performance, and some teachers think that teaching reading and writing is as difficult (Alghammas, 2020). This is due to the fact that teachers in the English departments who are responsible for completing a specified syllabus can find it difficult to start with their students from scratch, which might consequently impact the learning process (Alghammas, 2020).

Furthermore, a lack of attention on the link between reading and writing in the language classroom is one of the causes of the weakness in reading and writing in English among Saudi EFL learners at the college level (Al-Omrani, 2014; Fageeh, 2003). The separation of reading and writing instruction in the EFL classroom, which results in a significant lack of attention on the reading-writing relationship, is a key contributor to students' reading and writing weaknesses. According to Hao and Sivell (2002), teaching reading without teaching writing inhibits the development of reading abilities and *vice versa*; “The knowledge and skills students have acquired in reading cannot be transferred to writing” when reading is not incorporated into writing training, they noted (p. 1). As a result, the separation can cause EFL students to struggle with language and rhetoric when they begin reading or writing assignments, particularly when reading for writing.

In addition, reading and writing classes are typically silent because students take a passive part in their learning process (Alkubaidi, 2014). The pupils are then separated into groups and instructed to complete the set activities. The speaker will occasionally read the material to the students and then call for volunteers to read it again. The lecture lasts 90 minutes; however most lecturers finish ahead of schedule and assign the remaining exercises as homework to be completed by the students, with corrections to be made in the next session. Furthermore, most instructors rely on oral conversations, and they only deal with engaged or capable students who provide the proper answer(s) while ignoring the poor ones. This was corroborated by Alkubaidi (2014), who stated that teachers at times “have a group of students with whom they have a great rapport while with others may not” (p. 84).

When it comes to teaching reading, most lecturers use a decoding method. To grasp the material, students must translate the whole text word by word and memorise various grammatical rules and exceptions, as well as extensive vocabulary lists (Elmayantie, 2015; Masadeh, 2015). To put it another way, teaching reading focuses on teaching students how to decode words, comprehend sentences and answer questions about the material they are reading, and the teachers assess the students’ reading based on these features (Alharbi, 2017; Masadeh, 2015).

Reading is a solo activity for students in these classes. Teachers provide instructions and then give the correct answers to pupils, who put an x across a wrong response and circle their correct answers. In many circumstances, pupils have no idea why a response was incorrect. Reading has become a routine,

requiring bending one's head over the page and entering unfamiliar words into an electronic dictionary. Teachers give pupils a text to read and then wait for them to complete reading it. Between pupils, there is no dialogue. Students may be asked to answer a few pre-reading questions or complete another short exercise which helps them to activate a reading schema (Masadeh, 2015). A reading text is nearly always followed by a series of ‘comprehension questions’ in these reading textbooks, even though the questions tend to be more tests of memory than assessments of true textual comprehension. The instructor normally notifies the pupils of the right answers to the comprehension questions at the end of the lesson. Students frequently do not comprehend why their responses are incorrect and just circle their correct answers and place an x next to their incorrect ones. As a result, the teachers' emphasis on decoding words and comprehending sentences prevents pupils from effectively interacting with the reading text. That is, students are only provided with decoding reading processes and are not taught to apply comprehension reading processes such as goal setting, inference and monitoring, which are significant in the reading for writing tasks which are quite prevalent in Saudi Arabian English undergraduate majors (Al-Omrani, 2014; Alghonaim, 2018; Al-Dosari, 2016).

Students in Saudi Arabian institutions, on the other hand, continue to ignore and discourage writing (Alkodimi & Al-Ahdal, 2021). According to studies of Saudi students' writing abilities, there are several factors which can contribute to the Saudi poor writing ability. For example, Saudi lecturers who teach writing mostly use a product-oriented approach. To make it clear, “the students study model texts and attempt various exercises that enable them to draw attention to relevant features of a text, and then replicate them in their own writing” (Al-

Khasawneh, 2010, p. 6). According to Alghammas (2020), the focus of writing instruction at Saudi universities is on the surface level of the sentence, such as grammatical precision, rather than the meaning or function of the language, resulting in students' inability to transmit meaning to their readers (Alharbi, 2017). In addition, in writing classes, some teachers invite students to photocopy the materials supplied to them or various texts from other suggested books at the start of the course (Alharbi, 2017). There are no specific books or resources for writing classes, implying that there is no defined curriculum to guide and assist students in learning how to write effectively (Alharbi, 2017). As a result, students are unable to express themselves or produce coherent texts. Al-Zubeiry (2020) carried out research to assess the writing abilities of Saudi male and female undergraduate students and found that their written products comprised sentences which were inappropriately constructed and incoherently connected. They also lacked the capacity to develop a clear topic statement and back it up with sufficient information. Writing a subject statement, organising ideas, employing coherent links and reader orientation were among the key issues identified as affecting students' written texts.

Although Saudi educational institutions strive to teach students how to read and write well, inadequate English resources are, in general, one of the main reasons for the students' poor reading and writing abilities (Alghammas, 2020). Saudi students' ability to read and write in English has been affected by their lack of exposure to the language in an authentic setting (Al-Zubeiry, 2020). Saudi students are not exposed to authentic reading and writing patterns in the L2 context due to a lack of authentic reading and writing activities.

In addition, in the Saudi context, in reading and writing classes, there is a lack of contact and collaborative learning, as well as the insufficient use of technology which might aid learning and enhance students' reading and writing motivation (Alghammas, 2020). Al-Khairy (2013) made a similar remark, claiming that the lack of collaborative learning and the failure to use current technology were two of the causes leading to students' poor reading and writing abilities, particularly the latter. He went on to say that using pleasure reading and writing exercises in an interactive setting could assist students to develop their reading and writing skills while also increasing their motivation. According to Ansari (2012), Saudi students focus solely on understanding words and basic phrases in order to complete their reading classes. Furthermore, they solely concentrate on applying the grammar which they have learned to make similar written products which will enable them to pass writing class tests. He also stated that because of the lack of contact in the classes, students are hesitant to speak the target language because of their limited communication skills, and as a result, they lose interest in studying.

In addition, because of the large numbers of students in reading and writing classes, instructors are usually unable to provide personal feedback to all the pupils by checking their understanding or writing accuracy (Alharbi, 2017).

2.7.1.2 Socio-cultural factors

2.7.1.2.1 The use of L1 Arabic as a Medium of Instruction

The use of the L1 in language classes has been frequently criticised since it inspires students to think in their L1 before translating their ideas into the L2 (see, for example, Richard & Rodgers, 2001; Shaikh, 1993), which leads to deficits in many elements of EFL learning. Nonetheless, in Saudi EFL classes, the Arabic L1 is

employed extensively when teaching English as a foreign language including reading and writing (for example, Alkhatnai, 2011; Alhawsawi, 2013; Almutairi, 2008; Alnofaie, 2010; Alshammari, 2011; Fareh, 2010). The dominance of Arabic influences reading and writing abilities among Saudi students. They write in English but include Arabic grammar, punctuation, word order and articles, which makes it difficult for readers to understand their English compositions. They are instructed on how to use rules and academic words, and employ them in phrases, yet they still do not seem to understand the language. Many of them make errors when writing basic sentences, paragraphs or other types of discourse (Farooq & Wahid, 2019; Mohammad, 2015; Kurt & Atay, 2007).

Farooq & Wahid (2019) presented an example which shows clear evidence which points to the mother tongue's influence on English, which manifests itself in incorrect pronunciation. For instance, if a learner writes the word ‘pet’ as ‘bet’, he/she would have made a semantic error which makes it difficult for the intended audience to grasp the term in its proper context. The causes of pronunciation errors are numerous. The mother tongue's influence or transfer is the most frequent cause. For instance, the sound /b/ in Arabic is similar to the sound /p/ in English, which causes words like /pan/ to be mispronounced and written as [ban]. Since Arabic and English have different sound systems and spelling symbols, these pronunciation mistakes occur. These mistakes also occur with other linguistic components such as syntax and morphology.

Previous studies have sought to outline the amount of Arabic L1 usage in Saudi English language classes. Al-Abdan (1993) recruited 451 Saudi male and female instructors to investigate their literal usage of Arabic in the class and found

that 75% of the teachers used Arabic for 10% of the classroom time, 54.5% of them chose Arabic for teaching grammar, and the majority (87.6 %) used Arabic to clarify abstract terminologies. Alshammari (2011) more recently studied the beliefs of thirteen Saudi instructors and 95 pupils towards the utilisation of Arabic in EFL classrooms. The results showed that the majority of the students (61%) and instructors (69%) agreed that Arabic should be used when teaching English for a variety of objectives, including teaching grammatical rules, presenting new terms and providing test instructions. According to Alshammari (2011), such instructors believe that using Arabic saves time and improves student comprehension, and thus makes the learning process more successful. The main reasons for using the native language in EFL classrooms in Saudi Arabia seem to be the instructors' lack of skill and confidence in using English, as well as their preference to make their job simpler (see Alhawsawi, 2013; Rabab'ah, 2005).

The instructors' dependence on this ineffective educational method is a key issue which impedes Saudi students' English proficiency and has negative effects. First, employing Arabic as the medium of instruction limits exposing students to English by providing little or no chance for them to practise and speak in the target language, diminishing their communicative ability. According to Alharbi (2015), the desire to use Arabic in Saudi EFL classes has led to rare utilisation of English in these lessons. As a result, despite being in an EFL context where practice in classes is significant given the dearth of chances to speak English outside the classroom, Saudi students typically lack the incentive to practise speaking English in the class with their classmates and teachers.

The dominance of Arabic as the country's official language and the primary means of interaction among Saudis has undermined the importance of English among Saudi pupils (Al-Mashary, 2006; Alqahtani, 2011; Khan, 2011). According to Alqahtani (2011), this viewpoint has led to students believing that English is useless in their academic and social life, which leads to their low English performance. Alharbi (2015) asserted that in this context, Saudi students may not comprehend why they need to study English when they can get what they need using their native Arabic. Furthermore, according to Zaid (1993), the majority of Saudi students have some misunderstandings about the importance of learning English; specifically, Saudi students generally believe that it is not essential to learn English since they believe that when they finish their studies, they will attend universities or find jobs in which using English is not necessary. Those students regard English as a topic to be studied solely for the sake of obtaining the requisite test score, rather than as a tool for interaction in their daily life or their future working life.

The dominance of Arabic as the native language in the Saudi setting explains the lack of exposure to English. In Saudi Arabia, there are available opportunities for students to use English outside the classroom, such as access to English websites through the internet, which is now available in most middle-class homes. Students can utilise English on sites such as Facebook, Twitter, blogs and YouTube; they can view movies in English, watch TV shows/series in English and read English books and magazines online. Despite the availability of these options, Saudi students choose to access the internet and interact in their everyday lives using their Arabic mother tongue (Alrabai, 2016). According to Khan (2011), English is viewed as purely an academic subject in

Saudi Arabia since most Saudis use their mother tongue to communicate with their family members, friends and classmates and have limited chances to use English during everyday communications. He went on to say that a lack of exposure to English in everyday life activities makes it difficult, if not impossible, for Saudi students to achieve a high degree of English fluency and competency. Alharbi (2015) agreed with Khan's findings, stating that a lack of realistic scenarios for practising English communication skills outside the school is an impediment to achieving the intended language results in EFL contexts since it limits students' chances to communicate in English.

2.7.2 Internal factors affecting Saudi L2 students' reading and writing performance

There are several internal variables which affect students' reading and writing performance, such as motivation and anxiety.

2.7.2.1 The role of motivation

Lack of enthusiasm for studying English is a prominent feature of Saudi EFL learners which has a detrimental impact on their competency (see, for example, Al-Khairy, 2013; Alrabai, 2014b; Khan, 2011). Fareh (2010) found a similar attitude towards English learning in the Saudi EFL setting, noting that the vast majority of students were unmotivated and unwilling to study. Al-Johani (2009) and Khan (2011) reported that EFL learners in Saudi Arabia lacked motivation, which impeded their progress in gaining English competence.

Lack of motivation was reported to be one of the key factors that affect writing ability among Saudi EFL students. For instance, Al-Khairy (2013) looked

at the main issues which Saudi undergraduates have when writing academically in English as an EFL at the University of Taif in Saudi Arabia. He found that Saudi undergraduate students felt demotivated and that affected their writing performance. He identified a number of issues with academic writing at the sentence and paragraph level and offered numerous suggestions to help undergraduates improve their writing. He added that the major reasons for low achievement in writing in the Saudi EFL context are various factors such as vocabulary and grammatical weakness, unappealing textbooks, less practice, peer pressure, lack of motivation, prior educational background, using inappropriate lexical items, inappropriate teaching methods, inappropriate English faculty behaviour and insufficient utilisation of modern teaching aids. He concluded that Saudi lecturers are the people most responsible for students' lack of enthusiasm among these demotivating influences.

Al-Khairy's (2013) findings were in line with Alrabai's (2014b) and Al-Johani's (2009), who concluded that inappropriate teaching methods and English faculty behaviour are major causes for the Saudi low motivation for learning English. Based on Alrabai's (2014b) experimental study results, the causes for Saudis' low motivation for learn English are varied and complicated; however, the primary causes could be inappropriate teacher behaviours, students' low self-esteem and self-confidence, high language anxiety, low motivational intensity, low autonomy and inappropriate methods for teaching EFL.

In the same vein, Al-Johani (2009) identified many instances of EFL teacher misconduct which impeded students' motivation to learn a foreign language in Saudi Arabia. He claimed that most English professors demotivate students

because they do not deliver lessons in realistic scenarios, do not promote or appreciate students' involvement and ideas, overcorrect students' mistakes, and continually criticise students' learning attempts (Alrashidi & Phan, 2015). Another discouraging factor, according to Khan (2011), is a lack of teacher support for pupils in the classroom. He stated that in Saudi Arabia, EFL teachers frequently do not follow up on their students' work to see if they have improved, and that pupils are largely left alone without any direction from the teacher. This absence of instructor interaction reduces students' motivation and, as a result, their English proficiency. Furthermore, EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia overlook critical aspects which are highly linked to student motivation. Alrabai (2014b), for example, found that fostering student autonomy was the most infrequently employed approach for increasing learner motivation in Saudi EFL lessons. That study's sample of instructors also reported that they did not frequently include attempts to alleviate language anxiety with the goal of increasing student motivation into their teaching techniques.

2.7.2.2 The role of language anxiety

Language anxiety is prevalent among the majority of Saudi EFL students (for example, Alrabai, 2015; Al-Saraj, 2014; Javid, 2014; Mohammed, 2015). According to Alrabai (2014a), one key explanation for Saudi learners' low achievement in English might be anxiousness, which is common in English language programmes in Saudi Arabia. He noted that most students in English language classes in this setting appear hesitant to participate in classroom discourse, hesitate to offer comments, seldom ask questions, are reluctant to engage in class debates, and are unduly reliant on their teacher. Both male and female

learners display the same level of language anxiety in the Saudi EFL environment, as demonstrated by Alshahrani and Alandal (2015), who found that gender does not play a significant role in anxiety around foreign language acquisition among Saudi students.

Saudi students have been reported to experience a high level of anxiety when writing. For example, Altukruni (2019) conducted a study to address the issue of English writing anxiety among Saudi female undergraduate students enrolled in the preparatory year English language programme at a Saudi university. The researcher developed the English Writing Anxiety Survey (EWAS) to measure students' levels of writing anxiety in English, analyse the major triggers of second language writing anxiety (such as language classroom anxiety and cognitive anxiety), ascertain how writing anxiety affects students' writing performance and explore the effects of factors such as reading motivation and language proficiency on students' L2 writing anxiety.

Altukruni's (2019) descriptive and statistical analyses showed that the Saudi students reported moderate reading motivation, high cognitive anxiety and high anxiety when writing in English. The analyses also showed that writing anxiety had a negative effect on their writing abilities. The reasons given by students for their writing anxiety were lack of confidence, fear of making mistakes and fear of negative evaluation. These findings are in line with those of Alrabai (2014a; 2015), Al-Saraj (2014), Alshahrani and Alandal (2015) and Javid (2014), who all identified fear of negative evaluation as one of the primary sources of language anxiety among Saudi EFL learners. According to Al-Saraj (2014), EFL instructors' qualities and actions are important elements which can elicit student

fear in the Saudi setting. Some of these practices were highlighted by Alrabai (2014a), including the lack of teacher support, unsympathetic teachers, negative student performance evaluations, teachers' lack of time for personal attention, threatening questioning styles, intolerance of learner errors, harsh correction or overcorrection of students' mistakes, assessment procedures which rely primarily on written tests, and students' sense of being judged by the teacher or wanting to impress the teacher.

In addition, in line with Altukruni's (2019) findings about writing anxiety, Hamouda (2013) highlighted Saudi EFL learners' poor perceived confidence, stating the timid and hesitant characteristics of Saudi EFL learners striving to communicate in a foreign language as significant causes of their language anxiety. The researcher posited that many Saudi Arabian learners experience significant language anxiety as a result of their preconceptions about studying English as a foreign language. Some of these erroneous beliefs are as follows: that mastering a foreign language is a complicated and an overwhelming task which necessitates particular learning skills and intelligence, that young language learners are more successful than adults, that learning a foreign language is simply a matter of memorising vocabulary words and grammatical rules, that a learner is expected to be fluent or have a perfect accent and should be grammatically correct while speaking in the foreign language, and that learners should comprehend each word they read or hear in the language class.

2.8 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks

This section presents a survey of previous studies on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks. In the last two decades, there have been several studies on the effect

of reading on reading-to-write tasks, although most of them were conducted in L1 and ESL contexts (Cumming *et al.*, 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Shi, 2004; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015), and several in the EFL context (Alhujaylan, 2020; Al-Omrani, 2014; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2012).

Some previous studies were conducted in English language preparation courses using ESL placement tests as reading-to-write tasks and others were conducted in naturalistic contexts (the students' normal setting of study such as a college classroom) where students completed reading-to-write tasks as part of their academic studies. The difference between reading-to-write tasks performed in English language preparation courses and those conducted in naturalistic contexts is revealed in the type of reading texts used in these tasks and the time restrictions set for the students to finish the tasks. In contrast to the reading-to-write tasks conducted in naturalistic contexts in which students perform these tasks as part of their normal academic study using their usual reading texts and without time limits, reading-to-write tasks in English language preparation courses involve reading texts which are unfamiliar to the students and might be challenging for L2 students as they are designed to test their language proficiency. Additionally, reading-to-write tasks in English language preparation courses are restricted by time limits, putting the students under time pressure, which might consequently affect their reading comprehension and writing performance.

Most of the previous studies on reading-to-write tasks have been conducted in English language preparation courses using ESL placement tests as reading-to-write tasks (Cumming *et al.*, 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Gebril &

Plakans, 2009; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013), although several studies have been conducted in naturalistic contexts in which the participants carried out reading-to-write tasks in their specific academic disciplines (Alhujaylan, 2020; Al-Omrani, 2014; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). Although these studies are valuable in increasing our knowledge of reading for writing, they still leave gaps in our understanding of the reading processes employed in reading-to-write tasks and how these processes contribute to writing performance. These studies and their limitations are discussed in the following sections.

2.8.1 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in English language preparation courses

The role of reading in integrated writing has been investigated in a number of English language preparation courses (Cumming *et al*., 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013, Watanabe, 2001, Yang, 2009, Zhang, 2013) but its effect on writing has been inconclusive. For example, Watanabe (2001) investigated how multiple-reading-based compositions are evaluated by looking at three data sources: ratings, student texts and rater reactions. As part of an ESL placement test, 47 new overseas graduate students at the University of Hawaii wrote on three prompts, a typical non-source question and two reading-to-write prompts each with five short source readings on a particular topic. The reading-to-write prompts' reliability and validity were assessed using multi-faceted Rasch models. The length, usage of source ideas and original ideas, use of quotation marks and citations, and essay level organisation of reading-to-write essays (n=94) were all examined. There was also a protocol analysis of rater talk-aloud data and interview data to explore what text elements the raters were

paying attention to and valuing. The findings showed that the reading-to-write essays could be rated consistently and that they were primarily a test of writing skill rather than reading aptitude. Sources were determined to account for less than half of the essay's substance. However, around 10% of the essays had a unique topic. Some students had a very broad thesis, one based on a primary notion in a source, or none at all which had been explored consistently throughout the essay. When they quoted source materials word for word, most students used quotation marks and credited the source, but not when they changed the information even slightly. The following characteristics were found in the highly ranked reading-to-write essays: (1) a well-defined introduction with a thesis (not necessarily original), (2) a few paragraphs in the body, each deliberating a feature of the thesis with a source (at least two sources were cited) and expressing their own ideas (such as personal experience or related comments), (3) a concluding paragraph, and (4) satisfactory length in general. The researcher concluded that the independent reading scores could not predict reading-to-write task scores because the expected influence of the reading task depended on general language proficiency. Across different proficiency levels, differences occurred in essay length, the number of clauses and syntactic complexity. The writers with higher proficiency levels used a variety of words, scored higher on a grammatical accuracy scale, and wrote longer essays than writers with lower proficiency levels.

Delaney (2008) further examined the relationship between reading ability and reading scores on reading-to-write tasks in order to determine whether the reading-to-write construct is a result of the reader's and the writer's ability or an independent construct. The study examined three main elements, (a) test tasks, (b) the link between test task scores and scores on reading and writing measures, and

(c) the impacts of proficiency level and educational level on reading-to-write performance. The 139 participants comprised 50 native speakers of English (graduates and undergraduates) and 89 ESL learners from English preparation courses in two American universities. The ESL students were divided into two groups based on their English proficiency: intermediate (TOEFL = 450-543) and advanced (TOEFL = >550). The EFL students were student teachers in a TESOL programme in Venezuela, and there was no way to assess their competency. The participants' ages varied from 18 to 51 (mean=26) with 41 males and 98 females. The majority of them (about 75%) had majored in social sciences or humanities, with 41% majoring in TESOL or Applied Linguistics.

The researcher used two reading-to-write time-limited tasks: a summary and a response essay. For the summary task, examinees were required to read a source text and summarise the author's key points. In the second task, the students were required to write an essay on the text's principal topic. The scoring system involved two analytical scales, one for each task, and three score categories were derived from existing academic writing scoring methods: organization and development of ideas and arguments, utilisation of knowledge from the source reading texts, and language. The researcher used reading and writing measures to assess the students' reading and writing tasks and then compared their scores. The reading measure involved 38 multiple-choice questions about the "basic reading level" of comprehension (p. 143). For the writing measure, the researcher used an analytical rubric to evaluate the participants' basic writing levels. The rubric assessed organisation, language use and techniques. The results of the measurement of the relationship between reading comprehension scores and reading-to-write scores indicated a low correlation between reading and reading-

to-write scores, showing that reading-to-write scores were weakly linked to reading comprehension ability. These findings indicate that reading-to-write ability cannot be anticipated from reading ability. It was also found that individual factors such as language proficiency and educational levels affected the students' performance in reading-to-write tasks.

Esmaeili (2002), however, studied 34 ESL first-year engineering students in Canada and found the opposite results. The study sought to determine firstly, how ESL students' writing performance and overall scores on their summary recall protocols for reading comprehension in an English language test were affected when the writing task was related thematically to a reading passage, secondly, what reading processes the students used when the writing task was thematically related to the reading text, thirdly, which of the reading and writing models accounted for ESL students' reading and writing performance in an English language test with a thematic link between its reading and writing tasks, and finally, if there was a link between the quality of the students' written compositions and their self-assessment of their familiarity with the content of a reading section. By focusing on the effect of reading on writing performance in reading-to-write tasks and using two writing tasks as part of the IELTS test, Esmaeili (2002) set up two reading and writing tasks in two scenarios, one of which involved a text that was pertinent to the writing assignment, and the other was not. When the writing assignment was thematically connected to the reading task, the participants answered interview questions and completed a retrospective checklist of the writing styles which they had employed. In the condition where the reading and writing assignments were thematically connected, the students performed better on both writing and summary memories of their reading comprehension. The findings showed that connecting reading and

writing on a thematic level had improved both the processes and the outcomes of the students' writing. The findings also showed that both high- and low-scoring participants relied significantly on recalling words and phrases as meaning units from the reading text, which enhanced their writing performance.

Similarly, Cumming *et al.* (2006) evaluated the writing characteristics of three types of TOEFL prototype tasks: writing-only, reading-to-write and listening-writing. They examined and assessed written products across tasks and competence levels, highlighting the value of such comparisons by emphasising how the written discourse differed in written compositions generated by examinees with varied test scores. Because the discourse of written texts cannot be presumed to be constant for examinees with varying degrees of English proficiency, the researchers suggested that it was also necessary to investigate how the examinees' written discourse differed in particular tasks as a function of their English competence. These data were required to confirm or improve the scoring methods being created to assess performance in various writing assignments. The researchers employed 216 compositions prepared for six tasks undertaken by 36 examinees in a field test representing TOEFL essay score levels 3, 4 and 5 and categorised them for lexical and syntactic complexity, grammatical accuracy, argument structure, evidence orientations and verbatim uses of the source text. Analyses by non-parametric MANOVAs were followed by a three-by-three within-subjects factorial design (TOEFL essay, writing in response to a reading passage, and writing in response to a listening passage), and a within-subjects factorial design (English proficiency level: score levels 3, 4 and 5 on the TOEFL essay). For the variables of lexical complexity (text length, word length, ratio of different words to total words written), syntactic complexity (number of words per T-unit, number of clauses per

T-unit), rhetoric (quality of propositions, claims, data, warrants and oppositions in argument structure), and pragmatics, the discourse produced for the reading-to-write tasks differed significantly from the discourse produced for the writing-only essay (orientations to source evidence in respect to self or others and to phrasing the message as either declarations, paraphrases or summaries).

The researchers discovered disparities in essay length and number of sentences, both measures of syntactic complexity, across competency levels in their study. In the reading-to-write tasks, the least-competent writers tended to construct integrated reading-to-write compositions with opening paragraphs which referenced supporting themes. However, either their assertions in the opening sections of the thesis were not elaborated in the composition, or the examinees tended to focus on a single personal experience which had no bearing on the primary proposition. The appearance of many points gave a sense of incoherence. Phrases were organised in an unpredictable manner, with extended, run-on sentences, sentence fragments and other punctuation errors. There were several minor spelling and word-form problems. The language was restricted and there were times when it was difficult to understand what was being said. Some examinees used themselves as proof (for example, 'I can state that ...') which was inappropriate for the reading-to-write task. In these ineffectual works, verbatim sentences from the original text occurred often but there were few direct acknowledgements of the source. Most of the substantive topics stated in the source reading were summarised by the more competent examinees in the sample rather than paraphrasing these concepts or using terms verbatim from the source material. The mid-range compositions in this exercise tended to paraphrase concepts from the source readings word for word, employing numerous verbatim sentences from

the source reading. When phrases in exceptionally successful compositions were drawn from the original text, they were frequently typical terms in everyday usage (such as ‘at the same time’), making textual borrowing difficult to justify. Some of the most successful reading-writing replies were short, and some even lacked an established paragraph style, giving them the quality of a text, which might appear in a university course test response. These compositions tended to start with a major premise and then restate it at the conclusion, backed up with brief statements and pertinent facts. The choice of words appeared to be unique and accurate, with an intellectual tone. Similarly, the majority of T-units were third-person assertions, describing the source text but not always mentioning it as a source of proof. There were just a few small faults in these writings, which were written in a variety of syntactic structures and used a variety of verb tenses.

Plakans (2008) compared the processes of test takers when designing reading-to-write and writing-only exam problems and stated that reading-to-write tasks were increasingly being used to assess academic writing in English, frequently replacing classic spontaneous writing-only assessments. Ten non-native English-speaking students from a prominent mid-western American institution took part in the study. They wrote on tasks created for the university’s English placement exam. Non-native English speakers who had been accepted by a prominent mid-western institution were included in the study to match the target group for the placement exam. The participants were chosen based on their ability to communicate in a second language, native language or home nation, major, and degree status. These criteria were developed based on the exam’s target population and previous research on composing procedures. A concurrent verbal technique, or think-aloud, was used to record the L2 writers’ mental activity during the task and

the pre- and post-protocol interviews. The writers' general background, reading and writing experience and perceptions of writing assessment were all discussed during the pre-protocol interviews. Their perceptions of the two assignments, their writing processes and concerns which surfaced in their think-aloud protocols were all investigated in the post-protocol interviews. Each participant wrote in two talk-aloud sessions, the first with a writing-only assignment and the second with a reading-to-write task. The research was designed to balance the reading-to-write and writing-only tasks, as well as the themes, as much as was feasible. Because the real placement test was not computer-based, writers wrote using pencil on paper during the think-aloud sessions.

The data were qualitatively evaluated across tasks and test takers. The reading-to-write task elicited a more involved approach for some writers, whereas writing-only tasks required more initial and less online preparation. The students preferred reading-to-write tasks over writing-only tasks because they were able to connect and engage with the reading source materials and reflect on their compositions. As the writers read the source texts in the reading-to-write task, a difference emerged. Some students, both high and low scorers, skipped the planning phase and went straight to reading the source materials, indicating that they bypassed the task prompts and therefore missed the reading-to-write task's goal. These participants tended to rely on source reading texts, borrowing terms and phrases in their writings. Four high-scoring writers, on the other hand, started by planning for the task and employed reading processes such as summarising, borrowing ideas from the reading texts, and detecting syntactic structures to interact with the source texts. In their reading of the original texts, these writers demonstrated a more engaged and productive approach.

Yang (2009) examined the role of reading and listening in academic writing performance and argued that integrated writing activities including many language modalities such as reading and hearing were becoming more popular as ways to evaluate academic writing. As a result, it is important to understand how test-takers combine diverse skills to execute these tasks. Using a structural equation modelling technique, the study investigated L2 writers' strategy utilisation and its link to test performance on an integrated reading-listening-writing test problem. A total of 161 non-native English-speaking students from a prominent south-western institution in the US took part in the study: Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Iran, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, Turkey and Vietnam were the nations represented. There were around 66% females (n=106) and 34% males (n=55), and about 55% were graduate students (n=88), 29% were undergraduate students (n=47) and the other 16% were non-matriculated students (n=26) who were solely studying ESL programmes at the institution. They came from a variety of majors, including Engineering, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Fine Arts, and their TOEFL scores ranged from 123 to 283 on a 300-point scale, indicating a wide range of English proficiency (computer-based). The Strategy Inventory for Integrated Writing, an integrated task and the Integrated Writing Scoring Rubrics were the three research tools employed in the study. The test material was the integrated reading-listening-writing exam task from the TOEFL iBT Data Set 3: Writing (2008)2. All participants spent two minutes reading a 255-word paragraph and two minutes listening to a portion of a lecture related to the reading passage to complete the task. They then prepared a response to a question in which they were asked to describe concepts from the lecture and explain how they related to ideas from the reading passage. The findings showed that integrated writing strategy use is a

complex construct with three components: self-regulatory strategy use (SELFS), discourse synthesis strategy use (DSS), and 'test-wiseness' strategy use (TWS). Other sorts of strategy use were under SELFS. The DSS had a direct, positive influence on test performance, whilst the TWS had a direct, negative impact. The findings showed that the activity needs not just understanding and production abilities, but also the ability to regulate reading, listening and writing interactions. The results shed light on the nature of integrated reading-listening-writing activities and supported the test's validity claims.

In contrast, Gebril and Plakans (2009) investigated the characteristics of writing from integrated reading-writing activities, as well as the techniques which writers employed to accomplish them. A total of 131 undergraduate EFL female Arab students from a university in the United Arab Emirates performed a reading-writing task on global warming, followed by a questionnaire on their writing process. Their writing was graded and categorised into three competency levels. Discourse factors such as lexical sophistication, syntactic complexity, correctness and fluency were examined in the written output. They were also examined for source usage, with the quantity of source use, direct quotation or indirect integration, and verbatim source use all being taken into account. In one-way analyses of variance, all of these characteristics became dependent variables to see if they differed substantially among writing competence levels. The questions on the process questionnaire linked to the use of source texts were also evaluated across competency levels. A number of discourse and source-use variables showed substantial variations between levels, but follow-up research revealed that the disparities were bigger between the lowest level and the upper two levels. The upper levels did not differ considerably in terms of writing traits, implying that

higher-level writing was characterised by other factors such as organisation, content or coherence, which were on the rating rubric. The findings of the reading-to-write task showed that all high- and low-scoring writers who participated in the task used the source materials to generate ideas and develop views. Writers' challenges were coursework on integrated writing, borrowing words and phrases when performing the reading-to-write task, and using citations from the reading texts. For example, a higher-scoring participant said, 'I get words from reading' (Gebril & Plakans, 2009, p. 64).

The findings also suggest that although discourse traits defined integrated writing at lower levels, other textual features such as coherence, substance and organisation distinguished higher-level writing. Reading competency and understanding of integrating reading and writing should also be included in an integrated writing framework. The researchers asserted that as integrated writing tasks become increasingly common in academic writing research, more studies on their validity and use are needed to aid users in understanding scores.

Plakans (2009) sought to understand the effect of reading comprehension processes on integrated L2 writing tasks by investigating the reading comprehension processes during the composing process and between high- and low-scoring writers. She recruited twelve ESL participants from two large US universities; they were full-time graduate students, first-year undergraduates and those who were attending a pre-admission intensive English programme. Their majors differed as well; the range of backgrounds showed a diverse group of writers who represented the body of international students at the universities where the study was conducted. The researcher designed two reading-to-write tasks on

the topics of cultural borrowing and technology and asked the students to synthesise text information and then write an argumentative essay. These tasks were created for use in a university English placement test which assesses whether non-native English speakers will have to complete additional academic English training. These topics were picked from a list of subjects which had performed well in previous writing-only versions of the placement test. These source texts were chosen because they were interesting and similar in length. The researcher piloted these tasks with four writers similar to those who would be chosen for her main study and then amended the tasks before data collecting started. Three ESL writing teachers revised the writing tasks and offered improvements and phrasing for the directions. The researcher also used a think-aloud protocol and interviews to investigate the relationship and to capture the writers' thoughts as they completed the assigned tasks. Each writer was given instructions and listened to a sample think-aloud recording before participating in a practice session in which they spoke their thoughts aloud while completing two short tasks. They were given oral feedback on this practice session before the main writing session began. The think-aloud sessions were recorded, transcribed and double-checked for accuracy, after which those areas where the students were reading or thinking about the source texts were highlighted as actions or episodes for analysing and coding the data. Following their division into concept units to capture individual thoughts, these highlighted portions were coded as processes in the composing process. A total of 374 concept units were produced and classified from the twelve writers' written products. In addition to the think-aloud data, interviews were held after each session to ask writers about the task's and the topic's difficulty, their usage of the source texts, and general remarks on the assignments. During the coding phase,

these interviews and the think-aloud data were combined to triangulate and follow up on codes in the data.

The findings showed that word-level reading processes were most common among high- and low-scoring writers, along with global and mining reading processes. High-scoring writers were found to use more reading processes in general including both mining and global reading processes. The findings also showed that the reading-to-write tasks elicited strategic competence in that metacognitive (conscious processes for monitoring reading activities, including evaluating the effectiveness of the cognitive processes used) and goal-setting processes were employed. For the experienced academic writers, mining processes occurred concurrently with writing. In addition, the results showed that reading comprehension processes could facilitate writing by offering information as a basis for writing.

Plakans and Gebril (2013) studied integrated tasks in L2 writing with a focus on how to assess performance and scores from these tasks correctly. The use of source text material is a feature of integrated writing which is not seen in traditional autonomous writing. Using participants from 73 different countries with 47 different native languages, they looked at how source text usage shows in integrated writing task performances and how it varies by score level and problem topic. To investigate these topics, Educational Testing Service (ETS) provided 480 performances on the writing component of the internet based TOEFL iBT. A comparison summary of listening and reading materials which give opposing viewpoints on a topic is part of the integrated TOEFL assignment. In the study, multiple regression analysis was used to examine three aspects of source text usage:

(1) the relevance of source text concepts which writers incorporated in their summary, (2) the use of ideas from both a reading and a listening source text, and (3) the borrowing of precise terminology from the source texts (verbatim source use). These three regions were examined at nine different score levels, revealing a link between score and source usage. Overall, these characteristics of source text consumption explained more than half of the variances in the reading, listening and writing scores. The use of the hearing text and the inclusion of key concepts from source texts explained the most variation, but the use of the reading text and the usage of verbatim sources were less significant, showing a negative connection with the score, implying that the essays with lower scores had more of these characteristics. These findings back up the assumption that integrated writing evaluation evokes academic writing processes. High-scoring writers chose key concepts from the source texts and applied them to the listening text as directed by the assignment question. Low-scoring writers relied mainly on reading texts and direct copying of words and phrases. These findings back up the validity of interpreting integrated task scores as a measure of academic writing, but they also give a more detailed look at the role of particular source usage characteristics.

Zhang (2013) investigated the impact of teaching synthesis writing on ESL students' writing performance. The researcher claimed that in the previous ten years, synthesis writing had received a lot more attention in L2 EAP contexts, but that there had been little research on L2 synthesis writing, particularly treatment studies which linked writing instruction to the development of synthesis writing abilities. The participants came from two separate ESL courses, one of which was chosen at random to be the experimental group and the other to be the control group. The experimental group received five iterations of discourse synthesis

instruction over the course of a semester, and the control group worked on a similar amount of reading and writing practice. The students' discourse synthesis abilities were assessed by pre- and post-tests in which they wrote problem-solution essays based on two sources. The experimental group fared much better in the post-test and improved significantly more from pre-test to post-test than the control group. That is, by considering the task's goal, planning throughout the task and producing well-written texts, the experimental group was able to reduce the amount of borrowing from the source reading texts. These findings imply that instruction has a good impact on discourse synthesis writing. More importantly, the findings showed that synthesis writing teaching can be included in an ESL classroom without considerably disturbing the curriculum.

As these studies have shown, the effect of reading on writing is inconclusive. However, it is important to note here that all these studies, apart from Plakans (2009), correlated students' reading scores with their writing without considering specific reading processes and their individual contributions to writing. They were also conducted in English language preparation courses using ESL placement tests in which reading-to-write tasks were time-limited. Some studies (for example, Delaney, 2008) also used only one reading text for the tasks.

2.8.2 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in naturalistic contexts

The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks has also been investigated in naturalistic contexts in which students perform reading-to-write tasks in their particular academic subjects. The results of these studies indicate a relationship between reading and writing in reading-to-write tasks (Plakans & Gebril, 2012;

Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). For example, Shi (2004) investigated the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks by examining how undergraduates' use of words from source reading texts in their English writing was influenced by their L1 and the type of writing task. The participants were 97 first- and third-year undergraduates from an English Department at a US university, of whom 38 were native English speakers and 59 were ESL learners. The research comprised two tasks: a summary and an opinion essay. After completing both activities, the students were required to reply to two pre-selected explanatory texts. The theme and source texts were chosen after talks with the participating institution's writing teachers. For the opinion work, students were instructed to write between 200 and 300 words but there was no specified word limit for the summary task. Half of the students in each group conducted a summary task using two pre-selected source texts whereas the other half completed an opinion task. The researcher developed a textual borrowing coding method with three key categories, no references, references to the author or source text, and quotes. Both the first and second categories were further divided into three sub-categories to indicate whether borrowed word strings were exactly copied, slightly modified by adding or deleting words or substituting synonyms for content words, or closely paraphrased by reformulating syntax or changing the original wording. Paragraphs with no evidence of direct borrowing of two or three consecutive words from source texts were not categorised as textual borrowing. After that, the students' drafts and source texts were compared to see if they had retained strings of words from sources verbatim or almost verbatim, with or without acknowledgement. The number of words borrowed was affected by both task and L1, according to a two-way ANOVA. The findings showed that students who completed the opinion essay

task outperformed those who completed the summary essay task and that some students had employed source reading texts for both tasks without acknowledging sources. The findings also showed that the students used more borrowed words and phrases when completing the reading-to-write task, indicating that utilising words and phrases from the reading texts helped them with the integrated writing.

Plakans and Gebril (2012) examined nine EFL female undergraduate students' use of sources in their writing, the way the use of these sources helped in their writing and how language proficiency affected the synthesis essay. These participants were selected based on their writing scores from the 139 EFL female undergraduate students who had previously participated in Gebril and Plakans (2009). The researchers used a sequential model to answer the study questions, using a mixed-method approach in which the qualitative and quantitative stages were given equal status. These techniques were used for two reasons: to fill a gap in the literature and to give both a detailed description of writers' use of source texts and trends across a broader set of writers.

The multi-stage research was carried out in a Middle Eastern university with undergraduate students who were all native Arabic speakers with English skill levels appropriate for academic studies. The students were from different majors, Communication Studies, Geography, Urban Planning and Social Work, and were in their second, third and fourth years of university; the majority of them had attended a basic writing course and had more than a little writing experience. During the spring semester of 2008, this university hosted a number of data gathering sessions. Students received printed information regarding the study's goal, data collection procedures and their rights as participants. The writing task

was then explained, giving test takers time to read the instructions and ask questions. Each participant answered a questionnaire after the writing session. Nine out of 145 students agreed to think aloud while completing the tasks, filling out the post-writing questionnaire, and being interviewed. Because they had not yet completed the tasks, these participants were not pre-selected to represent the range of scores among the other writers. After they had finished writing, their essays were graded, giving a variety of scores from moderate to high: four received a score of 3, two received a 4 and three received a 5. The source reading texts were reviewed by five university faculty members who tested them with 46 of their students to see how long it took to complete and how clear the instructions were. It was decided that writers would have one hour to complete the writing task; the task required 300 words because the average pilot response rate was 325 words, and the instructions explicitly mentioned the use of sources and made it clear that the writers were to take a position on the topic. The researchers used a scoring rubric to grade the essays based on the TOEFL iBT integrated writing grading scale adopted from previous research investigations. That rubric was chosen because it was appropriate and clear, and it had been verified by previous research. Some of the validation studies looked into the characteristics which separated writing performance at various proficiency levels whilst others looked into raters' decision-making processes while using the scoring rubric. It should be noted that ETS has tested the TOEFL scoring criteria in a number of field studies. Based on the students' educational experience, language proficiency and culture, the scoring rubric was tested and refined for clarity, usefulness and task relevance for the study.

The integrated reading-to-write TOEFL scoring rubric is somewhat different from a reading–writing persuasive writing task since it is a reading–

listening–writing comparison summary. For example, the researchers emphasised development rather than mentioning a listening text. The essays were rated by two raters, with a third rater employed when there was a disagreement. Those raters had a Master's degree in foreign language/ESL instruction and were experienced ESL teachers. They were chosen because they had previous experience of assessing L2 writing and were familiar with the TOEFL scoring criteria. The raters were given instructions before rating the writing examples. For the think-aloud protocols, the students were provided with a training session. They were told to express any thoughts they had while writing and to utilise the language in which they were thinking, whether it was English or Arabic. They were then given 20–30 minutes to complete the questionnaire and be asked about their method, source text usage, writing task preferences and data gathering. The interviews were held in Arabic. A researcher skilled in both languages recorded and transcribed both the think-aloud protocols and the interviews. The findings of the writing questionnaire, think-aloud protocols and interviews showed that source use served an important function in writing. Through reading, the students could generate ideas about the topic and identify language-specific implications. The researchers reported that both high- and low-scoring Arab L2 learners relied significantly on the source reading texts by borrowing terms and phrases from them. The most occurring reading processes were re-reading and summarising. In addition, writing score levels also affected text comprehension, and when the writing score was low, the student’s lack of comprehension of the text was evident. These findings show that addressing the inherent reading processes and the use of top-down and bottom-up reading processes such as word-level and comprehension reading can be essential in reading-to-write tasks.

Zhao and Hirvela (2015) also investigated students' use of reading source texts in their writing and provided further evidence of the importance of reading in writing. They focused on two ESL mathematics first-year undergraduate students from China at a comprehensive mid-western university in the US. Because Chinese students constitute a fast-rising foreign student population in the US, the study and the wider initiative which it emerged from focused on them. Because of their comparable disciplinary and cultural backgrounds, as well as their distinct experiences with synthesis writing, these two students were chosen. Their reports of learning to write from sources were reflective of the learning experiences of the participants and gave useful accounts of L2 students' comprehension of reading and writing interactions. The researchers used a stimulated-recall protocol and semi-structured interview questions as data collection methods. The information presented in the study was derived mostly from three sources. The first data source was the drafts collected from the students' short and lengthy synthesis papers. The second data source was think-aloud retrospective methods, in which students read a model synthesis paper and articulated their reading techniques. Despite concerns about the use of think-aloud protocols, the researchers chose this method because it is commonly used in reading research to examine the reading process and it enabled them to closely examine the students' thought processes as they read a model synthesis paper. After the researchers had discussed two exemplar papers in class, the think-aloud part was created. They utilised a model article with which both participants were familiar. The participants verbalised their thoughts while they prepared their reading of the think-aloud protocols into a digital recorder in a quiet study room in the presence of the first researcher to ensure that the think-aloud protocols completely and properly portrayed the students' mental processes.

The students' writing processes for their synthesis papers were the subject of stimulated-recall interviews, which provided the third data source. In the middle and at the conclusion of the course, two stimulated-recall interviews were performed just after the participants had finished their papers. The interviews had two parts: the first was each participant's retrospective remarks about his writing methods or movements, and the second was their replies to many cued questions about their source organisation, selection and integration choices and decisions. The participants verbalised their thoughts in their L1, Mandarin, during the think-aloud retrospective protocols and the stimulated-recall interviews. The first researcher captured both data sources on audio and transcribed them into English. The findings showed that the students' understanding of the synthesis and their ability to use rhetorical reading processes (considering the reader's and writer's rhetorical contexts, their stance and their purposes for reading and writing such a text) played a crucial role in their integrated reading-to-write task. It was also found that the low L2 scoring writer missed the aim of the task and did not engage with the source reading text effectively. He was dependent on word-level reading processes such as decoding. In contrast, the L1 high-scoring student engaged effectively with the reading texts representing rhetorical reading processes. It should be noted that the researchers used a unique literacy task as a synthesis writing which might have influenced the students' reading-to-write performance as they might never have previously been exposed to this type of literary genre in the Chinese rhetorical tradition.

So as these studies in naturalistic contexts show, reading seems to play an important role in writing. However, it should be noted here that although these studies explored specific reading processes such as mining, global and rhetorical

reading processes, none of them focused on the range of different reading processes, such as lower-level and higher-level reading processes. Furthermore, the type of assessment and how the assignments were assessed also varied. Some studies (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015) used a questionnaire or synthesis to assess students' writing skills, whilst others (Shi, 2004) asked students to provide their opinion on the texts and used a summary to assess their writing. In addition, none of the studies was conducted with English major undergraduate students.

In the Saudi context, where the current study was conducted, Al-Omrani (2014) discussed theoretically the importance of the reading and writing link in L2 education from a reading-to-write viewpoint and addressed the topic of the EFL reading-writing connection at the college level in Saudi Arabia. It was suggested that reading and writing should be taught together, and the researcher recommended incorporating reading into writing instruction as a response to the Saudi context's lack of attention to the reading-writing relationship. The findings also implied that extensive reading and the use of L2 models improve L2 writing. Connecting reading and writing in L2 instruction, according to the findings, not only improves L2 writing but also increases L2 reading abilities, particularly in academic contexts. The researcher went on to say that when L2 students paraphrase an article, for example, to support their opinions in writing tasks, they can enhance their reading abilities. When L2 students are obliged to write about what they read, they might be able to improve their reading skills. As a result, EFL reading and writing instruction should simultaneously emphasise improving reading abilities. EFL Reading and Writing Classes at Saudi universities were also discussed by the researcher. He argued that the reading-writing link is missing in Saudi universities,

which might explain why Saudi EFL college students struggle to write in English. He added that it can also be deduced that reading is currently not well-integrated into writing instruction in Saudi universities' EFL programmes. Most Saudi English-major students may be unaware of the importance of reading for improving writing abilities due to the lack of reading and writing relationships in Saudi colleges. In Saudi colleges, English majors spend the first two years of their English BA degree learning language skills. The four language skills, on the other hand, are taught independently in Saudi universities' English departments' study programmes. There is no course called 'Reading/Writing' in the English department's programmes of study at King Saud University, King Khalid University or Imam University. Surprisingly, there is little emphasis on researching reading and writing connections, despite the fact that students for the BA English degree are required to produce academic papers in the last two years of the programme. This lack of emphasis on research on the reading/writing connection in EFL teaching classes might imply that the reading-writing relationship, or the integration of reading into writing instruction, is not addressed or understood. As a result, the researcher expressed the belief that integrating reading and writing in EFL programmes in Saudi universities is a critical issue which must be addressed as it can help students to improve their writing skills. According to the researcher, additional empirical studies on the reading/writing connection in the Saudi EFL context are also needed. Because there have been few studies undertaken in the EFL environment, the researcher suggested that further studies are needed on the impact of integrating reading into EFL college writing instruction for Saudi EFL university undergraduate students.

In a similar but more recent empirical study, Alhujaylan (2020) explored how EFL female graduate students' writing performance and total writing scores changed when the writing process had a thematic relationship with a reading passage, as opposed to a paper on a given topic with no or little reading practice. In other words, it sought to shed light on the inadequacy of current reading and writing skills teaching pedagogy and approaches, to reveal the challenges which students in a language classroom learning segregated skills face, and to assess the efficacy of integrating the reading and writing skills approach in higher levels of Saudi EFL undergraduate students enrolled in a university programme. The researcher contended that the existing separation of reading and writing skills courses in EFL classrooms is a significant impediment to the development of reading ability and writing skills competency in Saudi graduate students. The study involved 64 female students in the English Graduate Programme's level II reading class. These students had already finished level I of their graduate degree in a Saudi university's English department. It should be pointed out that in graduate reading classes, students rarely or never have any writing exercises. The reading class was chosen by the researcher to test the efficacy of applying the integrated reading and writing teaching approach. The current mandated courses, on the other hand, are completely separate and compartmentalised, with no interaction between the students and professors of these two courses. A pre-test was completed by both groups before the start of the study to guarantee the internal validity of the results and to rule out any chance of pre-existing disparities between the two groups. Quantitative data were collected using a pre-test and post-test. In the social sciences, a pre-test and post-test research design is ideal for determining the success of any novel teaching approach. The researcher therefore employed this

strategy to investigate the impact of integrated-skills instruction. Students in the experimental group underwent a full semester of integrated-skills instruction to assess the effectiveness of the integrated teaching technique. A brief thematic curriculum was created for this intervention. They practised two 500–600-word passages for reading comprehension in each class session for the whole semester in thirteen courses. After reading the texts and completing the reading comprehension tasks, the students prepared essays on thematically related themes. The researcher offered supplemental information on the chosen thematically linked reading passages from actual newspapers, periodicals and books for literacy exercises. The main goal was to enhance vocabulary volume and develop subject awareness. The students in the experimental group were divided into pairs for the expansion activities, which were tied to several class activities. For further writing practice, the experimental group was urged to identify the text's grammatical and lexical qualities. They were able to react in writing since the vocabulary and content forms of the text had been acquired. This section of the curriculum provides students with a more natural and informative basis for composing their opinions by synthesising information from the reading passages. Following their reading and researching of the pre-selected topics, the students were given online homework to practise their writing. Compared with students in the control group who were not exposed to any sort of integrated reading-writing tasks, the post-test findings showed that students in the experimental group did well in the areas of content and language style and had improved their reading-writing skills over the semester as a consequence of the integrated reading-writing skills strategy. The control group students, on the other hand, did not show any substantial increase in their reading and writing skills since those skills were taught independently. Their skill

improvement was therefore limited by the separated reading-writing skills training style. The experimental group's reading and writing skills improved significantly in terms of grammar and vocabulary as a result of the integrated reading-writing teaching method. Teachers' attitudes were identified using a standardised questionnaire. Integrated reading and writing courses, according to most experienced teachers, can improve EFL students' learning performance in both language skills. The results were confirmed using two-tailed t-tests. Comparison of the experimental group's mean post-test scores with the pre-test showed substantial progress in the group's mean post-test scores. The findings therefore showed that the integrated skills teaching style had a considerable influence on the students' reading and writing competency in a relatively short period of time.

In the Saudi context, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, only two studies have focused on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks. Al-Omrani (2014) reviewed the studies on reading-writing connections in both L1 and L2 contexts and concluded that the reading-writing connection is important in academic settings. He noted that although undergraduate EFL Saudi students are required to perform academic reading-to-write tasks, especially in the last two years of their studies, they do not have even one course which focuses on teaching reading and writing in an integrated teaching method, and little is known about the performance in reading-to-write tasks. Alhujaylan (2020), on the other hand, conducted an empirical study to explore how the writing performance and overall writing scores of EFL female graduate students were affected when the writing process had a thematic link to a reading passage rather than a paper on a given topic with no or little reading practice. Although Alhujaylan's (2020) study is important in explaining the performance of reading-to-write tasks in the Saudi context, it only

provided the students' writing scores before and after the teaching intervention without providing information about the reading or writing processes which the students employed in their reading-to-write tasks or even their writing-only tasks. Moreover, although the researcher provided the students' scores in reading-to-write compared with writing-only tasks, the study was entirely quantitative and dealt solely with numbers, so it is difficult to identify what factors affected the students' performance in such tasks. Also, that study was not conducted with English major undergraduate male students.

2.9 Factors affecting the performance of the reading-to-write task

As the literature review has shown, reading-writing relationships are not straightforward. The directional models of literacy development are based on L1 data and presume that the oral and general language systems are fully developed (Carson, 1990; 1993). For foreign-language learners, however, this is not the case, and changes in reading-writing connections in the L2 are to be expected. L1 literacy abilities (the capability to read and write different texts at the university level (Spack, 1997)), L2 language proficiency and prior experience are the primary factors driving the formation of literacy skills in a foreign language. Therefore, in the next sections, the roles of literacy, language proficiency and educational level on reading and writing will be explained and discussed.

2.9.1 The role of literacy expertise, language proficiency and educational levels on reading and writing performance

As previously stated, the link between L2 reading and writing is complicated. When comparing ESL learners with native speakers of English who, according to

Berghoff (1997), are “awash in a cosmic soup of language, numbers, images, music, and drama”, shows that there is a similar degree of complexity (cited in Jalongo, Fennimore & Stamp, 2004, p. 65). Even before beginning school, this experience clearly demonstrates a significant disparity in literacy development between L1 and L2 learners (Heller, 1991). Because of the variety of experiences which native speakers encounter in their language, the majority of studies on the L1 reading-writing link, whether correlative or experimental, have produced good findings.

Eisterhold (1990) said that native speakers develop a relatively complete oral language system, which is a vital factor in literacy development; non-native English speakers do not possess this capability, and in their early L2 learning phases they do not develop a complete set of literacy practices. Literacy, according to Eisterhold (1990), arises from a system of spoken language which children build through their L1 practice. These opportunities, which are made up of countless real conversations and materials, far outnumber those available to non-native English speakers.

This lack of exposure to and experience in English as L2 literacy leads to a lack of prior knowledge, resulting in yet another significant distinction between native speakers and ESL/EFL students (Carson, 1993; Casanave, 2003; Cumming, 1990; Spack, 1997; Victori & Lockhart, 1995). As a result, having access to previous knowledge about the issue at hand is required in order to comprehend reading texts and write confidently. This background knowledge is derived in part, but not entirely, through literacy. Because literacy is “bound together with culture and the hierarchical power of structures of society”, Jalongo, Fennimore and Stamp

(2004, p. 66) felt that the concept of literacy is complicated and always contested. Readers and writers sometimes struggle to understand or construct meaning from a text when they lack that complex underlying background knowledge.

Literacy levels in schools vary greatly between L1 and L2 English speakers. Native speakers have a stronger literary foundation than non-natives. Native speakers, for example, read more literature and are required to write about it. Alghonaim (2005) reported that native speakers had a regular writing session at a high school in which the students were expected to read a play and then answer a series of questions related to it.

This sort of relationship between reading and writing and literacy practices exposure, even as early as kindergarten and preschool or "during the long summers between school years" (Micek, 1994, p. 31), is more likely to foster literacy in the native language. The distinct position of non-native English speakers can be explained by this early broad exposure to literacy. Furthermore, the presence of widespread literacy in the L1 facilitates the establishment of a link between reading and writing. According to Eisterhold (1990), ESL students do not have adequate linguistic competence in the L2 to conduct a broad range of literacy practices. As a result, many academics advise that the reading-writing connection be emphasised explicitly.

Previous studies into some of the distinct factors which affect reading-to-write performance, such as literacy expertise, language proficiency and educational level, have suggested that reading or writing capability has an influence on how readers and writers arrange and connect various pieces of information from the source reading texts with their own writing products. For example, literacy

experience and language competence have been shown to have an important influence on reading and writing performance in previous L1 research.

On the role of language proficiency, literacy and educational levels in the L1, one of the earliest longitudinal studies (Loban, 1963) tracked pupils from third to sixth grade and found a positive link between reading-writing performance and language proficiency. The findings also showed that as the students' reading and writing proficiency improved in the higher grades, this association grew stronger. Similar studies of the reading-writing relationship for L1 readers/writers in lower grades (Abbott *et al*., 2010) and upper grades (Grobe & Grobe, 1977) have also found correlations and validated their linkage to reading and writing competency levels. Abbott *et al*. (2010), for example, monitored two cohorts of learners from first to fifth grade and third to seventh grade for four years and found a strong association between their reading and writing performance and their language proficiency level.

Kennedy (1985) analysed readers' deliberate behaviours while writing from sources to see if those behaviours clustered at recognisable phases in the reading-writing process and if the processes were the same for able and less able readers. From a group of volunteers, six pupils were chosen and took the reading comprehension test of the descriptive test of language skills as an independent assessment of reading ability. Three of the six scored above the ninetieth percentile and three scored below the thirtieth percentile. The high scorers were labelled 'really fluent' readers and the low scorers were labelled 'not-so-fluent' readers. Three articles on the theme of communication were given to the subjects, who then had to write an objective essay based on the reading materials.

The findings showed that in the integrated writing activity, high-scoring students outscored low-scoring students. High-scoring readers used a wider range of study-type processes than low-scoring readers, with the exception of some high-level reading processes such as planning, which was missing from the low-scoring readers' repertoire. However, chi-square analyses of these data showed that although high-scoring readers employed more processes than low-scoring readers, the general distribution of these processes was not significantly different. To put it another way, these data show that both excellent and poor readers employed the same reading processes but that better readers employed them more frequently. The data also showed that reading proficiency had an impact on the number of notes taken and the depth of the notes' content.

Cumming, Rebuffot and Ledwell (1989) conducted a study in the first and second languages to compare the thought processes of fourteen adult Anglophone students of French completing reading and summarising tasks. Reading and writing performance in L1 and L2 were compared using a within-subjects methodology. Two parameters were set for choosing participants: (1) degrees of writing competence in their L1 and (2) levels of proficiency in their L2. Characteristics such as age, previous education and cultural background were also taken into account when choosing the participants.

When writing and reading in both languages, the students used the same proportion of higher-order problem-solving skills. These varied according to the students' literary proficiency level in their L1 and were related to the quality of the written summaries which they generated in both languages. The use of these problem-solving methods appeared to be unrelated to the participants' L2

competence levels (beginning and intermediate). Analysis of the verbal reports showed thought processes which were similar to reading and summary writing in L1 and L2, but which appeared to differ depending on the students' literacy proficiency and relevant information. In other words, the findings suggested that reading and writing abilities and literacy experience affected reading and writing performance.

Risemberg (1996) examined the role of reading and writing proficiency levels on students' organizing and transforming processes throughout a reading-to-writing task. During a reading-to-writing exercise, students used two self-regulated learning techniques. Seventy-one college students examined two source materials before writing a compare-and-contrast essay on them. The use of one self-regulated learning approach, organizing/transforming, was evaluated by grading the amount of organisation in the students' pre-writing notes.

The second technique, task information seeking, was assessed by timed access to directions for producing compare-and-contrast essays and two example compare-and-contrast essays which were available to the participants but not compulsory reading. Reading ability and self-efficacy for writing were also tested as relevant factors. The findings showed that the quality of essay writing, as judged by primary trait score, was strongly connected with each of the four factors. A multivariate regression analysis showed that just two factors, reading proficiency and task information seeking, had a significant impact on writing performance. It was also found that reading and writing proficiency level had an impact on the use of problem-solving behaviours and the integration of information at many levels (such as verbatim and propositional).

Cumming *et al*. (2005) found differences in scores and source utilisation due to language proficiency level. Mid-level proficiency writers tended to paraphrase and plagiarise more than high- and low-proficiency writers, whereas the least proficient writers summarised, paraphrased and copied less than all other proficiency levels of writers. The researchers expected that low-skilled writers would not be able to comprehend the original material well enough to duplicate it directly. It is worth noting that in the majority of this research, 'proficiency' was determined by the writers' test scores, but in other cases, an independent measure of proficiency was used. This discrepancy might lead to conflicting explanations for how source usage varies by proficiency level.

These studies concluded that reading and writing abilities are inextricably linked. Also, when it comes to language competence, the two skills appear to go hand-in-hand as a person's language proficiency improves. These findings have significant implications for L2 learners whose L2 competency does not necessarily correspond to their grade levels, or for those whose L2 reading and writing abilities have been relatively undeveloped in comparison with other language skills owing to learning circumstances.

Studies performed in L2 contexts have consistently demonstrated that reading and writing abilities are inextricably linked for L2 learners, and that language proficiency level, literacy and educational levels affect students' reading and writing performance. For example, in terms of grade and competency levels, Shanahan (1984) found a substantial link between reading and writing performance and language proficiency among second- and fifth-grade ESL students. The findings showed that there were disparities in such relationships between low- and

high-level ESL students. Similarly, Carson *et al.* (1990) reported that reading and writing proficiency levels influenced ESL students' performance in reading and writing activities.

Llach (2010) investigated the role of L2 proficiency in the link between reading and writing abilities, as well as the significance of this involvement, by looking at primary school Spanish EFL students who had a low to low-intermediate level of English proficiency. They were given a cloze test to determine their English ability as well as reading and writing abilities. The cloze test used to distinguish different proficiency levels consisted of one reading passage followed by eight multiple-choice questions. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between low-proficiency L2 learners' reading and writing abilities, and a particularly significant relationship for low-intermediate-proficiency learners. As a result, L2 proficiency appeared to distinguish the relationship between reading and writing abilities.

Other studies with high-proficiency L2 undergraduate learners anticipated Llach's (2010) study, which solely focused on low to low-intermediate young L2 learners (Carrell & Connor, 1991; Graber-Wilson, 1991). For example, Graber-Wilson (1991) studied intermediate to advanced ESL university students in the US. Their writing abilities as measured by one narrative and two expository compositions were scored using the TWE (Test of Written English) Scoring Guideline, and regardless of the genre of written discourse which they produced, a strong positive relationship between their reading and writing language proficiency and their reading and writing performance was found. Furthermore, Carrell and Connor (1991) investigated the link between intermediate ESL undergraduate

learners' reading and writing abilities in both persuasive and descriptive genres by rating their work holistically using the Toulmin approach, which focuses on writing content analysis. The findings showed a substantial connection between reading and writing with a significant association between reading ability and the qualitative writing evaluation based on the Toulmin model.

In addition, in L2 reading-to-write tasks, as discussed in the previous section, some studies have found that language proficiency level affects students' reading and writing performance (Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). For example, in the Middle East context, in integrated reading and writing tasks, Gebril and Plakans (2009) reported that adult Arabic learners of English had varied proficiency in their capacity to generate traditional elements of written texts, noticing specifically disparities in their abilities to integrate content from the source reading texts. They concluded that the students' ability level to generate specific English discourse elements in written compositions was systematically related to their abilities to comprehend and write about source reading materials, implying that this capacity was critical to their academic English proficiency. They also found that the students' English language proficiency level differed based on their educational level.

In the Saudi context, as discussed in section 3.7.1.1, many studies have reported that Saudi students' performance in reading and writing is affected significantly by their English language proficiency level (Alghammas, 2020; Al-Khairy, 2013; Alrabai, 2014a; Alrashidi & Phan, 2015; Ansari, 2012).

2.10 Summary

To sum up, this review of the reading and writing literature shows that there have been some previous studies which have focused on the role of reading in writing-only tasks. Most previous studies focused on the effect of integrating extensive reading into writing instruction (Al-Dosari, 2016; Almansour & Alshorman, 2014; Alqadi, 2013; Christiansen, 1965; Flahive & Bailey, 1993; Mekheimer & Al-Dosari, 2013), the impact of reading-aloud teaching on the writing performance of young learners (Michener,1985), the impact of reading in writing-only tasks by correlating reading and writing scores in L1 and L2 (Carson *et al.* 1990), or theoretically reviewed the relationship between reading and writing in L2 instruction (Alghonaim, 2018; Almalki & Soomro, 2017; Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015; Tsai, 2006; Zaiter, 2019).

These studies are useful in elucidating the link between reading and writing in the L2 context, and particularly those conducted in the Saudi EFL environment, which is the context of the current study, are important to the current research in explaining the reading and writing connection in this context, particularly in characterising the reading and writing performance of Saudi EFL undergraduate students. However, the aim of the present study is to investigate the reading and writing connection from the reading-to-write viewpoint. More precisely, it focuses on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks, which involve reading which is thematically related to writing tasks, which was not covered by any of the previous studies.

The extensive review of the relevant literature has shown that there have been several studies which have focused on the role of reading in reading-to-write

tasks (Alhujaylan, 2020; Al-Omrani, 2014; Cumming *et al*., 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; 2013; Shi, 2004; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). These studies have been very valuable and informed the current study, but they nevertheless each had limitations in terms of their contexts, designs and methodologies.

Previous studies conducted in English-language preparation courses (Cumming *et al*., 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013) have shown that the role of reading in writing is inconclusive. Nonetheless, it is worth mentioning here that all these studies, apart from Plakans (2009), linked students' reading scores with their writing without taking into account particular reading processes and their distinctive contributions to writing. Although Plakans (2009) explored some particular reading processes such as word-level, mining and global reading processes, that study did not focus on the range of different reading processes such as higher- and lower-level reading processes. The previous studies also took place in English-language preparation classes utilising ESL placement tests in reading-to-write tasks, which were restricted by time. Delaney (2008) used just one reading text for the tasks.

Reading appears to have an important role in writing, as the previous research in natural contexts demonstrates (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). However, although only Zhao and Hirvela (2015) looked at particular reading processes such as rhetorical reading processes, they did not look into the spectrum of diverse reading processes, such as lower-level and higher-level

reading processes. In addition, the type of evaluation and how the tasks were evaluated differed. Some previous studies (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015) used a questionnaire or synthesis to measure students' writing skills, whilst others (Shi, 2004) asked students for their opinions on the texts and assessed their writing using a summary. Furthermore, none of the previous studies involved undergraduate Arab male students majoring in English or even other majors.

The present study, however, was conducted in a naturalistic context where the participants performed reading-to-write tasks in their undergraduate studies in an English major. It used two technical reading texts which were similar to the texts which the participating students were used to in their classes in order to help them to construct arguments in their writings. It focused on the range of higher- and lower-level reading processes using the think-aloud protocol to uncover the students' thoughts while reading, and used ten EFL male participants, giving a thorough explanation of their demographic profiles, the context and the data collection process in order to enhance the reliability of the study. It also assessed writing using an holistic rubric which examined the consideration of the reading purpose, organisation, development and language use. In all these ways, the current study was designed to address the gaps in the literature and benefit future research on this topic by providing information about the reading processes used in reading-to-write tasks and providing a further explanation for the students' reading process use by examining the factors affecting their reading and writing performance when conducting reading-to-write tasks.

To the best of the researcher's knowledge, in the Saudi context, only two studies have investigated the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks. One of them

was an empirical study on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks (Alhujaylan, 2020). Although that study was significant in exploring the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in the Saudi context and portraying the students' performance in such tasks, it simply reported the students' writing scores before and after the teaching intervention, with no information regarding their reading or writing processes in either reading-to-write or writing-only tasks. Furthermore, although the researcher supplied the students' pre- and post-test scores in the reading-to-write vs writing-only tasks, it is impossible to determine what factors (such as task demands, individual or socio-cultural) had influenced the students' performance in such tasks because the findings were entirely quantitative. Also, that study was carried out with English major undergraduate students.

The significance of the role of reading in writing was also considered by Al-Omrani (2014), who reviewed the literature on the reading-writing connection in both L1 and L2 contexts and came to the conclusion that the reading-writing connection is essential in academic contexts. Although undergraduate EFL Saudi students are required to carry out academic reading-to-write tasks, particularly in their last two years of study, he remarked that little is known about how well they perform these tasks. There is therefore a clear gap in the literature which demands a focus on the hitherto unaddressed role of reading in reading-to-write tasks. Alshamrani (2003), Mekheimer and Aldosari, (2013), Almansour and Alshorman, (2014), Al-Omrani (2014), Al-Dosari, (2016), Alghonaim, (2018) and Alhujaylan, (2020) all stressed that there is a need for empirical studies in Saudi Arabia to address the reading-writing connection and the impact of reading on reading-to-write tasks, particularly on the different types of reading processes used in such tasks, such as high and low reading processes. The present study is designed to

bridge this gap in the literature and investigate the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks in Saudi Arabia by addressing the following research questions:

1. What reading processes do Saudi university EFL undergraduate students employ when performing an integrated reading-to-write task?
2. Are there any differences in the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring writers?
3. What are the factors affecting Saudi university EFL undergraduate students' reading and writing performance in an integrated reading-to-write task?

Chapter 3: Methodology

3. Introduction

This study aimed to investigate the reading processes which Saudi EFL English students used when completing an integrated reading-to-write academic task, and how these processes related to their resulting writing performance. The study also aimed to identify the factors affecting Saudi EFL students' performance when carrying out a reading-to-write task. To obtain an in-depth and holistic understanding of the study's aims, a multiple case study design was employed. That is, a think-aloud was used to investigate students' reading for writing processes, as well as a writing task to determine the role of reading in writing. Additionally, pre-task and post-task interviews were used to explore students' previous reading and writing experiences, and their beliefs about reading and writing. This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section offers a summary of the philosophical and methodological underpinnings of the study. It also provides an explanation and rationale for the use of the mixed methods and case-study approach. The second section describes the research setting and the participants. In the third section, I provide a detailed explanation of the data collection methods, and then report on the pilot study results. In the fourth section, I describe the data analysis procedures and consider the trustworthiness of the study.

3.1 Philosophical underpinnings

3.1.1 Research Paradigm

The importance of describing the researcher's theoretical viewpoints in relation to the research objects arises from the fact that these perspectives serve to explain the researcher's perception of the surrounding reality and social life within it. Crotty (1998) described a theoretical perspective as a way of perceiving and comprehending the world. He went on to say that every research study is informed by a theoretical perspective which describes the philosophical viewpoint which drives the methodology used in the investigation. It is therefore critical for researchers to determine and properly articulate their paradigmatic perspective. They should also be aware of any other theoretical viewpoints which might influence their research directly or indirectly. A paradigm framework was described by Guba and Lincoln (1989) as a collection of fundamental ideas which influence our activities, whereas Grix (2004, p. 78) defined a paradigm as "the understanding of what one can know about something and how one can gather knowledge about it". After briefly explaining how important it is to comprehend the notion of a paradigm framework, it is critical to explain the major characteristics of the specific theoretical framework within which this study is situated.

A research paradigm is composed of the following components: epistemology, ontology, methodology, and methods. Epistemology is defined as "a way of understanding and explaining how we know what we know" (Crotty, 1998, p. 3). It reinforces "the nature of the relationship between the knower and the would-be-known" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 108). Furthermore, according to Grix (2004), epistemology is viewed as a concept (theory) in educational research which

enables the researcher to use multiple logical techniques for the investigation and explanation of diverse aspects of reality. On the other hand, ontology is perceived as “the theory of existence” (Ernest, 1994, p. 20), whereas Crotty (1998, p.10) described it as "the study of being”, underlining that it deals with “the nature of existence, and the nature of reality as such”. Anderson and Buddle (1991) defined ontology as a science which aims to provide a knowledge of reality by addressing the question ‘what is there that can be known?’. Every research paradigm is defined by its epistemological and ontological stance. In other words, each stance represents a different set of assumptions about reality and knowledge, which leads to a distinct research approach.

The research methodology is defined as the philosophy that guides our choice of appropriate approaches and techniques (Ernest, 1994). Crotty (1998) offers a more complete description, defining methodology as the strategy, plan of action, procedure, or design that guides the selection and application of a given method and establishes a connection between it and the desired results. As a result, determining the best technique for a particular research project is critical, as it guides the choice of research tools to be used in the study. The final part of a research paradigm is the methods, which are the procedures and techniques used to gather and analyse the data (Crotty, 1998).

The positivist assumptions hold that “realities exist outside the mind” (Crotty, 2003, p. 10), rejecting the idea that reality is shaped by people’s judgments within a particular culture (Gergen, 2003). In other words, positivism is the belief that reality exists objectively without human consciousness and that this reality can be discovered through observing it (Bryman, 2016). As a result, positivist theorists argue that phenomena exist independently of human interpretations (Scotland,

2012). The knowledge that needs to be discovered is thought of as being absolute, devoid of any values, and not situated in a political or historical context (Scotland, 2012). Because knowledge must be determined objectively, the research, the researcher, and the participants are all distinct entities that must be distinguished in order to develop knowledge (truth) appropriately (Scotland, 2012).

On the other hand, interpretivist assumptions hold that reality is actually based on the common meaning generated by everyone in a community (Crotty, 1998). Pring (2000), a proponent of interpretivism, said that the construction and shaping of the numerous realities that exist in this world are based on the negotiation of meaning. Lodico *et al*. (2006) commented that different individuals may bring different conceptual frameworks to a situation based on their experiences, which would also influence what they perceive in a specific situation. Thus, the social scientist's job is to interpret human actions and the social world from the human perspective (Bryman, 2016).

Pragmatism emerged as a philosophical choice to bridge the gap between positivism and interpretivism. The term "pragmatism" is derived from the Greek word "pragma," which means action and is the central concept of this philosophical stance (Pansiri, 2005). In line with the positivist viewpoint, it argues that reality exists apart from the human mind; nonetheless; they reject the notion that the truth about reality can be determined (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Human behaviour, according to pragmatism, is inextricably linked to one's prior experiences and the ideas that resulted from those experiences, and thus humans have the power to control their own experience through their decisions and actions (Pans, 2005). In this sense, reality is dynamic and constantly changing as a result of actions.

Positivism prefers quantitative methods and a deductive approach, whilst interpretivism prefers qualitative methods and an inductive approach. The third methodological paradigm is mixed method research, which opposes forced choices between positivism and constructivism in terms of methodology, logic, and epistemology (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Thus, pragmatism rejects the dichotomy between subjectivity and objectivity, viewing these two paradigms as residing 'on a continuum, rather than on two opposing poles' (Teddiie & Tashakkori, 2009.p. 87). This approach means that the study design and methodology choices made by the researcher depends on how effectively they answer the research questions.

The current study uses a pragmatism research paradigm as its overall meth odological stance. The philosophical paradigm used for this study is decided based on the goals of the study and the type of data gathered. Since the current study is focused on investigating the reading processes that the students use when conducting the reading-to-write task and the factors affecting their performance in such a task, both quantitative and qualitative methods were needed for the study. The choice of this particular approach for the study is based on the notion that social settings and the learning environment have an impact on learners' development and behaviour and that learning is constructed. The current study supports this stance and employs a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques. It uses data collection methods such as the think-aloud protocol, pre- and post-protocol interviews, and students' essay writings.

The use of a mixed methods approach design enables the researcher to a gain rich and in-depth understanding of the issues under investigation (Cohen et

al., 2011). This is particularly important since exploring reading-to-write tasks and the factors affecting the performance in such tasks requires adopting a combination of different methods (Plakans & Gebril, 2012). Similarly, since some reading processes are internal or mental processes, designing an accurate study to assess these mental processes might be challenging. Therefore, Matsumoto (1993) stated that using multiple methods approach is "strongly encouraged, if we are to obtain more accurate, valid data on learners' cognitive processes as well as compensate for the problems inherent in each method" (p. 46). Besides, because the majority of previous research on reading-to-write tasks (Alhujaylan, 2020; Cumming et al., 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans and Gebril, 2013; Shi, 2004; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013) was quantitative in nature, a mixed method approach is required to fill that gap in the literature. That is, although previous quantitative studies were able to correlate students' reading and writing scores in reading-to-write tasks to assess their performance, the reading processes used by their participants and the factors which might have influenced their performance in reading-to-write tasks were not reported. This is because the studies were entirely quantitative, and it is difficult to understand these factors fully when we are only dealing with numerical data. The qualitative part of this study enabled the researcher to understand the context and the participants to fully analyse and explain tasks of this kind.

Furthermore, triangulating the data (which means that "the findings are credible to the research population and the readers") (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 180) for this study by employing multiple research methods (think-aloud protocol, pre- and post-protocol interviews, students' writing essays) can be methodically justified because each method compensates for the limitations of the others. This

study benefited from the use of these various data collection methods for two reasons. First, this combination demonstrated that the type of reading processes used by the students in the think-aloud protocol were corroborated by the students' perceptions gathered from their interviews. Second, the use of students' essay writings enabled the researcher to determine the students' writing scores and the role of reading on their writing performance. In other words, the writing scores of the students were used to determine and compare the differences in the reading processes employed by high and low-scoring writers.

3.2.2 The multiple case-study approach

A mixed method case study was conducted collecting qualitative data from think-aloud protocols and interviews with students, as well as quantitative data from students' writing scores. By definition, exploratory case studies are frequently used in a research context which is not well defined but still requires data for the formulation of valid hypotheses (Yin, 2003; 2009). Their broad concept gives the researcher a great deal of flexibility and independence in terms of research design and data collection, as long as they meet the required scientific criteria of validity and reliability (Streb *et al.*, 2008), so the qualitative specificity of an exploratory case study is unrestricted. However, critics of such studies question their relevance in terms of research which goes beyond the basic formulation of hypotheses leading to continuous research, rather than considering this a valuable methodological approach in and of itself, due to the ostensible high degree of potential options. The similarities between exploratory case study research and grounded theory become clear here.

Because the principal goal of an exploratory case study is to discover the previously unknown, in terms of the scientific *status quo*, cases which face the typical research field difficulties readily obvious benefit the most. It is usual practice to make an approximate transfer from extreme findings, such as single case studies, to the general. This is especially true when the researcher is constrained by data availability and/or a constrictive research environment in terms of the phenomenon being studied; that is, when preliminary data collection for ultimate generalisation is a requirement for developing subsequent causal studies.h

Exploratory case studies, according to Robert Yin (2003; 2009), the seminal author in the field of case study research in general, are a way to specify the necessary questions and hypotheses for building further studies. He emphasised the contribution which case study research makes to the advancement of continuous social research in general. This covers single and multiple case studies, which can be used to test proposed research methodologies and open the door to a number of different research designs in the future.

In comparison with descriptive or explanatory case studies, Yin (2009) also underlined the disputed status of this sort of case study research among the scientific community. The main source of debate surrounding exploratory case studies is their intuitive approach, which is also their greatest advantage when studying phenomena which have yet to be acknowledged.

Although this definition is consistent with the position set out in the preceding sections, it overlooks the value of exploratory case study research in the study of social phenomena in their original context, particularly when doing so through other methods is difficult or impossible. This may apply to other types of

case study research as well, but it is a distinguishing feature of the intuitive and flexible exploratory case study.

The present study employed an exploratory, multiple and holistic case study since, as previously explained, Saudi EFL undergraduate students' performance in reading-to-write tasks is still in its infancy and little is known about it. The aim of the present research was to collect information about Saudi undergraduate students' reading processes used in reading-to-write tasks and the factors affecting their performance in such tasks.

Yin (2003) suggested that a single holistic case study can be used for exploring a unique and specific case in a specific context. Yin (2009, p. 18) defined a case study as an empirical study intended to examine "a bounded entity in real-life situations" in depth. One important aspect of a case study is that it has to be a bounded entity, which means that there should be a limit, "actually or theoretically, to the number of people who could be interviewed or the number of observations that could be conducted" (Merriam, 1998, p. 28).

A case study "penetrates situations in ways that are not always susceptible to numerical analysis" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p. 253). It offers "an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit ... relying heavily on inductive reasoning in handling multiple data sources" (Merriam, 1998, p. 27). The case-study method fits the goals of the present study since it would help to obtain a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of students' reading processes and reading beliefs and how these processes might relate to their writing performance.

A single case study concentrates on a particular case such as a specific person, association, society, family or school/college/university (Bryman, 2016). The difference between a single case study and a multiple case study is that in the latter, the researcher examines many examples in order to determine the differences and similarities between them (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Stake, 1995). Another distinction is that the researcher has the ability to analyse data both within and across cases (Yin, 2003; 2009). Multiple case studies can be used to predict either opposing or similar findings in the research for a variety of reasons (Yin, 2003; 2009). As a result, the researcher will be able to determine whether or not the findings are valuable (Eisenhardt, 1991). When case studies are compared, the researcher can use the differences and similarities to have a significant impact on the literature (Vannoni, 2015). Other benefits of using several case studies include the creation of a more convincing theory since the proposals are more deeply rooted in a wider variety of factual evidence. As a result, several cases allow for a more in-depth examination of research topics and theoretical development (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007).

The evidence generated by a multiple case study is powerful and credible (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Duff (2008, p. 124) also argued that a larger number of participants might lead to a deeper understanding and the "contextualisation of each case, taking fully into account the complexity of interactions, [and] perspectives of participants". Therefore, the reading processes used by Saudi EFL undergraduate students when carrying out reading-to-write tasks were investigated in the current study using multiple cross-case analyses. The study comprised multiple cases (n=10) to compare within and between cases, with each case serving a specific purpose within the overall scope of inquiry (Yin, 2003). Using multiple

cases would enable the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of the variations within and between the cases (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 548), and present a compelling and vigorous interpretation of the data (Merriam, 1998); that is, provide a detailed picture of the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring student writers and the factors affecting their reading and writing performance.

Case studies have been criticised by nomothetic theorists as lacking generalisability. Critics state that case studies focus on single or multiple cases, which makes them unsuitable for application to a wider population which shares related or diverse circumstances, and they do not accept universal implications and theory production (Yin, 2009; 2012). However, case studies do not use specific cases which represent a particular population (Bryman, 2016) but focus on the paradigm of transferability and not generalisability. Generalisability entails applying findings to new situations, individuals or samples (Creswell, 2009), whereas transferability indicates that the findings of a case study could be applied to similar settings, populations or samples (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Furthermore, analytically, case studies are generalisable to theoretical underpinnings rather than to people, settings or worlds (Duff, 2008).

The present study focused on reinforcing the transferability of the findings and not statistical generalisability. The purpose was to examine intensely and holistically multiple cases in order to corroborate whether the data confirmed the theoretical interpretations made on its basis (Bryman, 2016). That is to say, this case study was designed to explore the use of reading processes among Saudi undergraduate students and how these processes related to their writing. In other words, the aim of this study was to broaden and generalise the cognitive theory of

reading with the help of data, rather than merely counting the number of reading processes used by the students (Yin, 2009; 2012).

3.3 Study Setting

The present study focused on the role of reading in integrated reading-to-write tasks at the University of Bisha (UB) in Saudi Arabia. In the Saudi EFL context, (at UB in particular where this study took place), students carry out reading-to-write tasks mainly in the third and fourth years of their English course due to the development of their language skills. Therefore, reviewing the Saudi context and the context at UB in particular was essential for understanding its education system and surrounding circumstances.

This section is focused on the importance of English at UB, more specifically, in the English Department. Additionally, the curriculum and learning approaches that are promoted by the English Department at UB will be explained in detail.

3.3.1 The aims of the English department in the Bisha context

The English department at UB offers a BA in English, which is the only programme at an undergraduate level. The programme has a vision to be regarded as distinguished both locally and internationally. This vision focuses on providing an excellent English programme to equip students with effective skills and knowledge to succeed in their future jobs (University of Bisha, Department of English, 2022). That is, it endeavours to prepare graduates to meet societal employment standards to become translators, teachers and researchers, and to encourage students to keep up to date with the latest technology by using eLearning (University of Bisha,

Department of English, 2022). It also aims to improve the language proficiency of students in different professional areas such as linguistics and applied linguistics, and in the critical skills of literary writing and translation.

3.3.2 The curriculum of the English-language programme in the UB English department

The undergraduate English programme at UB teaches English from the low-intermediate level up to the advanced level. The programme consists of four years of study, each with two semesters. It offers a wide variety of courses in English language skills in the two years prior to the commencement of the major courses in the third and fourth years. After completing the preparatory courses for two years and training in performing different reading and writing activities in the third and fourth years, students carry out reading-to-write tasks. In these, they are asked to read different materials such as articles and textbooks in order to write different types of essays such as narrative, persuasive, descriptive and compare-and-contrast essays. A more detailed explanation of the English programme's syllabus is provided in the following section.

3.3.3 The importance of English reading and writing in the UB English department

Undergraduate students study nine reading, writing, listening, grammar and speaking courses, comprising four reading comprehension courses, four writing courses and one course of writing for specific purposes. During these courses, students learn reading and writing from the low-intermediate level up to the advanced level and these courses are extended from year 1 up to the end of year 2. In years 3 and 4, students are provided with key courses on applied linguistics,

theoretical linguistics, literary forms, translation and technology, and language learning. All these courses are taught in one programme which means that students have all these courses as core courses and none of them is elective.

In the first, second, third and fourth semesters of the English programme, students study reading comprehension, writing, grammar, listening and speaking, Arabic language, Islamic culture, study skills and vocabulary building. Reading Comprehension *1, 2, 3* and *4* in the first, second, third and fourth semesters are designed to improve students' reading processes to help them in their reading comprehension and build their vocabulary for them to become confident readers. This is accomplished by training them in reading by designing classroom activities to provide them with appropriate study skills, reinforce their vocabulary development and improve their ability to read rapidly. Furthermore, this course provides students with skills in reading techniques such as previewing, scanning and skimming to enable them to practise their reading outside the classroom and, most importantly, to enable them to become capable of performing the reading-to-write tasks which they will encounter in the third and fourth years of their undergraduate studies.

The Writing *1, 2, 3* and *4* courses in the first, second, third and fourth semesters are designed to provide students with the ability to write sentences and paragraphs in English, in addition to using vocabulary and grammar. The students are also trained to write an introduction, body and conclusion in order to be able to write essays. These courses are meant to help students to develop their writing skills so that they can undertake reading-to-write tasks in years 3 and 4.

After the first and second years when students have completed the prerequisite courses such as reading comprehension and writing, they are introduced to the main subjects, language learning, research methods and applied linguistics, in which they are required to carry out reading-to-write tasks. For example, in the sixth semester, the students study a technology and language learning course which gives them a brief introduction to current technology and theories which support language teaching and learning. It also enables them to use technology in language tests and research and teaches the skills necessary for evaluating and using language learning software. In this course, the students are required to read different academic journals about e-learning theories and then discuss, compare and summarise them in their writings.

Similarly, in the seventh semester, the students take a research methods course which teaches them how to comprehend and critique language-learning research, to understand the aims and objectives of different research methods, to acquire the basics of academic writing, research proposals and research projects, the foundations of using appropriate references and bibliography, the proper academic critical writing and critical reading processes, and teamwork skills by getting them to undertake research tasks in groups and pairs, such as reading various academic papers and critiquing them, and to practise data collection, analysis and reporting results. Students learn the importance of defending their research methods and results and avoiding plagiarism. This course is also designed to equip them with skills to choose a topic which stems from gaps in the literature and research problems, to search for academic resources for their research and to use their knowledge to deal properly with the research problems and difficulties (see Appendix B for a description of the research methods course).

In the seventh and eighth semesters, students study Applied Linguistics courses *1* and *2* which introduce them to applied linguistics, improve their understanding of the L1 and L2 acquisition theories, teach them about the non-linguistic aspects which influence teaching and language learning, introduce the language-learning processes, give a brief historical background to the principal aspects of language planning, enable them to evaluate the impacts of the global spread of English, identify research gaps in the field of applied linguistics, compare, evaluate, critique, summarise and present proper arguments about different language learning and teaching theories in both L1 and L2, analyse the performances of learners and demonstrate learning problems and possible solutions, evaluate the importance of non-linguistic features affecting language learning, and the language-learning processes which they use and their effectiveness based on adequate planning and research (see Appendix A for a description of the applied linguistics course). A summary of the curriculum of the English Department at UB is provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Study Plan for the Undergraduate English Programme, Department of English, UB

Year 1	***Year 2***	***Year 3***	***Year 4***
Reading Comprehension 1 & 2	Reading Comprehension 2 & 3	Speech Workshop	Translation 2 & 3
Writing 1 & 2	Writing 2 & 3	Introduction to Linguistics	Research Methods
Listening & Speaking 1 & 2	Listening & Speaking 2 & 3	Phonetics	Applied Linguistics 1 & 2
Grammar 1 & 2	Grammar 2 & 3	Introduction to Literary Forms	Morphology
Arabic Composition 1	Islamic Culture 2 & 3	Writing for Specific Purposes	Poetry
Islamic Culture 1 & 2	Vocabulary Building 1 & 2	Technology and Language Learning	Novel
Study Skills	Computer	English Phonology	International Test Preparation
		Short Story	Syntax
		Drama	Modern Literary Movements
		Translation 1	
		Arabic Composition 2	
		Islamic Culture 3 & 4	

The study plan described in detail above shows that undergraduate students in the English Department of UB are provided with a wide range of preparatory courses

to improve their English skills (see Appendix C for the detailed study plan). Preparatory courses in years 1 and 2 include reading, writing, listening, speaking and vocabulary. In years 1 and 2, there are four reading comprehension courses in which students read for comprehension by using information processing skills such as previewing, scanning, skimming and decoding. They also learn how to speed-read and how to read tables and graphs. They are also provided with four writing courses in which they learn how to write sentences and paragraphs. They learn how to write with correct grammar and spelling.

The curriculum also contains major courses in years 3 and 4 in which students learn about theoretical linguistics, applied linguistics, literature and translation. During these courses, they write different essays and research papers. For instance, applied linguistics students are required to understand areas and definitions of applied linguistics theories and must compare different theories of L1 and L2 acquisition, analyse learners' performance and evaluate the effectiveness of language-learning processes by reading different books and articles and incorporate these reading materials into their research papers.

In year 4, students carry out a research study in which they demonstrate their academic and critical writing skills and their teamwork skills as they work together in groups and pairs, and their ability to justify a research methodology and defend their results. They must avoid plagiarism and produce an original piece of research by using their research skills to find relevant sources, evaluate them and then incorporate them into their writing. Additionally, as the undergraduate students studying English at UB do undertake reading-to-write tasks, the context was entirely suitable for the present study to be undertaken there.

To sum up, this overview of the curriculum of the Department of English at UB shows that undergraduate students study reading and writing preparatory courses which are designed to prepare them to carry out reading-to-write tasks at later stages in years 3 and 4. In the third and fourth years of their study, the students perform reading-to-write tasks in subjects such as technology and language learning, applied linguistics and research methods. Overall, therefore, because these students carry out reading-to-write tasks, this department was a suitable setting for the current study to be conducted.

3.4 The participants and the sampling techniques of the study

Ten third-year undergraduate students from the Department of English participated in the study. Convenience and purposive sampling techniques were used to recruit them. Convenience sampling is defined as a type of non-probability sampling in which members of the target population who meet specific practical criteria such as easy accessibility, geographic proximity, availability at a specific time and willingness to participate are included in the study (Dornyei, 2007). Purposive sampling, on the other hand, also known as judgement sampling, is defined as the purposeful selection of a participant based on the participant's characteristics. It is a non-random strategy which does not require any underlying ideas or a predetermined quantity of participants (Etikan *et al*., 2016). Patton (1990, p. 169) said that purposive sampling is the most powerful strategy for "selecting information-rich cases for the study in-depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about the issues of central importance to the purpose of research". Other researchers have argued that in selecting a sample, the most important factor to evaluate is whether the sample is likely to yield the

information needed to answer the research questions (Bryman, 2016; Cohen *et al.*, 2007; Mackey & Gass, 2005).

Convenience sampling was used because the population was relatively small (Newby, 2010), and all participants who volunteered for the study were recruited. In purposive sampling, the main sampling criteria were third-year students studying for the English language degree who would have higher English language proficiency than first- or second-year students in order to complete the reading-to-write tasks. In other words, the third-year students were assumed to have higher English language proficiency because they had all studied English language courses in reading, writing, listening and grammar for two years. Fourth-year students were excluded from the study to avoid any disruption to the final year of their study.

Initially, 28 third-year students who were studying for their English degree were invited to participate in the study; however, 12 participants returned their consent forms. Two subsequently withdrew from the study due to their inability to verbalise their thoughts out loud in the think-aloud, with ten students therefore completing all the tasks.

3.4.1 Demographic information of the participants

The participants were Sami, Salman, Hatim, Bader, Rami, Khalid, Muneer, Jawad, Kamal and Ziad (all of their names were altered using pseudonyms). Respect and protection for research participants were provided by ensuring the confidentiality of information shared and anonymity by not revealing their identities. Anonymity was provided through the use of pseudonyms (Surmiak, 2018). The students' age ranged from 21 to 23 years old. They were divided into high- and low-scoring

students based on their essay writing scores. The participants' profiles are presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2
The Profiles of the Participants

Pseudonym	***Age***	***L1***	***Average essay scores (out of 5)***	***High (H) or Low (L) Scoring Writers***
Sami	22	Arabic	4.33	H
Salman	22	Arabic	3.66	H
Hatim	21	Arabic	3.33	H
Bader	23	Arabic	3.66	H
Rami	22	Arabic	3	H
Khalid	22	Arabic	1.66	L
Jawad	21	Arabic	1.66	L
Kamal	21	Arabic	2.33	L
Ziad	21	Arabic	2	L
Muneer	22	Arabic	1.66	L

The biographic data from the interviews showed that the students all came from villages close to the University of Bisha and had completed their previous studies in primary, middle and high school in their villages. None of the participants had studied any additional English courses other than those provided in the school.

Because of the country's cultural norms and the fact that the researcher was a male, all the participants were male and homogenous. Their native language was Arabic, and English was their foreign language which they had studied from the ages of 13 to 15.

3.5 Data collection methods

The current study employed methodological triangulation, using multiple methods such as the think-aloud protocol, pre-protocol and post-protocol interviews, and the students' written work (see section 3.15 for a detailed explanation of the triangulation method). The data collection methods were based on two principles. First, that there should be a match between the research methods and the research questions, and they should be connected with and complement each other; and second, that the selection of the methods should enhance the trustworthiness of the study (Dornyei, 2007; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015).

Every data collection method was connected to and complemented the other methods. More specifically, pre-protocol interviews were used to complement the think-aloud protocol reports by understanding the participants' backgrounds and their perceptions about reading, and post-protocol interviews complemented the think-aloud protocol reports by providing information about the students' experience of the reading-to-write task. In addition, their written work complemented the interviews and the think-aloud protocols by providing information on the students' writing proficiency levels and shedding light on the relationship between their reading processes and their writing performance. Patton (1990) stated that triangulation or using multiple data collection methods helps to understand phenomena in detail and also enriches the validity of the findings by obtaining information from different data sources. An explanation of the design of each instrument is presented in the following sections.

3.5.1 The think-aloud protocol

A think-aloud protocol was used in the study to collect the data on students' reading processes. The think-aloud protocol is a description of verbal reports which represents a person's thought processes, and it is used to explore the cognitive incidents and processes which take place while doing a task or solving a problem (Bowles, 2010; Ericsson & Simon, 1993). In other words, in the field of cognitive psychology, the think-aloud protocol is regarded as an important research instrument which enables researchers to observe the techniques used by participants when working on a task. It allows the verbalisation of participants' thoughts without altering their thought processes (Bowles, 2010; Ericsson & Simon, 1993) and can provide an enormous amount of valuable qualitative data for researchers which illustrate the ways, explanations and justifications for why people act in a particular way (Hannu & Pallab, 2002). To gain insights into how the participants thought as they approached and carried out the reading-to-write task, the think-aloud method was therefore deemed appropriate for the current study.

In reading research, the think-aloud protocol is defined as "a measurement instrument to assess the students' text comprehension while they read" (Bowles, 2010, p.6). This method is centred on encouraging students to express their thoughts while reading, allowing the researcher to determine their reading strategies. The think-aloud protocol was used in this study to explore the students' reading processes in reading-to-write tasks. The reading process is not something tangible or easily accessible, so the think-aloud method was used to access the participants' mental processes. In other words, the think-aloud protocol was

intended to answer the first and second research questions which were about the types of reading process which the students used when reading for integrated writing, and to identify any differences between the participants in their usage of reading processes.

A think-aloud protocol, according to Ward and Traweek (1993) and Greene (1998), comprises a concurrent think-aloud protocol and a reconstruction procedure. The concurrent approach obtains verbalisation as soon as the participant interacts with the text and the researcher. The task is videotaped during reconstruction, and the subject is asked to evaluate it and remark on his/her reading. Concurrent think-aloud protocols were employed in this study because they enabled the researcher to communicate directly with each participant and acquire precise information during the task. This was in line with previous studies on the role of reading-to-write tasks (Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2012).

There are many advantages to the think-aloud protocol, which makes it a valuable instrument for data collection. First, it can help to reveal how people work on a task and what choices or decisions they make in completing it (Cowan, 2019; Ericsson & Simon, 1993). Second, it can also help participants and researchers to determine the best techniques and processes for planning and performing a task successfully. Third, it makes it possible to examine the feelings, practices and beliefs which the participants experience while performing a task. Fourth, it enables researchers to examine the sequential phases of the participants' cognitive processes over a specific duration, rather than receiving a broad summary at the end of a task (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). As a consequence, this approach

significantly improves the detail of the data obtained (Bowles, 2010). For example, in the current study, the think-aloud protocol enabled me to collect the reading processes as they occurred when the participants performed the reading-to-write task.

Despite its numerous advantages, however, it also has some limitations. First, there are possible effects which researchers could have on participants while they are completing the tasks. Second, there could be also the difficulty of verbalising in a second or foreign language. Third, verbalising the task could be also challenging due to time-limits on a task. Any or all of these limitations might hinder the verbalisation process and they will be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

The first limitation of the think-aloud protocol is the possible impact that a researcher could have on participants while they are carrying out a think-aloud task which might change the techniques and processes which they employ, and this is known as a 'reactivity problem' (Hannu & Pallab, 2002; Smagorinsky, 1989; 2001). For instance, when the researcher distracts the participants or provides them with specific instructions on how to perform a task, which might change the structure of their thought process. Therefore, in this study, I made my presence less visible to the participants to avoid distracting them, and I did not interact with them or ask them any questions while verbalising their thoughts other than reminding them to verbalise their thoughts when they fell silent using the verbalisation technique which will be explained next.

There is also the possibility that the participants might not verbalise all of their thoughts. To overcome this issue, Chi *et al.* (1989), Ericsson and Simon

(1993), Charters (2003), Cowan (2019), Ferguson-Hessler and de Jong (1990), Gibson (1997), Green (1998), Guvendir (2014) and Van Someren *et al*. (1994) all suggested that it is important for a researcher or research assistant to constantly remind participants to continue verbalising their thoughts when they fall silent. The current study, therefore, used the question and prompting technique to stimulate the students' verbalisation. During a think-aloud process, the researcher can ask questions, or the participant can be prompted at predetermined intervals to say what s/he is thinking or doing. For example, the researcher could ask questions such as 'Did you double-check this idea?', 'Why are you using this idea?', 'Does this idea remind you of another idea?' or simply 'What are you thinking of?', which is the most unbiased form of prompt (Cowan, 2019; Charters, 2003). Thus, in this study, the researcher only used the unbiased prompting technique, asking 'What are you thinking of?' whenever a participant stopped verbalising his thoughts; this was the only interruption made by me during the whole process of verbalisation.

Another limitation of the think-aloud protocol is the difficulty of verbalising in L2, as this can lead to inhibition in which participants might find difficulties in expressing some thoughts which they would not encounter in their native language (Rubin, 1994). To address this issue, the students in the current study had the choice of using their L1 in the verbalisation process.

There could also be a difficulty of verbalising when a task is restricted by time. When participants verbalise their thoughts under time pressure, their performance in the think-aloud task might degrade (Hertzum & Holmegaard, 2013). Therefore, as suggested by Ericsson and Simon (1993), Green (1998) and Russo, Johnson and Stephens (1989), I took precautions when conducting the

think-aloud protocol such as not imposing any time constraints on the task. In addition, the students were asked not to interpret their thoughts while thinking (Charters, 2003; Cowan, 2019; Ericsson & Simon, 1993; Green, 1998; Plakans, 2009; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Zhao & Hirvela (2015), but just to verbalise them as they occurred to them. These instructions were also provided in the instructions on the first page of the task, and they were emphasised by the researcher during the training session to ensure that the participants were not distracted when verbalising their thoughts.

The difficulty of the task could be also an issue. The think-aloud protocol involves various tasks and some are more difficult than others (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977; Penney, 1975). When the task is too difficult for the participants to comprehend, it hinders their verbalisation process. Difficulties which arise in this circumstance are related to short- and long-term memory. Information retrieved from the short-term memory is preferable to that from the long-term memory since information from the long-term memory is sometimes affected by the perception processes. The problem is that when data are stored in the long-term memory, participants start to inaccurately describe the process which they are using (Ericsson & Simon, 1993).

To overcome these issues in the current study, I therefore asked the participants to verbalise their thoughts out loud to the tape-recorder while undertaking the task. Also, as suggested by Gebril and Plakans (2009) and Zhao and Hirvela (2015), the reading texts used in the think-aloud reading-to-write task were checked by two experienced teachers from the English Department where the current study was conducted in terms of the language difficulty and suitability for

the students. The language complexity of the reading texts was also evaluated by piloting the reading materials with four English undergraduate students similar to the students who participated in the main study (see the 'Pilot study' section).

Furthermore, according to Hosenfeld (1977) and Hertzum and Holmegaard, (2013), the researcher should use a follow-up approach to corroborate the findings from think-aloud protocols and to assess their impact on the task. Thus, the follow-up approach employed in this study was post-protocol interviews to assess the effect of the think-aloud protocol on the participants' performance in the reading-to-write task.

3.5.2 Pre- and post-protocol interviews

In line with Plakans (2008), two types of interviews were used in this current study, before and after the think-aloud task. According to Plakans (2008), it is crucial to interview students both before and after a think-aloud task in order to gather general information about the participants prior to the task and assess the impact of the think-aloud protocol on the students' performance afterwards. Interviews are not just a simple conversation between a researcher and a participant but a conversation with a purpose (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). So the interview which preceded the think-aloud protocol was designed to collect information about the participants' previous reading and writing experiences in English, their perceptions about reading and writing and their understanding of what a good reader or writer is. The pre-interview question guide was based on that proposed by Plakans (2008). It is important to note that as the present study focused on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks, I added questions related to reading, which were not

included in Plakans's (2008) pre-protocol questions (see Appendix D for the pre-protocol interview questions). For example, the students were asked:

- 'What is reading?'
- 'What are the features of a good reader in your studies?'
- 'What is writing?'
- 'What are the features of a good writer in your studies?'

The post-task interviews, on the other hand, focused on the participants' thoughts about the reading-to-write task, how they had started and how they had finished it, their understanding of the task expectations, what problems and difficulties they faced while performing the task, how they dealt with those difficulties, and whether the think-aloud protocol had affected their reading or writing performance. The post-protocol interview questions were designed based on the questions suggested by Plakans (2008) (see Appendix E for the post-protocol interview questions). For example, the participants were asked:

- 'How did you start your task?'
- 'Did you experience any problems/difficulties before doing the task? if yes, what were they?
- What did you do to solve the problems?'
- How did you know you were done with the task?

The pre-protocol interviews took place a week before the data collection for the think-aloud protocol. They were conducted independently from the reading-

to-write tasks and the post-protocol interviews since they focused on general information about the participants and their perceptions of reading and writing and were thematically unrelated to the reading-to-write tasks. The post-protocol interviews, on the other hand, were conducted soon after the reading-to-write task because they were designed to assess the think-aloud impact on the students' performance in the task. The post-protocol interviews, in other words, were based on the students' short-term recollections of the reading-to-write task.

It should be noted here that although I used a question list prepared for the interviews in the current study, I also tried to be open to any other unanticipated information which might emerge during the interviews. I also ended every interview session with an invitation for the interviewee to add any comments or ask any questions about the study.

3.5.3 The reading-to-write tasks

The first stage in using the think-aloud protocol as a data collection instrument, according to Rankin (1988), is to choose suitable texts for the reading-to-write task. In this regard, Rankin (1988) advised that the length, organisation and complexity of the texts should all be considered when choosing a text. The level of difficulty should be appropriate for the cognitive load of the subjects: not too challenging, as this would prevent them from thinking aloud, and not too easy, as this would cause them to read automatically.

Two reading-to-write tasks on the topic of education were developed for the purpose of this study. The reading part consisted of two excerpts from journal articles, one entitled 'Foreign students and foreign methodologies' by Holliday (1994) and the other 'A pedagogy of particularity' by Kumaravadivelu (2001).

These topics were chosen because they were similar to the students' English language discipline which they studied at the university, applied linguistics in particular (see Appendix F for the original reading-to-write tasks used in the English Department). The teachers in the English Department where the current study was conducted used different pedagogical authentic articles about teaching and learning theories (see the 'Study Setting' section) more specifically (see Appendix A for Applied linguistics course description), and after the researcher consulted two experienced teachers, they suggested these topics and checked them for language difficulty and appropriateness for the participating students. The reason for reviewing the reading texts with teachers from the same English Department as the students who were recruited for the current study was to take into account the students' nature, background knowledge and cultural issues, as recommended by Carrell (1987). In addition, the language difficulty and suitability of the reading texts were evaluated by piloting the texts with four English undergraduate students who were similar to those who participated in the main study (see the 'Pilot Study' section). Using similar source reading texts would help to stimulate the students' thoughts and help them to perform better in the reading-to-write tasks. That is, this kind of text would help the students to use different reading processes to overcome comprehension difficulties and construct arguments in their writings (Delaney, 2008; Hirvela, 2004; Watanabe, 2001).

In addition, the text length should be sufficient to engage the participants in reading but not so long that they feel overwhelmed by the demands of having to think aloud. Rankin (1988) recommended that texts should be between 300 and 1000 words long. Thus, both of the source reading texts were one page long, with

no more than 500 words in each, the first having 357 words and the second 388 words.

The genre chosen for the reading-to-write task was an argumentative essay prompt using two reading excerpts which presented contrasting viewpoints. The argumentative genre was chosen based on the advice of a number of previous researchers (Cumming *et al.*, 2005; Plakans, 2008; Gebril, 2006) who, for example, argued that students approach argumentative writing tasks well since this type of genre requires them to evaluate the reading texts, construct, and concisely present their arguments. The tasks required students to read the two reading texts and then write an argumentative essay according to the writing prompts. The writing prompts required the students to write an essay in which they defend their argument by using examples and evidence from the reading texts, incorporating related information from the texts, citing the authors rather than copying exact sentences and providing a conclusion (see Appendix G for the reading-to-write tasks used in this study).

In addition, the students' written products were used as a source of data to establish their writing levels and to investigate the role of reading in their writing in the reading-to-write task.

3.6 The pilot study

Pilot studies are described as "small-scale versions of the planned study, trial runs of planned methods or miniature versions of the anticipated research" (Kim, 2010, p. 2). Prior to carrying out any research, piloting the research instruments is required as part of the research design cycle to ensure their usability, feasibility and

clarity (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2001). De Vaus (1993, p. 54) emphasised the need to carry out a pilot with a simple recommendation: "Do not take the risk … Pilot test first".

The aim of the pilot study was to examine all the planned procedures of data collection including testing the validity, reliability and suitability of the instruments, the think-aloud protocol, the pre- and post-protocol interviews and the reading-to-write tasks, and to refine them if needed. The study was piloted in the same English Department where the main study was conducted. It took place in the first semester of 2018, and it lasted for two weeks.

Students for the pilot study were selected purposely to ensure that as far as possible they were similar to the sample intended to be recruited for the main study, that is, third-year undergraduate English students. Nineteen students expressed an interest in participating in the pilot study but eventually only four students completed all the pilot tasks.

3.6.1 Pilot study data collection procedure

The pilot students were invited to a training session at which they signed informed consent forms and attended a presentation about the think-aloud protocol. In the presentation, the aims and objectives of the study and the participants' rights in the study were explained in detail. After the presentation, the students received instructions about carrying out the think-aloud protocol and listened to a recording of a sample of thinking aloud. After that, as recommended by Ericsson and Simon (1993), Gebril and Plakans (2009), Plakans (2008; 2009); Plakans and Gebril, (2012), Shi (2004) and Zhao and Hirvela (2015), they were given a practice session.

In the practice session, I showed them the think-aloud process by playing a video which explained the verbalisation process of the think-aloud protocol (see Appendix I for the video link to the think-aloud protocol demonstration). I also trained them to think while reading using the reading-to-write task which I intended to use in the main study in order to test issues such as familiarity and difficulty. Before the data collection, oral feedback on the training session was provided to the participants to reduce any concerns they might have about the think-aloud protocol tasks and process. The feedback emphasised the need to verbalise their thoughts rather than reading the texts out loud, as well as the importance of continuing to verbalise their thoughts rather than falling silent. They also had an opportunity to ask any questions related to the study.

I started the pilot with a pre-task interview, which lasted for around 20 to 28 minutes, and then asked the students to do the reading-to-write task. After the task, they were invited to comment on it.

The tasks were arranged in the following order. Students were first presented with the think-aloud protocol instructions on the first page, then the first reading task on the second page, the second reading task on the third page, and the task instructions on the fourth page. Each task was presented in this order on a separate page and these pages were given unstapled to the students so that they could choose to proceed with the task in their preferred order. This also enabled me to check whether the students would read the instructions first or would read the texts first and then the instructions. In other words, it enabled me to check whether they were reading the texts with a purpose.

The tasks were performed in a small classroom, and I started the pre-protocol interviews with each participant in the first week. Then in the second week, I started the reading-to-write task which was followed by post-protocol interviews. During the reading-to-write task, I remained with each participant in the room for around five minutes to make sure that they were verbalising their thoughts out loud and then left them alone. I told the students to call me when they had finished the task. Each task session lasted for between two and four hours and the performance of the tasks was audio recorded; none of the participants felt comfortable with being video recorded. When the participants had finished verbalising their thoughts and writing, I conducted the post-task interviews, which each lasted between 18 and 20 minutes. All the interviews were audio-recorded.

3.7 Adjustments to the process of the data collection

As a result of testing the study instruments in the pilot, changes were made to the verbalising process, time duration and number of participants. These are explained in detail below.

3.7.1 Verbalisation issue

When I checked the recordings of the four pilot participants, I found that all of them were reading silently and sometimes out loud, or that there were long gaps in their verbalisation. None of them had verbalised their thoughts properly. For example, a participant started verbalising his thoughts in the following way (the text in normal font is from the actual text, and the text in parenthesis is the participants' verbalised thoughts):

> On the one hand, there are curriculum developers or teachers trying to effect appropriate English language teaching with

students who are foreign, (what is foreign?) (Using phone to translate) to them, either at home or abroad. They try to understand students' attitudes and ways of doing things, which, to the outsider, are often unclear. On the other hand, there are teachers and curriculum developers who are native to the countries where they work, and the same nationality as the students they teach. These language educators are trying to make sense of methodologies developed in Britain, North America or Australasia for 'ideal'... teaching-learning situations which are very different from their own. In this latter scenario, the question of what is the ideal classroom situation, or how far received classroom methodologies are the most appropriate, becomes very important. However, we have insufficient data about what really happens between people in the classroom. In addition, we lack this data for the wide range of social settings in which English language education is carried out around the world. (Okay).

Another participant read in the following way:

> First and foremost, any post method pedagogy has to be a pedagogy of particularity. That is to say, language pedagogy, in order to be relevant, must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural environment. A pedagogy of particularity, then, is opposed to the notion that there can be one set of pedagogic aims and objectives realisable through one set of pedagogic principles and procedures. At its core, the idea of pedagogic particularity is consistent with the perspective of situational understanding (Elliott, 1993), which claims that a meaningful pedagogy cannot be constructed without a holistic interpretation of particular situations, and that it cannot be improved without a general improvement of those particular situations. All pedagogy, like all politics, is local. Politics …! To ignore local needs is to ignore lived experiences. Pedagogies that ignore lived experiences will ultimately prove to be "so disturbing for those affected by them - so threatening to their belief systems - that hostility is aroused and learning becomes impossible" (Coleman, 1996, p. 11). A case in point is the sense of disillusionment that accompanied the spread of communicative language teaching. From South Africa, Chick (1996) wonders whether "our choice of communicative language teaching as a goal was possibly a sort of naive ethnocentrism prompted by the thought that what is good for Europe or the USA

> had to be good for KwaZulu" (p. 22). From Pakistan, Shamim (1996) reports that her attempt to introduce communicative language teaching into her classroom met with a great deal of resistance from her learners, making her "terribly exhausted" and leading her to realise that, by introducing this methodology, she was actually "creating psychological barriers to learning" (p. 109). From India, Tickoo (1996) points out that even locally initiated pedagogic innovations have failed because they merely attempted to combine them with the methodological framework inherited from abroad, without fully taking into account local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities, (Okay, so it is about Europe and the USA).

Another participant started this way:

> (Okay), First and foremost, any post … a pedagogy of particularity, then, is opposed to the notion that there can be one set of pedagogic aims and objectives which are realisable … (okay).

These examples show that the participants kept on reading loudly with long gaps in their verbalisation or reading silently with no verbalisation. As a result of this finding, I decided to stay with each participant throughout the performance of the task in the main study. The participants were reminded to think aloud every time they fell silent or stopped verbalising their thoughts to ensure that they verbalised all their thoughts rather than keeping silent. The reminding technique used in the main study was asking them "What are you thinking now?", which was the only interruption from me.

3.7.2 The issue of think-aloud during writing

Another issue identified during the pilot study was the difficulty of thinking aloud during writing. When the participants started writing, they failed to verbalise their thoughts and fell silent most of the time. That might have been caused by the reactivity problem (Smagorinsky, 1989) which is the disturbance which occurs to

the cognitive processes when students have to write and think aloud at the same time. Therefore, in the main study, the participants were asked to verbalise their thoughts only during the reading stage to ensure the reliability of conducting the think-aloud protocol process.

3.7.3 Timing issue

The amount of time required to complete the tasks was also a major challenge in the pilot data collection process. This might affect the quality of the data collected as it could have added a greater cognitive load to the participants and made them reluctant to participate. The first participant in the pilot study spent four hours on the reading-to-write tasks and other students who had been invited to take part in the pilot study started to hesitate and asked to withdraw. So in the main study, I focused on verbalisation during the reading process only and let the participants write without verbalisation.

This issue had been reported as a possible effect of the think-aloud protocols (Cohen, 2000; Green, 1998; Russo, Johnson & Stephens, 1989; Stratman & Hamp-Lyons, 1994; Wade, 1990) and the previous researchers had suggested training the students on undertaking a think-aloud protocol as a means of tackling this potential problem. Although the students who participated in the pilot study were trained on performing a think-aloud protocol, they still could not bear the additional cognitive load of verbalising their thoughts while engaged in writing. Previous studies on the role of reading-to-write tasks have dealt with this issue differently. That is, the studies conducted in English-language preparation courses have used placement tests as reading-to-write tasks and these placement tests were restricted by time, which might have affected the quality of the students'

verbalisations (Cumming *et al*., 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013). The previous studies conducted in natural contexts, in which students carried out reading-to-write tasks as part of their normal studies, reported that think-aloud protocol issues including the timing issue were dealt with in the training session, however, the exact techniques used to address these issues were not reported (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015).

3.7.4 Student retention issue

In addition, I found it difficult to recruit a large number of students to the study. In the pilot study, nineteen students expressed interest in participating but fourteen did not show up when the study began. As a result, I had five participants, one of whom requested to withdraw in the middle of the reading-to-write task and was advised that the information which he had submitted would be erased.

Duff (2012) asserted that case studies use small numbers of participants to investigate in depth particular cases rather than generalising statistics. I therefore decided to recruit a smaller number of students in each group in the main study. I encouraged the students to participate in the study by explaining its importance for both students and language teachers.

3.8 Data collection procedure in the main study

The main study was conducted over a period of seven weeks from 1 September to 27 October 2019. In week one, I visited the Department of English to familiarise myself with the students and prepare the data collection place. The data were collected in a quiet office well equipped with chairs and desks. Also, the students

were informed about the aims and procedure of the study and were then asked to read and sign informed consent forms.

First, in week 1, I attended the students' class to invite them to participate in the study and to answer any questions they had in order to lower their concerns about participating in a study. I knew that the current study was the first empirical study to be conducted in the Department of English and the students told me that they were using the think-aloud technique for the first time. I invited them to attend a presentation about thinking aloud at which I explained the aims, objectives and procedure of the study in greater detail, with a focus on the think-aloud protocol and their rights in the study. Also, the importance of the study and how it would help them to learn about actual research and data collection were explained. After the presentation, the students who agreed to take part in the study were given informed consent forms and asked to sign and return them to me or their teachers (see Appendix J for the informed consent form). The students were also told that they could email me or come to the designated office if they had any questions about the study. Consequently, I attended the office daily from 8am to 2pm to fit with the students' availability and to be there to answer their questions. As expected, many students and teachers came to the office and asked many questions about the study in general and the think-aloud protocol in particular.

In week 2, the students who had consented to participate in the study were invited to a training session. This session was held for two reasons: first, for me to become familiar with the participants and to make them feel relaxed and motivated as they would be dealing with a member of their own society (Crabtree & Miller, 1999) and second, to train them on how to conduct the think-aloud protocol and to

reduce their concerns about the think-aloud verbalisation (Ericsson & Simon, 1993).

In the training session, the participants received instructions about think-aloud tasks. I showed them a video of the think-aloud process carried out by me. In this four-minute demonstration video, I demonstrated the verbalisation process by focusing on verbalising my thoughts and not simply reading the text out loud. I used the reading-to-write task which I had created for the practice session (see Appendix H for the think-aloud protocol practice task). After that, the participants were given a practice session using the prepared practice reading-to-write task. In that session, I trained them to think-aloud while reading by demonstrating the process in front of them using the training practice reading-to-write task. The focus of my performance in both the video and the training session was on distinguishing between reading loudly and thinking aloud. I also attempted to urge them to continue verbalising their thoughts, to relax, and to deal with this activity as if it were one of their regular class assignments. After my demonstration, the participants were given a copy of the practice task and asked to carry out a verbalisation one at a time. They were asked if they would feel comfortable verbalising out loud in front of everyone attending the practice session and they welcomed the idea.

After the training session and before the actual data collection, the students were given oral feedback on the training session. I invited them to meetings at which I gave them oral feedback on the training session. Each meeting lasted 20 to 30 minutes, with each participant receiving individual attention. The feedback was on the verbalisation process, specifically the gaps in the verbalisation and the habits

of reading silently or aloud, which I had observed during the training session. The feedback was significant for ensuring that the participants were verbalising their thoughts properly, as some of them had just read the texts out loud without verbalising their thoughts at all. I therefore had to make sure that they understood that verbalising their thoughts while reading was an essential part of the study and was different from reading texts out loud.

Muneer (a low scorer), for example, had read silently and not clearly verbalised his thoughts when reading. As a result, I concentrated on these issues with him, and I noted that he was making progress. Kamal (another low-scorer) was reading aloud with little verbalization so I had to make sure that he understood the distinction between reading aloud and thinking aloud in order to avoid these problems throughout the data collection. Sami, a high-scoring participant, was verbalising his thoughts but his voice was very low, and he explained that he was not used to thinking aloud, so I had to make sure that he raised his voice and I encouraged him by praising his performance in the think-aloud protocol for his first time, which was later reflected positively in his performance, particularly in raising his voice.

Moreover, at this stage, as mentioned in section 3.4 two students decided to withdraw from the study due to their inability to verbalise their thoughts out loud, even after several attempts to alleviate their fears regarding the verbalisation process, and I completed the study with ten students. In addition, as the training session was intended to reduce any concerns the participants had about the think-aloud protocol tasks or the process for conducting these tasks, I invited them to ask any questions regarding the study by emailing, texting or even calling me.

Also in week 2, I started the preparations for the main data collection and for the location. I made sure that the designated office for the study was suitable, quiet and equipped with comfortable chairs and desks. I prepared beverages and snacks for the participants to make them feel comfortable and to keep them focused on the task. After collecting the signed consent forms from the participants, giving them a presentation, a training session about the think-aloud protocol and feedback on the session, I started to schedule them according to their availability and readiness. The data were collected in two phases: week three was designated for the pre-protocol interviews and weeks four, six and seven were designated for the reading-to-write tasks and the post-protocol interviews.

On an attendance sheet, I wrote the participants' names, their preferred day and time for the pre-protocol interviews and for the reading-to-write task and post-protocol interviews within the limits of the study time scale, and their telephone numbers so that I could remind them one day prior to their appointment. I collected telephone numbers because Saudi students do not use emails routinely but depend primarily on telephone communication. As recommended by Gillham (2000), I started to prepare the participants by reminding them of the aims of the interview, the place where they were to meet me, the estimated duration of the reading-to-write task and the reasons for audio-recording them. None of the participants were comfortable with being video recorded, so all the sessions were audio-recorded only. Also, as suggested by Cohen (2000), Ericsson and Simon (1993), Green (1998), Russo, Johnson and Stephens (1989) and Wade (1990), the participants were allowed to use their preferred language in the interviews and the think-aloud protocol verbalisation, which in all cases was their first language, Arabic.

In week 3, I started the data collection by reminding every participant at the beginning of the session of the nature of the study, its aims and the think-aloud protocol procedure. Then, with my recording device charged and ready to use, I started the pre-protocol interviews on the students' previous and current reading and writing experiences. In addition, as recommended by Creswell (2007), if the participants' answers were incomplete or ambiguous, I tried to understand their point better by asking follow-up questions, such as 'What do you mean by that?' or by repeating the question or part of it, or by providing prompts as explained in the interviews (see Appendix E for the post-protocol interviews). The pre-protocol interviews lasted between 30 to 38 minutes. It is important to note that since the pre-protocol interviews were about general information about the participant and were independent from the reading-to-write tasks, I decided to conduct them before the actual data collection to reduce the amount of cognitive load on the participants. The pre-protocol interviews with the participants lasted for five days with two interviews on each day. Since each participant had to attend only one interview, I asked them if they would be able to free one hour on one day to be interviewed and they agreed, and their time slots were entered on the attendance sheet.

Sami and Ziad were the first two students interviewed on the Sunday, the first day of the week (Friday and Saturday are week-end holidays in Saudi Arabia). The participants were reminded in the morning by a text message. I had already asked them to keep at least an hour free for the pre-protocol interview to allow for any delays or unforeseen circumstances. Sami's time slot was 11am, and I called him nine minutes before the start time because I wanted to make sure that he came to the office on time. I welcomed him to the office with our normal greetings and we talked about his classes and his progress in the study. We also talked about

things of mutual interest related to the English Department and other general topics to help him relax. Before I started the pre-protocol interview, I reminded him of the aims and objectives of the study and his rights as a participant and then I asked him if he would prefer to hold the interview in English or Arabic and he chose Arabic. I then prepared my audio recorder by naming the audio recording with his pseudonym ('Sami-pre-protocol interview'). The audio recorder had a feature which enabled me to pause and save the audio recording and continue recording Sami's think-aloud and post-protocol interview at later stages. This made it easier for me to keep all his recordings in one place, and to transcribe them more easily.

With the interview guide ready, I started the pre-protocol interview with Sami. I tried to ask the questions and to listen carefully and show the utmost respect and interest in his answers. If I realised that he had not understood a question, I asked it again and clarified it. For instance, when I asked him 'How did you feel about the English reading in your studies?', he remained silent for some time, so I repeated the question and he went on to answer it. I concluded the interview by thanking him and again by reminding him that he could contact me any time if he had any questions by email or phone.

Ziad was also reminded in the morning by a text message. His time slot was 2pm and I followed the same processes with him. I followed the same process with all of the participants and since the other interviewees were scheduled on normal days which were not preceded by a weekend holiday, the participants were reminded a day before the interview to make sure that no interruption happened to the data collection process. It is important to note that all the interviews were conducted in Arabic as all the participants chose to be interviewed in this way.

In week four, after the pre-protocol interviews, I started the data collection of the reading-to-write tasks followed by the post-protocol interviews. Following the time schedule, I sent reminder text messages to every student one day before his participation. Additionally, the data for the think-aloud and post-protocol interviews were collected over a three-week period to ensure that the students were able to pick a time that was most convenient for them, as I had requested them to set aside three hours for this data collection procedure. I made sure that no more than one participant took part in the reading-to-write task per day. For example, Kamal, a lower-scoring student, was reminded a day before his participation day. I contacted him five minutes before his scheduled time slot on the day of his participation to ensure that he arrived on time. I greeted him when he arrived at the office where the data was to be collected, and we talked about general things of interest to him, such as his village and known individuals in his community, to help him relax. I then set up my audio recorder and began the reading-to-write task. The two reading texts, the think-aloud instructions and the writing prompts were given to him (see Appendix G for the reading-to-write tasks used in this study). The papers were not stapled to enable me to see how he would approach the reading-to-write task, for example, whether he would begin with the reading texts or the writing prompts to see if he would consider the reading purpose or not. Before he started the reading-to-write task, I read the think-aloud instructions to him which were also written on the first page of the reading-to-write task. As suggested by Cohen (2000), Ericsson and Simon (1993), Gebril and Plakans, 2009, Green (1998), Plakans (2008; 2009), Plakans and Gebril, (2012), Russo, Johnson and Stephens (1989), Wade (1990) and Zhao and Hirvela (2015), the think-aloud instructions focused on asking the participants not to interpret their thoughts while

thinking but simply to verbalise them as they occurred. I also told them that they had the option to verbalise in their mother tongue Arabic or in English. These precautions were also explained in the training session to ensure that the participants remained focused on verbalising their thoughts and were not distracted.

Kamal then started the reading-to-write tasks. I sat at another desk close to him listening and observing his verbalisation. To avoid distracting him, I pretended to be busy reading a book. Whenever Kamal fell silent or stopped verbalising his thoughts for more than twenty seconds, I reminded him to verbalise by asking questions such as 'What are you thinking now?', as recommended by Cohen (2000), Ericsson and Simon (1993), Plakans (2008; 2009) and Wade (1990). This reminding technique was the only interruption made by me. Kamal started with the reading texts; reading the first text and moving to the other text and then he asked me "What should I do now?" and I replied "Just do what you would normally do with these tasks". He spent 73 minutes on his reading and verbalisation process and then started writing.

As previously stated in the pilot section (3.6), the students only verbalised their thoughts during the reading phase, and they wrote without verbalising their thoughts during the writing process to reduce the cognitive burden that would have been produced by having to verbalise while writing. As a result, when Kamal finished reading and verbalising his thoughts, I turned off the audio recorder and left him to write while I sat on the other desk preparing for the post-protocol interview. Kamal spent 43 minutes on his writing.

As mentioned in the interview section (3.5.2), the post-protocol interviews were stimulated recall interviews, which means that they relied primarily on the students' short-term recollection of the reading-to-write task. It was therefore essential to conduct them immediately after the reading-to-write task. After Kamal finished his writing, I took a seat across from him, prepared my post-protocol question guide and audio recorder, and began asking the questions. As he had chosen Arabic for his pre-protocol interview, his post-protocol interview was also conducted in Arabic. I asked the questions in simple terms without affecting the original meaning and whenever he did not understand a question, I repeated it or part of it (see Appendix E for the post-protocol interviews). Kamal's post-protocol interview lasted for 38 minutes. When it was completed, I thanked him and told him that the transcripts of his pre-protocol, think-aloud and post-protocol interviews would be emailed to him so that he could check that what was written was what he actually said, thus ensuring the veracity of the data.

I followed the same processes with all of the other participants. The participants spent between 40 and 73 minutes reading and verbalising their thoughts. Then they undertook the writing task by reading notes or paraphrasing ideas from the two texts. They spent between 39 and 52 minutes on this phase. When the participants had finished writing, I conducted the post-protocol interviews with each student individually. The post-protocol interviews lasted for 28 to 41 minutes. The time the participants spent in the pre-protocol interviews, the reading and the verbalisation process, the post-protocol interviews, and the writing task are provided in table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Students Time Slots in the Reading-to-Write Task and Interviews

Students' names	Pre-protocol interviews	Reading and verbalisation	Writing	Post-protocol interviews
Sami	36	49	43	41
Salman	32	40	40	39
Hatim	38	53	52	30
Bader	33	58	48	36
Rami	31	62	40	35
Khalid	36	47	43	31
Jawad	37	52	50	38
kamal	33	73	49	33
Ziad	35	55	46	28
Muneer	30	48	39	36

After the data collection, I informed the participants that I would send them an email with the think-aloud protocol and interview transcriptions, and I asked them to give me feedback by replying to my email. The feedback which I asked for was essentially whether or not the transcription matched what they had actually said.

In week 5, no data were collected as mid-term examinations were taking place, so the data collection for the think-aloud protocol, writings and post-protocol interviews continued in week 6 and finished in week 7. Week 8 was set aside for the students' questions and feedback. In week 8, the students had the option of checking the accuracy of their think-aloud protocols and interview transcriptions

but only one student expressed a willingness to do that. This was done to maintain the ethical research considerations and to ensure that what was said during the think-aloud protocol and the interviews had been transcribed and translated accurately (Hagens *et al.*, 2009). A summary of the data collection procedure is provided in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4
Data Collection Procedure

Week	*Consent form*	*Training session*	*Pre-protocol interviews*	*Reading-to-write and think-aloud*	*Post-protocol interviews*	*Students' questions and feedback*
Week 1	✓					
Week 2		✓				
Week 3			✓			
Week 4				✓	✓	
Week 5				First mid-term exams from 29 September to 6 October 2019		
Week 6				✓	✓	
Week 7				✓	✓	
Week 8						✓

3.9 Data analysis in the main study

In this section, I explain the analysis of the data from each of the data collection instruments: the think-aloud protocols, the pre- and post-protocol interviews and the students' essays. Before describing the analysis process, I describe the data preparation and data organisation approaches.

3.9.1 Data preparation, familiarity and organisation

Data preparation is defined as the act of pre-processing raw data, which can come from various data sources, into a form that can be easily and properly analysed. Data preparation and organisation are effective ways to become familiar with the data, gain early insights into the data and have a thorough knowledge of any potential data quality issues (Mandinach *et al*., 2011; McLellan *et al*., 2003). Therefore, once all the data were collected, the think-aloud verbal reports from the actual oral articulation and interviews were carefully transcribed and then translated verbatim from Arabic into English by the researcher to make them ready for the analysis.

First, for the think-aloud protocol transcription, original chunks from the texts which were simply read out loud by the participants were marked in bold and the participants' thoughts in normal font (see Appendix K for a think-aloud protocol transcription example). The think-aloud protocol transcription reports were kept in separate PDF documents. A separate file was created for each group, high- and low-scoring students. The think-aloud protocol recordings and the reports were each named with the same pseudonyms and their classification as high- or low-scorers to enable them to be checked easily at later stages.

The interview transcriptions were also kept (under the pseudonyms) in separate PDF documents in two files named 'high-scoring group' and 'low-scoring group'. In addition, the students' essays were scanned and saved as PDF documents in separate folders based on the students' classification as high- or low-scoring. I used Microsoft Word when transcribing and coding the data because I found it reliable and easy to use. Two think-aloud protocols and interviews and their

recordings were also carefully checked by two PhD colleagues at the University of York who spoke both Arabic and English.

The data were analysed using both deductive and inductive techniques. The inductive and deductive approaches, according to Trochim (2006, p. 1), are two “wide techniques of reasoning”; he defined induction as moving from the specific to the general, whereas deduction begins with the general and ends with the specific; inductive arguments are best expressed through experience or observation, whereas deductive arguments are best expressed through laws, rules or other widely accepted principles. Deductive researchers, according to Creswell and Plano Clark (2007, p. 23), “work from the 'top down,' from a theory through hypotheses to facts to support or refute the theory”. Inductive researchers, on the other hand, are defined as those who work from the “bottom-up, using the participants’ perspectives to create bigger themes and generate a theory that connects the themes” (*ibid.*).

Using frameworks (predefined codes) derived from the reading and writing literature (Birch, 2007; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007; Koda, 2007; Kuzborska, 2011; Weir & Khalifa, 2008), the deductive approach was used to analyse the think-aloud protocols to identify and compare the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring participants. That is, the study focused on identifying the reading processes which the students used when undertaking the reading-to-write tasks and also comparing these reading processes between high- and low-scoring students. The deductive approach was also used to analyse the students’ essays to find their writing scores using a writing holistic rubric designed to assess reading-to-write tasks.

To analyse interviews, both the inductive and deductive approaches were used. That is, I used the deductive approach to analyse the pre-determined themes in the interview guide and I used the inductive approach to analyse the interviews by re-reading the students' answers and looking for related codes and themes. A detailed explanation for each data collection instrument is provided in the following sections.

3.10 The analysis of think-aloud protocols

To start the analysis of the think-aloud oral data, I first created a provisional 'start list' based on Miles & Huberman, (1994), of the lower-level and higher-level reading processes. In other words, when I started analysing the data from the think-aloud, I had a list of preliminary codes, such as goal setting, monitoring, inferencing, creating a text-level structure, building a mental model, establishing propositional meaning, syntactic parsing, lexical access and word recognition (see Table 3.5 below for the full list of codes used in the analysis of reading processes). Using the comment tool in Word, I started to allocate these codes to phrases, sentences and even chunks of texts if they were related to specific reading processes.

Table 3.5
The Analytical Framework of Reading Processes (*adapted from* Birch, 2007; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007; Koda, 2007; Kuzborska, 2011; Weir & Khalifa, 2008).

Reading processes		
COMPREHENSION PROCESSES	***Definition of the process***	***Examples (From the current study and from Plakans, 2009)***
Goal setting	Checking the reading task	'So, I'm supposed to read the passages and write an essay, okay.' (Plakans, 2009, p. 6)
Monitoring	Recognising lack of comprehension	'This sentence is very complex and unclear.'
Inferencing	Making inferences from clues provided by the author in a text and interpreting the connection between the ideas in the text	'Forcing its ideals sometimes is true.' (Plakans, 2009. p. 6)
Creating a text-level structure	Constructing an organised representation of the text	'The author is using an argumentative style in this text.'
Building a mental model	Integrating new information, enriching the proposition using cultural and content area knowledge (background knowledge activation process)	'Second writing, is basically, ah, talking about the economic impact of this new technologies is, I know it, uh,' (Plakans, 2009, p. 6)
LINGUISTIC PROCESSES	***Linguistic knowledge***	
Establishing propositional meaning	Combining word meanings and structural information into basic clauses, sentence levels and meaning units	'Oh, this sentence is about academic writing.'
Syntactic parsing	Chunking into sentences and phrases using syntactic knowledge	'The tense in the previous sentence is present simple, the verb 'met' is past?'

Lexical access	Lexical knowledge, accessing word meaning (lemma: meaning, word-class)	'This word is new; I need to translate it.'
Word recognition	Identifying form: orthography, phonology and morphology	'com-pu-ter-i-sa-tion computerisation.' (Plakans, 2009, p. 6)

Table 3.5 shows the analytical framework of the study which included higher-level comprehension reading processes of goal setting, monitoring, inferencing, creating a text-level structure and building a mental model, and lower-level linguistic reading processes of establishing propositional meaning, syntactic parsing, lexical access and word recognition. Brief descriptions of these reading processes are provided in the following paragraphs (please see the detailed explanation of these reading processes in Chapter 2).

Higher-level processes are often used to define comprehension processes and are often portrayed as involving specific component abilities performed under the control of the reader. For example, goal setting is a cognitive activity which is essential to all reading acts. Goals provide readers with reasons to take action and plausible explanations for what they are reading. Goal setting is viewed by good learners as a higher level of conscious awareness (Grabe, 2009). When readers set their goals and are aware of what they are doing, this will help them understand what they are doing (Grabe, 2009; Horiba, 2000; Linderholm *et al.*, 2004; Perfetti, Landi & Oakhill, 2005). For example, 'I have to cite the author' (Plakans, 2009, p. 212).

Monitoring one's own language communication and comprehension is regarded as a fundamental human cognitive activity; from childhood onwards,

everyone monitors their own language communication and comprehension (Grabe, 2009, p. 212). Understanding monitoring shows how readers examine and measure their text comprehension and achievement in reading (Garner, 1994; Cox, 1994). When comprehension becomes difficult to maintain, monitoring occurs. For example, 'I cannot understand this sentence, it is complicated' (Sami, high-scorer).

Inferencing is one of the most essential cognitive procedures because it connects what the reader is trying to figure out with the memory resources which supply his/her background knowledge. Inferencing is an important part of text comprehension. Text information can be linked to the information stored in the memory using this method. Because texts contain multiple unspoken conceptions which are expected to be known by readers, readers create inferences. Furthermore, readers' inherent need to link ideas leads them to provide information which is not clearly stated in the text (Kuzborska, 2018). For example, 'It is true, sometimes they force' (Grabe, 2009, p. 212).

Text-level structure knowledge refers to structural forms such as the techniques used to arrange information in texts. These techniques include chronological text structure, cause and effect, problem and solution, compare and contrast, and classification-division. Text structure also includes elements such as the use of a thesis statement in a paragraph (Alexander & Jetton, 2000; Duke & Pearson, 2002). It is an important reading process as it helps with understanding the main ideas, such as recognising a topic sentence and understanding the text effectively. For example, 'I think this text is not organised and very complex' (Hatim, high-scorer).

Building mental knowledge refers to content knowledge, which embodies perspectives, notions, philosophies, ideologies, items, places, people and events which are mentioned in a specific text. It involves knowledge about conventions, beliefs, values and cultural expectations (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller 2002; Urquhart & Weir 1998; Hudson, 2007). For example, 'Second writing, is basically ah, talking about the economic impact of these new technologies is, I know it, uh,' (Plakans, 2009, p. 6).

Linguistic processes or lower-level reading processes refer to the most automatic linguistic processes. For example, the process of merging word meanings and structural information into basic clause-level meaning units is known as semantic proposition formation. In this process, a reader integrates information in a meaningful way which is consistent with previous reading, taking into account that the reader integrates information after identifying words and grammatical forms. Meanings are linked through this process, and if they are recapped or reactivated, they become active in the memory (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007). For example, 'So, in developed countries such as Japan, these methodologies were difficult to implement' (Salman, high-scorer).

Syntactic parsing or syntactic knowledge is accessing meaning from words and sentence structure, such as sentence and phrase structures. Syntactic parsing is a crucial part of the reading process as it assists readers with combining terms into phrases and clauses. It also helps them to identify subordinate and superordinate relationships between clauses, to recognise word order in clauses, and to decide which pronouns and definite articles apply to an earlier text (Kuzborska, 2019). For

example, ‘The tense in the previous sentence is present simple, the verb ‘met’ is past?’ (Jawad, low-scorer).

Word recognition is a rapid and automatic process which cannot last for a long time without the ability to recognise words rapidly (Grabe, 2009). It enables readers to connect the orthographic form of words (grapheme or symbol) with the phonological form (phoneme or sound) in order to identify the grammatical features of words and their functions (such as nouns functioning as objects, verbs as actions). It also refers to the use of the internal structure of words (affixation in English), For example, ‘com-pu-ter-i-sa-tion computerisation’ (Plakans, 2009, p. 6).

Lexical access or lexical knowledge is an essential process in reading comprehension. It enables readers to recall the meanings of words from memory or what is called the mental lexicon (Kuzborska, 2019). For example, ‘Here I have some words I need to translate: ‘scenario, ideal settings, lack’’ (Rami, high-scorer).

Two transcripts of the think-aloud verbal reports were also checked by two PhD colleagues at the University of York to ensure inter-rater reliability. Each of them was emailed one think-aloud verbal report and the analytical framework and asked to code them individually. The raters’ codes were then checked and discussed until a final agreement of 92% was achieved.

3.11 The analysis of the interviews

A thematic analysis approach was used to analyse the data obtained from the interviews in the main study. Thematic analysis is a deep description of data or a detailed account of a particular aspect (Braun & Clarke, 2013). In other words, it

is the process of classifying themes of qualitative data. Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 78) advised that it should be the first qualitative analysis method to be considered as "it provides core skills that will be useful for conducting many other kinds of analysis". Thematic analysis enables the researcher to see and make sense of common or shared meanings and experiences by focusing on meaning across a data set. The goal of thematic analysis is not to find unique and idiosyncratic meanings and experiences located just within a particular data piece. It is a method of discovering and making sense of what is similar to the way a topic is discussed or written about. From the learning and teaching perspective, it is acknowledged to be a method rather than a methodology (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Clarke & Braun, 2013). This means that it is not restricted to any particular epistemological or theoretical standpoint, which makes it a flexible method and a substantial benefit to the learning and teaching fields. Thematic analysis was used in the current study to identify the important themes such as the students' reading and writing perceptions and the factors affecting their reading and writing performance.

The procedure followed in the thematic analysis, as suggested by Braun and Clarke (2013), consisted of becoming familiar with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing the themes, defining them and then writing up the findings. So in order to analyse the interview data, I started by reading the scripts many times to get an overall sense of the data. Then I began to read the transcribed data again from the start by using the 'insert comment' command in Word to highlight and allocate meaningful categories to the words, phrases or sentences which I considered to be the main ideas and perceptions. This coding process resulted in some initial codes, as presented in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6

Initial Codes in the Interview Analysis

Students' statements	***Codes***
A reader who reads habitually, understands the meaning rapidly and has an enormous amount of vocabulary	A good reader reads constantly A good reader understands the meaning rapidly A good reader has a lot of vocabulary
It was difficult at the beginning and is still difficult, but I feel that I am much better now. My teachers helped me to improve my English writing.	Writing is a difficult process
Researcher: "How did they help you?" *Participant*: "They helped me write correct spelling and grammar."	Writing is about good spelling and grammar

I then started the second-level coding. In this coding process, I thematically grouped related categories which emerged from the interviews under broader labels to make them more manageable. I started to highlight and assign the most appropriate codes which were most likely to elicit themes and sub-themes which were the main focus of the present study. That is, I was able to decide the factors which affected the students' reading and writing performance expressed in their answers. I analysed the interviews in this way for each student separately and then conducted a cross-case comparison to understand the factors affecting high- and low-scoring students' performance in reading and writing. Throughout the analysis, the pre-protocol interview was referred to as 'interview 1' and the post-protocol interview as 'interview 2'.

3.11.1 Themes from the pre-protocol interviews

Interested in the factors affecting the students' performance in reading and writing, more specifically, the students' perceptions of reading and writing, I divided the themes into reading themes and writing themes. Five reading sub-themes were identified from the pre-protocol interviews: reading is understanding the text, a good reader pronounces words accurately, a good reader is a good summariser, a good reader reads rapidly, and a good reader has a lot of vocabulary. The writing

theme had three sub-themes: writing is difficult, writing is about grammar and spelling, and writing is good handwriting. A concise summary of the pre-protocol interview themes and sub-themes is presented in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7
Pre-protocol Interview Themes and Sub-themes

Themes	*Sub-themes*
Students' perceptions of reading	Reading is understanding the text
	A good reader pronounces words accurately
	A good reader is a good summariser
	A good reader reads rapidly
	A good reader has a lot of vocabulary
Students' perceptions of writing	Writing is difficult
	Writing is about grammar
	Writing is about correct spelling
	Writing is good handwriting
	A good writer has a lot of vocabulary

3.11.2 Themes from the post-protocol interviews

The aim of the post-protocol interviews was to understand the students' understanding of the task and why they performed the task in a particular way, for example, reading the instructions first and then the texts. Based on this focus, the following themes emerged from the data. The first theme was related to the students' reading practices and its sub-theme was 'did not consider the reading purpose'. In order to obtain a better understanding of the students' reading practices, that is, whether they considered a reading purpose before reading a text, they were asked 'How did you start your task?' Their answers were then analysed in terms of whether they considered setting a reading purpose or ignored it and focused on something else instead. All the students, however, did not pay attention to the reading purpose and therefore their answers were coded as 'Did not consider the reading purpose'.

The second theme was about the familiarity and difficulty of the reading texts and it had two sub-themes: 'the reading texts were familiar to the students'

and ‘the reading texts did not affect the students’ performance’. To investigate the reading texts’ familiarity and complexity, the students were asked ‘Are you familiar with the topic of the texts?’, ‘Did the topic affect your reading and writing?’ Their responses were then analysed to determine whether they were familiar with the reading texts and whether the reading texts had influenced their performance in the task. All the students answered that they had studied familiar topics in their classes, particularly in the applied linguistic course, and that their performance in the reading-to-write task was unaffected by the reading texts, so their answers were coded as ‘The reading texts were familiar to the students’ and ‘The reading texts did not affect the students’ performance’.

After coding the interview scripts, I gave two transcribed scripts to two raters for them to code them individually. The transcribed data were emailed to them and a meeting was scheduled to discuss their ratings. We discussed the differences in the codes and themes and refined them until we reached an agreement of 90%.

3.12 The analysis of the students’ essays

The participants’ written essays were analysed using an holistic rubric from the scoring rubric of the TOEFL iBT integrated task compiled by Gebril and Plakans (2009). The researchers had modified and piloted this scoring rubric with EFL undergraduate Arab students from the Middle East, specifically the United Arab Emirates. The researchers made the following changes to the rubric: (a) illustrating the rubric’s development and organisation components to match the prompt evaluation criteria used in their reading-to-write task, (b) giving raters instructions on scoring essays with plagiarism or no source use, and (c) removing any

references to listening features (the TOEFL scoring rubric is used with integrated writing essays using both reading and listening sources).

This scoring rubric was chosen because it had been piloted and used to assess the academic integrated writing essays of Arab undergraduate students from the Middle East and it had been used in a context which was similar to the context in which the current study was conducted. Also, this rubric had the main essential components for assessing academic integrated writing essays such as assessing the source use (considering the reading purpose), language use, organisation and development. The assessment criteria of the rubric had six scores, from zero to five, and seventeen components in total.

The first assessment category was source use, which was assessed by examining the evaluation of different opinions, integration, connection and presentation of the ideas from the reading texts in the students' essays. It is important to note that since the current study used an argumentative essay prompt, I added the evaluation of different opinions to the source use category, which was not included in Gebril and Plakans' (2009) scoring rubric.

The second assessment category was language use, which was evaluated by looking at formal writing style, complete sentences, subject/verb agreement, thesis statement, topic sentence, grammar, capitalisation, varied sentence length and spelling.

The third category was text organisation, which evaluated how the students arranged the text, for example, introduction, body and conclusion in their essays.

The final category was content development, which evaluated the students' elaboration of their key ideas by adding relevant details and supporting them in their essay writings. Table 3.8 shows the holistic rubric and the scoring procedure in detail.

Table 3.8
The Scoring Rubric for the Students' Writing

Score	*Task Description*
5	**A response at this level:** successfully evaluates different opinions presented in the reading sources; successfully presents ideas in relation to the relevant information presented in the reading sources; is well organised with well-developed content; has occasional language errors which do not result in an inaccurate or imprecise presentation of content or connections.
4	**A response at this level:** is generally good in coherently and accurately presenting ideas in relation to the relevant information in the reading texts, although it may have inaccuracy, vagueness or imprecision in connection to points made in the readings; has clear organisation and logical development; has more frequent or noticeable minor language errors, but such errors do not result in anything more than an occasional lapse of clarity or in the connection of ideas.
3	**A response at this level:** conveys some relevant connection to the reading, but only a vague, global, unclear or somewhat imprecise connection to points made in the reading; has development which is somewhat limited, but some specific support for the argument is provided; occasionally lacks cohesion but has a basic organisational structure;

includes errors of usage and/or grammar which are more frequent or might result in noticeably vague expressions or obscured meanings in conveying ideas and connections.

2 **A response at this level:**

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 organisational coherence and development. Ideas are very general and lack specific details in support;

contains language errors or expressions which largely obscure connections or meaning at key junctures, or which would likely obscure understanding of key ideas for a reader not already familiar with the topic.

1 **A response at this level:**

provides little or no meaningful or relevant coherent content from the readings and does not follow an organisation pattern or develop content;

includes language which is so poor that it is difficult to derive meaning from it.

0 **A response at this level:**

either merely copies sentence(s) from the reading, rejects the topic, is not connected to the topic, is written in a foreign language, or is blank.

Notes: If only one phrase or sentence is copied from the reading, do not assign a '0' but base the rating on the rest of the essay; if language use and development are at a certain level but the readings have not been included (directly or indirectly), do not rate lower; if ideas from the readings are used but not cited, do not rate lower unless the writer is copying directly.

After scoring all the essays, I then categorised students as either low-scoring writers or high-scoring writers (see Appendices L and M for examples of high- and low-scoring essays). The participants' scores are shown in Table 3.9 below.

Table 3.9
Students' Essay Writing Scores

Name	***Essays' average scores out of 5***	***H/L scoring writers***
Sami	4.33	H
Hatim	3.66	H
Salman	3.33	H
Bader	3.66	H
Rami	3	H
Khalid	1.66	L
Jawad	1.66	L
Kamal	2.33	L
Ziad	2	L
Muneer	1.66	L

H: high-scoring writer, L: low-scoring writer

To ensure the appropriateness of the use of the scoring rubric, I followed the criteria set out by Gebril and Plakans (2009) for using this rubric effectively. Matching the criteria to the development and organisation of the reading-to-write task prompts used in this study, as well as thoroughly describing the criteria to the reviewers shows these criteria. That is, the scoring rubric components shown in Table 4.7 include components for assessing development, organisation, content, language use and source use, all of which align with the reading-to-write task prompts for writing an argumentative essay using a source reading text.

I also explained the scoring rubric criteria and the task requirements to the two raters who participated in scoring the students' essay writings. That is, I gave them instructions to consider when assessing the students' essays in terms of language use and content, such as grading the essays on formal writing style, complete sentences, subject/verb agreement, thesis statement, topic phrase, grammar, capitalisation, sentence length variation and spelling.

The students' writing was checked and scored independently by the two reviewers who were experienced writing teachers from the same English Department where the current study was conducted in order to take into account the students' culture, background knowledge and language proficiency level. Each reviewer gave a score from 0 to 5, following the same holistic rubric criteria (see Appendix N for the inter-rater reliability scores). The inter-rater reliability was then checked using the intra-class correlation coefficient, which gave a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.90, which is very close to 1, indicating strong agreement between the raters.

3.13 Ethical considerations

In scientific and educational research, ethical considerations play a critical role. Wellington (2015, p. 54) stated that ethics is a broad term which encompasses "moral principles which are concerned with people's behaviour and actions" and that ethical conduct in educational research is essential. Similarly, Creswell (2003) stated that a researcher should be aware of any potential ethical difficulties which might arise at any stage of the study, with an emphasis on the domain of the research questions, the statement of the problem and data collection process. Miller and Brewer (2003, p. 95) noted that "ethical responsibility is essential at all stages of the research process, from the design of a study, including how participants are recruited, to how they are treated through the course of these procedures, and finally to the consequences of their participation".

Prior to the pilot study, appropriate ethical considerations were taken into account and permission was obtained from the UB to conduct the study. An ethical consideration form was also submitted to the University of York and it was

approved. After that, an informed consent form was sent to the head of the English Department at the UB (see Appendix O for the HOD consent form). The head of the English Department was initially contacted in August 2019 for me to explain the nature and objectives of the study in order to gain permission to conduct the study there. The head of the English Department asked me to give a presentation explaining the study, especially the think-aloud protocol, in order to obtain permission. When permission was granted, potential participants were approached.

In compliance with the appropriate ethical requirements, the participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study any time up to two weeks after returning the signed informed consent form by emailing the researcher. They were also allowed to email me to request their verbal reports and interview scripts and to comment on them. As a result, they received emails after the data collection process enclosing their think-aloud protocol and interview transcripts, and they were asked to check them and to check whether or not the written transcripts matched what they had said. To ensure the participants' privacy throughout the whole process, their names were kept anonymous by using pseudonyms.

Although the participants originally agreed that their think-aloud performance could be audio and video recorded, they were uncomfortable with the video recording and requested the researcher to simply audio-record the session. The participants were also asked if they were willing to grant permission for the researcher to access their writing assignment grades in order for me to compare them with the writing tasks which they completed in this study, but they did not consent to this. In addition, I was given permission to name the university in which this study was conducted.

3.14 Trustworthiness of the study

In this section, I explain the procedures adopted to ensure the trustworthiness of the study. Miles and Huberman (1994) asserted that a well-conducted study is not enough to elicit good findings; it should also encourage confidence in readers and researchers. In other words, a researcher must explain and rationalise the legitimacy and trustworthiness of the study in the research framework. When case studies include a single or a limited number of cases and are related to a specific context, they lack validity and reliability and are regarded as susceptible to researcher bias (Dornyei, 2007). The key rationale for a case study is that "the criteria of trusting the study are going to be different from the ones in an experimental study" (Merriam, 1998). Qualitative researchers have replaced the concepts of validity and reliability with a whole new set of concepts, such as credibility, transferability, confirmability and dependability. Credibility has replaced internal validity, transferability has become external validity/generalisability, confirmability has replaced replicability and dependability has replaced reliability (Merriam, 1998). In the following sections, I shall describe these criteria and explain in detail how they were addressed in the study.

3.15 Credibility

Credibility means that "the findings are credible to the research population and the readers" (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 180). Triangulation is one of the most significant methods used to enhance credibility (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 180; Merriam, 1988, p. 169; Miles & Huberman 1994, pp. 277-78). Creswell and Miller (2000, p. 126) described triangulation as "looking for convergence among multiple

and different sources of information to form themes or categories in a study". The argument for employing this strategy was that any inherent flaws in any research method might be compensated for by the strengths of other methods if they were used in the right mix (Jack & Raturi, 2006). "Corroborating evidence collected through multiple methods [...] to locate major and minor themes" is another benefit of triangulation (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 127). Denzin and Lincoln (2008) suggested three main types of triangulation: triangulation of data, triangulation of investigators and triangulation of methods. In other words, if various sources of data, various investigators and various methods all produce relatively similar outcomes, this is a strong indication of a high degree of credibility.

The study used multiple cases and employed interdependent techniques – the think-aloud protocol, interviews and students' written work – to collect and triangulate the data. When the students reported their reading processes in the think-aloud verbal reports, these processes were verified using their interview responses.

Furthermore, as recommended by Mackey and Gass (2005), I carried out repeated visits to the study site before the start of the data collection to enable the participants to become comfortable with my presence.

3.16 Transferability

In qualitative research, transferability is one of the most significant measures to be considered (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 267). Mackey and Gass (2005, p. 180) stated that "although findings in case study research are rarely directly transferable from one context to another, the extent to which findings may be transferred

depends on the similarity of the context". I have provided a detailed explanation of the participants' personal and educational backgrounds. Furthermore, a detailed explanation of the context has been provided for readers so that they can comprehend the context in which the study was conducted. Procedures for the data collection and the principles of data analysis have also been delineated in sufficient detail, as have the data collection procedures and data analysis principles.

3.17 Confirmability

Confirmability refers to a detailed explanation of the data collection and analysis processes to enable researchers to "examine the data and confirm, modify, or reject the interpretations of the study" (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 180). To ensure confirmability, Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 278) recommended that a researcher should endeavour to clarify the "sequence of how data were collected, processed, condensed/transformed and displayed for specific conclusion drawing" and to ensure that the study is free from "unacknowledged biases". To ensure confirmability, I have presented a detailed explanation of the data collection and analysis processes. Moreover, data source records, the think-aloud protocol, interview transcripts and students' written work, are available for an audit trail to be conducted.

3.18 Dependability

Dependability in qualitative research "involves an interrogation of the context and the methods used to derive the data" (Richards, 2009, p. 159). Richards (2009) went on to say that questioning should include facts about the methodology's link to the study's aim, as well as the data collecting techniques, how they were employed to create the data, and the data analysis process. The concept of

dependability is comparable to the idea of internal reliability in quantitative research (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 277).

Yin (2009, pp. 79-82) suggested two processes to address dependability: using case study protocols and using a case study database. A case study protocol refers to an explanation of data collection and data analysis procedures and general instructions. The purpose of the protocol is to lead the researcher through the data collection procedure from a single case. The case study database refers to the documentation of the alterations and choices made throughout the data collection process. It also refers to maintaining a record of the data sources, which in this study were the think-aloud protocol, interview transcripts and their translations, audio-recordings and written products. In the current study, the case study protocols involving the procedures and instructions for collecting the data from each participant were made clear throughout the study with the purpose of facilitating the replication of the current study by other researchers. Alterations or modifications made in the present study's methods, instruments and processes, such as the think-aloud protocol and the interviews, were explained and justified in the pilot study section, as suggested by Edge and Richards (1998).

3.19 Summary

In this chapter, I first outlined the study's design and its rationale and then described the data collection and analysis methods in detail. More specifically, I used four types of data collection method, think-aloud protocols, pre- and post-think-aloud interviews with students, and the students' written essays. I also explained the importance of providing think-aloud training for the students and checking the validity and reliability of the instruments in the pilot study. I then

explained how I analysed the data obtained from these four data collection instruments and illustrated my coding schemes with some examples from the data. All the data collection instruments and data analysis methods were explained in detail so that the trustworthiness of the study could be ensured. In the next chapter, I shall report the results of the study.

Chapter 4: Results

4. Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study and the answers to the research questions, which were designed to explore and investigate the reading processes which Saudi university EFL undergraduate students employed when performing an integrated reading-to-write task, the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring student writers, and the students' perceptions of reading in integrated reading-to-write tasks. To address the research questions, I present the results obtained from four data collection methods: think-aloud reports, two sets of interviews and students' essays. The results reported in the following sections are on the reading processes used by the participants in the reading-to-write task, the differences in the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring student writers, and the factors which affected the students' performance when undertaking the reading-to-write task.

4.1 The reading processes used by Saudi EFL undergraduate students in a reading-to-write task

The first research question of the study concerned the type of reading processes which Saudi university EFL undergraduate students used in a reading-to-write task. In order to answer this question, I obtained data from the students' think-aloud protocols and analysed them according to a pre-determined reading process taxonomy. That is, a taxonomy of linguistic reading processes of establishing propositional meaning, syntactic parsing, lexical access and word recognition and comprehension reading processes: goal setting, monitoring, inferencing, text structure and building a mental model. Table 4.1 presents the total occurrences and

percentages of the students' lower-level reading processes. The percentage of the reading processes were calculated by dividing the value by the total value and then multiplying the result by 100.

4.2 Lower-level reading processes

Table 4.1

Lower-Level Reading Processes' Frequency Counts

Linguistic processes	*Students' names and score levels (H-high scorer; L-low-scorer)*										*Totals*			
	Sami (H)	*Salman (H)*	*Hatim (H)*	*Bader (H)*	*Rami (H)*	*Khalid (L)*	*Jawad (L)*	*Kamal (L)*	*Ziad (L)*	*Muneer (L)*	*Total (N)*	*Total (%)*	*Total (N)*	*Total (%)*
Establishing propositional meaning	24	32	30	26	32	19	27	24	19	20	253	(50.00%)	499	(98.61%)
Syntactic parsing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	5	(0.98%)		
Lexical access	18	23	21	14	17	28	34	31	25	30	241	(47.62%)		
Word recognition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)		
Total (N)	**42**	**55**	**51**	**40**	**49**	**47**	**62**	**56**	**47**	**50**				
Total (%)	**(8.30%)**	**(10.86%)**	**(10.07%)**	**(7.90%)**	**(9.68%)**	**(9.28%)**	**(12.25%)**	**(11.06%)**	**(9.28%)**	**(9.88%)**				

The linguistic reading processes or lower-level reading processes were employed by both high- and low-scoring students and were utilised 499 times (98.61%). In detail, the propositional meaning processes were the most-used reading processes, which occurred 253 times (50%), the lexical access reading processes were also frequent, occurring 241 times (47.62%) and the least-used lower-level process was syntactic parsing, which occurred only five times (0.98%). The word recognition reading processes were not used during the reading of the texts. These lower-level reading processes are explained in detail in the following sections.

4.3.1 Propositional meaning reading processes

The most common reading processes were propositional meaning processes, which appeared 253 times (50%). For example, Salman and Rami, high-scoring students, were the most reliant on these reading processes as each one of them used them 32 times (6.32%), followed by Hatim, another high-scoring student, who used them 30 times (5.92%), Jawad, a low-scoring student, who used them 27 times (5.33%), Bader, a high-scoring student, who used them 26 times (5.13%), Sami, a high-scoring student, and Kamal, a low-scoring student, who each used them 24 times (4.74%), Muneer, a low-scoring student, who used them 20 times (3.95%), followed by Khalid and Ziad, both low-scoring students, who were the least reliant on these reading processes as they each used them 19 times (3.75%). Below are examples of the propositional meaning processes (the text in normal font is from the actual text, and the text in parenthesis is the participants' verbalised thoughts):

> It is problematic that English language teaching methodologies developed specifically in Britain, North America and Australasia, are implemented almost everywhere else. Almost all the internationally established literature on English language education is published in these countries, which at present, seem to have a virtual control on received methodology. (Okay, these countries have a problem with their English language teaching methods). (Sami, High scorer)

> However, it is not simply a Western/non-Western problem, because it is sometimes difficult to implement the methodology in continental Western Europe. Neither is it simply a developed/developing problem, because there are difficulties in implementing the methodology in developed countries such as Japan. (So, in

developed countries such as Japan, these methodologies were difficult to implement). (Salman, High scorer)

However, it is not simply a Western/non-Western problem, as it is sometimes difficult to implement the methodology in continental Western Europe. Neither is it simply a developed/developing problem, because there are difficulties in implementing the methodology in developed countries such as Japan. (So, it is not a problem of western or non-western countries or developed/developing countries because there are difficulties in implementing the methodology in a developed country like Japan). (Hatim, High scorer)

All pedagogy, like politics, is local. To ignore local needs is to ignore lived experiences. (It means pedagogy is local and based on experiences, and you should not ignore these experiences of education). (Bader, High scorer)

'Ideal' teaching-learning situations are based on experiences in North America or Australasia, which are very different from those not based in those contexts. (So, they are training teachers to learn new ways of teaching which are different from their 'normal' ways). (Rami, High scorer)

However, it is not simply a Western/non-Western problem, because it is sometimes difficult to implement the methodology in continental Western Europe. (One of the difficulties in the methods of teaching English was the differences in the Western and non-Western contexts). (Khalid, Low scorer)

It is problematic that English language teaching methodologies developed specifically in Britain, North America and Australasia, are implemented almost everywhere else. (They have taken these methodologies that they have created in Britain, North America and Australia, and applied them to countries all over the world). (Jawad, Low scorer)

That is to say, in order for language pedagogy to be relevant, it must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural environment. (Okay, so this pedagogy is connected to certain goals in a certain social environment). (Kamal, Low scorer)

> At its core, the idea of pedagogic particularity is consistent with the perspective of situational understanding, which claims that a meaningful pedagogy cannot be constructed without a holistic interpretation of particular situations. Additionally, it cannot be improved without a general improvement of those particular situations. (So, these educational methods cannot be improved unless they are considered together). (Ziad, Low scorer)

> Pedagogies that ignore lived experiences will ultimately prove to be "so disturbing for those affected by them - so threatening to their belief systems - that hostility is aroused and learning becomes impossible" (so, pedagogy is connected to social factors that have to be considered when using this educational system). (Muneer, Low scorer)

4.3.2 Lexical access reading processes

The lexical access reading processes were also common in the data, appearing 241 times (47.62%). In detail, Jawad, a low-scoring student, was the most dependent on these reading processes as he used them 34 times (6.71%). Kamal, another low-scoring student, used them 31 times (6.12%), followed by Muneer, a low-scoring student, who used them 30 times (5.92%), Khalid, a low-scoring student, who used them 28 times (5.53%), Ziad, a low-scoring student, who used them 25 times (4.94%), Salman, a high-scoring student, who used them 23 times (4.54%), Hatim, a high-scoring student, who used them 21 times (4.15%), Sami, a high-scoring student, who used them 18 times (3.55%), Rami, a high-scoring student, who used them 17 times (3.35%) and finally Bader, a high-scoring student, was the least dependent on these reading processes, who used them 14 times (2.76%). Some examples of the lexical access reading processes are the following (the text in normal font is from the actual text and the text in parenthesis is the participants' verbalised thoughts):

> Almost all the internationally established literature on English language education is published in these countries, which, at present, seem to virtually control received methodology. ('Received methodology') (using phone to translate). (Sami, High scorer)

On the one hand, there are curriculum developers or teachers trying to effect appropriate English language teaching with students who are foreign to them, ('curriculum' is a new word, I will find out what it means, also 'foreign'). (Salman, High scorer)

This literature argues that the transfer of methodologies from the first to the second in each race is problematic because of different attitudes towards education or lack of resources. ('Argues' means 'indicates', I think). (Hatim, High scorer)

On the one hand, there are curriculum developers or teachers, trying to effect appropriate English language teaching with students who are foreign to them, either at home or abroad. (Okay, I have now 'curriculum') (Using phone to translate), ('developers', I need to translate this word). ('Effect' and 'appropriate') (using phone to translate). (Bader, High scorer)

In this latter scenario, the question of what the ideal classroom situation is, or how far received classroom methodologies *are* the most appropriate, becomes very important. However, we have insufficient data about what really happens between people in the classroom. In addition, we lack this data for the wide range of social settings in which English language education is carried out around the world. (Here I have some words I need to translate: 'scenario', 'ideal settings', 'lack') (using phone to translate). (Rami, High scorer)

At its core, the idea of pedagogic particularity is consistent with the perspective of situational understanding, ('consistent', 'perspective') (using phone to translate), which claims that a meaningful pedagogy cannot be constructed without a holistic interpretation of particular situations, and that it cannot be improved without a general improvement of those particular situations. (What does 'holistic' mean? 'Constructed interpretation') (using phone to translate). (Khalid, Low scorer)

On the one hand, there are curriculum developers or teachers, ('curriculum'?) (using phone to translate), ('developers' also) (using phone to translate), trying to effect appropriate English language teaching, ('appropriate') (using phone to translate), with students who are foreign to them, either at home or abroad. ('Either at home or abroad') (using phone to translate). (Jawad, Low scorer)

> From Pakistan, Shamim (1996) reports that her attempt to introduce communicative language teaching into her classroom met with a great deal of resistance from her learners, making her “terribly exhausted” and leading her to realise that, by introducing this methodology, she was actually “creating psychological barriers to learning” (p. 109). (‘Resistance’, ‘terribly exhausted’) (using phone to translate). (Kamal, Low scorer)

> Current literature on the subject of appropriate methodologies often distinguishes between Western and non-Western countries, or between the developed and the developing world. (I need to translate ‘distinguishes’) (using phone to translate). (Ziad, Low scorer)

> However, it is not simply a Western/non-Western problem, because it is sometimes difficult to implement the methodology in continental Western Europe. Neither is it simply a developed/developing problem, because there are difficulties in implementing the methodology in developed countries such as Japan. (I will translate ‘implement’, ‘continental’). (using phone to translate). (Muneer, Low scorer)

4.3.3 Syntactic parsing and word recognition reading processes

Syntactic parsing was the least-used lower-level process, occurring only five times (0.98%), and no word recognition reading processes were applied during the reading of the texts. For example, Ziad, a low-scoring student, used the syntactic parsing reading processes three times, followed by Jawad and Kamal, both low-scoring students, who each used these reading processes once. Examples of linguistic syntactic parsing examples follow (the text in normal font is from the actual text and the text in parenthesis is the students’ verbalised thoughts):

> However, it is not simply a Western/non-Western problem, because it is sometimes difficult to implement the methodology in continental Western Europe. (It is ‘not’, okay ‘simply’, an adverb?) (Ziad, Low scorer)

> Pedagogies that ignore lived experiences will ultimately prove to be “so disturbing for those affected by them - so threatening to their belief systems - that hostility is

aroused and learning becomes impossible”, (‘pedagogies that ignored’, I think; it has to be past tense). (Ziad, Low scorer)

It is rather a problem of English language teaching methodologies developed specifically in Britain, North America and Australasia being implemented almost everywhere else. (‘It is rather the problem, English is known’). (Ziad, Low scorer)

From Pakistan, Shamim (1996) reports that her attempt to introduce communicative language teaching into her classroom met with a great deal of resistance from her learners, making her “terribly exhausted” and leading her to realise that, by introducing this methodology, she was actually “creating psychological barriers to learning” (p. 109). (The tense in the previous sentence is present simple, the verb ‘met’ is past tense?) (Jawad, Low scorer)

First and foremost, any post-method pedagogy has to be a pedagogy of particularity. That is to say, in order for language pedagogy to be relevant, it must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural environment. A pedagogy of particularity, then, is opposed to the notion that there can be one set of pedagogic aims and objectives realisable through one set of pedagogic principles and procedures. (‘A pedagogy of particularity’, oh, two nouns, how?) (Kamal, Low scorer)

4.3 Higher-level reading processes

This section presents a taxonomy of comprehension reading processes such as goal setting, monitoring, inferencing, text structure and building a mental model. Table 4.2 presents the total occurrences and percentages of the students’ higher-level reading processes.

Table 4.2

Higher-Level Reading Processes' Frequency Counts

Processes	*Students' names and score levels (H-high scorer; L-low-scorer)*										*Totals*		*Totals*	*Totals*
Comprehension processes	***Sami (H)***	***Salman (H)***	***Hatim (H)***	***Bader (H)***	***Rami (H)***	***Khalid (L)***	***Jawad (L)***	***Kamal (L)***	***Ziad (L)***	***Muneer (L)***	***Total (N)***	***Total (%)***	***Total (N)***	***Total (%)***
Goal setting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)	7	(1.38%)
Monitoring	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	(0.59%)		
Inferencing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)		
Creating a text-level structure	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	(0.79%)		
Building a mental model	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)		
Total (N)	**4**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**(1.38%)**		
Total (%)	**(0.79%)**	**(0.19%)**	**(0.19%)**	**(0.19%)**	**(0.00%)**	**(0.00%)**	**(0.00%)**	**(0.00%)**	**(0.00%)**	**(0.00%)**				

As Table 4.2 shows, the higher-level reading processes or comprehension reading processes were used by high-level scoring students only seven times (1.38%) but were not used by low-level scoring students. A detailed explanation of the reading processes used by the high-scoring students will be presented in the following sections. The goal setting, inferencing and building a mental model reading processes did not occur in the current study. The monitoring reading processes were the least-used reading processes, which occurred only three times (0.59%), followed by text-level structure processes which occurred four times only (0.79%).

4.2.1 Monitoring

The monitoring reading processes were the least used, occurring only three times and used only by Sami, a high-scoring student. Examples of the monitoring reading processes from Sami's think-aloud verbal report are presented below (the text in normal font is from the actual text and the text in parenthesis is the students' verbalised thoughts):

> These language educators are trying to make sense of methodologies developed in Britain, North America or Australasia for 'ideal' teaching-learning situations which are very different from their own. (So, this is about curriculum, this is unclear). (Sami, High scorer)

> First and foremost, any post-method pedagogy has to be a pedagogy of particularity. That is to say, language pedagogy, to be relevant, must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural environment. (I cannot understand this, it is complicated). (Sami, High scorer)

> From India, Tickoo (1996) points out that even locally initiated pedagogic innovations have failed because they merely attempted to combine them with the methodological framework inherited from abroad, without fully taking into account local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities. (This sentence is very complex and unclear). (Salman, High scorer)

4.2.2 Creating a text-level structure

The second least-used reading processes were text-level structure reading processes which occurred only four times (0.79%). They were used by Sami twice (0.39%), and once each by Hatim (0.19%) and Bader (0.19%). These were all high-scoring students. Examples of text-level structure reading processes used in the think-aloud verbal reports are presented below (the text in normal font is from the actual text and the text in parenthesis is the students' verbalised thoughts):

> On the one hand, (on the one hand; this is the first point of the argument), there are curriculum developers or teachers, trying to effect appropriate English language teaching with students who are foreign to them, either at home or abroad. They try to understand students' attitudes and ways of doing things, which, to the outsider, are often unclear. On the other hand, (yes, as I expected, this text is argumentative, this is the second point of the argument), there are teachers and curriculum developers who are native to the countries where they work, and the same nationality as the students they teach. (Sami, High scorer)

> That is to say, in order for language pedagogy to be relevant, it must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural environment. A pedagogy of particularity, then, is

> opposed to the notion that there can be one set of pedagogic aims and objectives realisable through one set of pedagogic principles and procedures. At its core, the idea of pedagogic particularity is consistent with the perspective of situational understanding, which claims that a meaningful pedagogy cannot be constructed without a holistic interpretation of particular situations and that it cannot be improved without a general improvement of those particular situations. (I think this text is not organised and very complex). (Hatim, High scorer)

> From Pakistan, Shamim (1996) reports that her attempt to introduce communicative language teaching into her classroom met with a great deal of resistance from her learners, making her "terribly exhausted" and leading her to realise that, by introducing this methodology, she was actually "creating psychological barriers to learning" (p. 109). From India, Tickoo (1996) points out that even locally initiated pedagogic innovations have failed because they merely attempted to combine them with the methodological framework inherited from abroad, without fully taking into account local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities. An interesting aspect of particularity is that it is not a thing out there to be searched and rescued. Nor is it an illusion that lives in the fantasy world of productive imagination, unreal and unrealized. From a pedagogic point of view, particularity is at once a goal and a process. (A lot of long sentences are presented in this text, I think it is not well-organised). (Bader, High scorer)

In the following section, I present and discuss the differences in the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring student writers.

4.4 The differences in the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring student writers

The second research question of the study investigated the differences between high- and low-scoring Saudi university EFL undergraduate students in the use of reading processes in the reading-to-write task. The reading processes which they employed were collected using think-aloud protocol verbal reports in order to answer this question. The differences in the use of lower-level reading processes by high- and low-scoring students, the differences in the use of higher-level reading processes by high- and low-scoring students, and finally, an overall picture of the differences in the reading processes used by high- and low-scoring students will be discussed in the following sections.

4.4.1 The differences in the use of lower-level reading processes by high- and low-scoring student writers

This section presents the differences in the use of lower-level reading processes between high- and low-scoring students in the reading-to-write task. Table 4.3 presents the total occurrences and percentages of the students' lower-level reading processes.

Table 4.3

The Frequency and Percentage of Lower-level Reading Processes Employed by High- and Low-Scoring Student Writers

Students' names and score levels (H: high scorer; L: low-scorer)	*Lower-level Processes Linguistic processes*					
	Establishing propositional meaning	*Syntactic parsing*	*Lexical access*	*Word recognition*	*Total (N)*	*Total (%)*
Sami (H)	24	2	18	0	42	(8.30%)
Salman (H)	32	1	23	0	55	(10.86%)
Hatim (H)	30	0	21	0	51	(10.07%)
Bader (H)	26	0	14	0	40	(7.90%)
Rami (H)	32	0	17	0	49	(9.68%)
Khalid (L)	19	0	28	0	47	(9.28%)
Jawad (L)	27	1	34	0	62	(12.25%)
Kamal (L)	24	1	31	0	56	(11.06%)
Ziad (L)	19	3	25	0	47	(9.28%)
Muneer (L)	20	0	30	0	50	(9.88%)
Total (N)	**253**	**5**	**241**	**0**		
Total (%)	**(50.00%)**	**(0.98%)**	**(47.62%)**	**(0.00%)**		

Table 4.3 shows that both high- and low-scoring students used the lower-level reading processes. For example, establishing propositional meaning reading processes occurred 253 times (50%) and Salman and Rami, both high-scoring students, were the most reliant on these reading processes, each using them 32 times (6.32%). Hatim, also a high-scoring student, was close to them as he used these reading processes 30 times (5.92%). Bader, a high-scoring student and Jawad, a low-scoring student, were very close in their usage for the establishing propositional meaning reading processes: Bader used them 26 times (5.13%) and Jawad used them 27 times (5.33%). They were followed by Sami, a high-scoring student, and Kamal, a low-scoring student, who both used them 24 times (4.74%), Muneer, a low-scoring student, used them 20 times (3.95%), Khalid and Ziad, both

low-scoring students, were the least reliant on them, each using them 19 times (3.75%).

Syntactic parsing reading processes were only used by low-scoring students five times (0.98%). Ziad was the most reliant on these lower-level reading processes, using them three times (0.59%), followed by Jawad and Kamal who each used them once (0.19%).

Lexical access reading processes were also common, occurring 241 times (47.62%). Jawad, a low-scoring student, was the most dependent on them, using them 34 times (6.71%). Kamal and Muneer, both low-level scoring students, were close to Jawad in their usage: Kamal used them 31 times (6.12%) and Muneer used them 30 times (5.92%). Khalid and Ziad, both low-scoring students, followed; Khalid used them 28 times (5.53%), and Ziad used them 25 times (4.94%), followed by Hatim, a high-scoring student, who used them 21 times (4.15%).

Sami and Rami, both high-scoring students, were less dependent on these reading processes: Sami used them 18 times (3.55%) and Rami used them 17 times (3.35%). The least reliant on these reading processes was Bader, a high- scoring student, who used them 14 times (2.76%). Moreover, none of the high- or low-scoring students used any word recognition reading processes.

4.4.2 The differences in the use of higher-level reading processes by high- and low-scoring student writers

This section presents the differences in the higher-level reading processes used by high- and low-scoring students in the reading-to-write task. Table 4.4 presents the total occurrences and percentages of the students’ higher-level reading processes.

Table 4.4
The frequency and Percentage of the Higher-Level Reading Processes Employed by High- and Low-Scoring Student Writers

Students' names and score levels (H: high scorer; L: low-scorer)	*Higher-level Processes Comprehension processes*						
	Goal setting	*Monitoring*	*Inferencing*	*Creating a text-level structure*	*Building a mental model*	*Total (N)*	*Total (%)*
Sami (H)	0	2	0	2	0	4	(0.79%)
Salman (H)	0	1	0	0	0	1	(0.19%)
Hatim (H)	0	0	0	1	0	1	(0.19%)
Bader (H)	0	0	0	1	0	1	(0.19%)
Rami (H)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)
Khalid (L)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)
Jawad (L)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)
Kamal (L)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)
Ziad (L)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)
Muneer (L)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.00%)
Total (N)	**0**	**3**	**0**	**4**	**0**		
Total (%)	**(0.00%)**	**(0.59%)**	**(0.00%)**	**(0.79%)**	**(0.00%)**		

Table 4.4 shows that although Sami, a high-scoring student, was the student who depended on higher-level reading processes the most, he only used them four times (0.79%). That is, he used monitoring reading processes and text-level structure twice each (0.39%). Salman, Hatim and Bader, all high-scoring students, each used text-level structure reading processes only once (0.19%). It is worth noting that the low-level scoring students did not use higher-level reading processes.

4.5 The reading processes employed by high- and low-scoring student writers

This section presents an overall picture of the differences between high- and low-scoring students in the use of the higher- and lower-level reading processes in the reading-to-write task. Table 4.5 presents the frequency and percentages of the processes used by the high- and low-scoring student writers.

Table 4.5

The Frequency and Percentage of the Reading Processes Employed by High- and Low-Scoring Student Writers

Processes	***Score level***			
Comprehension processes	***High scorers***		***Low scorers***	
	Total (N)	Total (%)	Total (N)	Total (%)
Goal setting	0	(0.00%)	0	(0.00%)
Monitoring	3	(0.59%)	0	(0.00%)
Inferencing	0	(0.00%)	0	(0.00%)
Creating a text-level structure	4	(0.79%)	0	(0.00%)
Building a mental model	0	(0.00%)	0	(0.00%)
Total (N)	**7**		**0**	
Total (%)	**(1.38%)**		**(0.00%)**	

Linguistic processes	***High scorers***		***Low scorers***	
	Total (N)	***Total (%)***	***Total (N)***	***Total (%)***
Establishing propositional meaning	144	(60.75%)	109	(41.60%)
Syntactic parsing	0	(0.00%)	5	(0.98%)
Lexical access	93	(39.24%)	148	(56.49%)
Word recognition	0	(0.00%)	0	(0.00%)
Total (N)	**237**		**262**	
Total (%)	**(47.49%)**		**(52.50%)**	

Table 4.5 shows that whereas some comprehension reading processes such as monitoring and the construction of text structure were used by some high-scoring students, these processes were used by the students very rarely (1.38%). The monitoring reading processes were used only three times (0.59%), twice by Sami (0.39%) and once by Salman (0.19%). Text-structure reading processes, on the other hand, were used only four times (0.79%); twice by Sami (0.39%) and once each by Hatim and Bader (0.19%). In addition, the low-scoring students did not employ higher-level reading processes at all.

On the other hand, Table 4.5 shows that the linguistic reading processes were used by both high- and low-scoring writers very frequently, with high-scoring

writers using them 237 times (47.49%), and low-scoring writers using them 262 times (52.50%). The establishment of propositional meaning was used most by both high- and low-scoring students at 253 times (50%), although it was the high-scoring students who relied on these processes the most as they used them 144 times whereas the low-scoring students used them109 times (60.75% and 41.60% respectively). For example, high-scoring students Salman and Rami were the most reliant on these reading processes, each using them 32 times (6.32%), followed by Hatim, a high-scoring student, who used them 30 times (5.92%), Jawad, a low-scoring student, who used them 27 times (5.33%), Bader, a high-scoring student, who used them 26 times (5.13%) and Sami, a high-scoring student who used them 24 times (3.75%).

The second most frequently used reading process was lexical access, which was used 241 times (47.62%), although it was the low-scoring students who relied on this process the most as they used it 148 times and the high-scoring students used it 93 times (56.49% and 39.24% respectively).

In detail, Jawad, a low-scoring student, was the most reliant on these reading processes, employing them 34 times (6.71%). Kamal, a low-performing student, used them 31 times (6.12%), followed by Muneer, a low-performing student, who used them 30 times (5.92%), Khalid, a low-performing student, who used them 28 times (5.53%), Ziad, a low-performing student, who used them 25 times (4.94%), Salman, a high-performing student, who used them 23 times (4.54%), Hatim, a high-achieving student, who used them 21 times (4.15%), Sami, a high-achieving student who used them 18 times (3.55%), Rami, a high-achieving student who used them 17 times (3.35%), and finally Bader, a high-achieving

student, who was the least reliant on these reading processes, using them 14 times (2.76%). In addition, none of the high- or low-scoring students used any word recognition reading processes.

These results show that both high- and low-scoring student writers used lower-level reading processes most of the time. However, in addition to attempting to build propositional meanings of the text, the low-scoring student writers were also preoccupied with understanding the meaning of separate words. This is the only substantial difference between the reading processes of high- and low-scoring student writers found in the study.

4.6 Factors affecting students' reading and writing performance

The third research question investigated the factors affecting the Saudi university EFL undergraduate students' reading and writing performance in an integrated reading-to-write task. In order to answer this question, I obtained data from the students' pre- and post-protocol interviews and analysed them using the thematic analysis approach. The factors affecting the students' performance were their reading perceptions, their writing perceptions and their lack of understanding of the purpose of the reading-to-write task.

4.6.1 Students' perceptions about reading

One factor which affected the students' performance in the reading-to-write task was their perceptions about reading. This factor might have contributed to their focus on lower-level reading processes, and not utilising their higher-level reading processes. The students' perceptions about reading were:

- reading is the level of understanding of a text;
- a good reader pronounces words accurately;
- a good reader is a good summariser;
- a good reader reads rapidly;
- a good reader has a large vocabulary.

The students' reading perceptions and their total occurrences are presented in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6
Students' Perceptions of Reading and their Total Occurrences

Sub-themes	***Total of responses (H: high-scorers; L: low-scorers)***
Reading is understanding of a text	10 (H -5; L-5)
A good reader pronounces words accurately	3 (H-2; L-1)
A good reader is a good summariser	5 (H-4; L-1)
A good reader reads rapidly	5 (H-2; L-4)
A good reader has a lot of vocabulary	7 (H-2; L-5)

In the pre-protocol interviews, when students were asked 'What is reading?', one of the prevailing answers that both low and high-scoring students provided was that reading is an understanding of a text. These are some of their answers.

Reading is a capsule of understanding that moves from the text to my mind. (Sami, High scorer)

Reading means understanding the text, without understanding, there is no reading. (Muneer, Low scorer)

Students also associated a good reader with someone who pronounces words accurately. These are some of their responses:

"Clarity *and pronunciation are very important in reading (*Researcher: *Why are they important?) Stuttering or bad pronunciation causes ambiguity in the meaning".* (Sami, High scorer)

A good reader is "a reader who reads with accurate pronunciation". (Ziad, Low scorer)

Students thought that a good reader is a good summariser. Students replied that a good reader is one who is competent in summarising texts. These were some of their responses:

A good reader is "*a reader who summarises reading texts properly and grasps the main ideas in a text".* (Bader, High scorer)

A good reader is "*a reader who understands and summarises reading texts".* (Kamal, Low scorer)

Students also considered a good reader as someone who reads rapidly. A good reader, according to both high and low-scoring students, was someone who reads quickly. These were some of their responses:

A good reader is "*a reader who reads quickly and understands the text".* (Salman,

High scorer)

A good reader is "*a reader who reads quickly and understands the text".* (Jawad, Low scorer)

The students considered a good reader as someone who has a lot of vocabulary. According to both high and low-scoring students, a good reader is someone who has a large vocabulary. In the pre-protocol interviews, the students were asked, 'What are the features of a good reader in your studies? Here are some examples of their responses:

A good reader is "*a reader who does not use a dictionary".* Researcher: *What do you mean?* Participant: *A reader who has a huge amount of vocabulary.* (Bader, High scorer)

A good reader is "*a reader who has a lot of vocabulary as it is the most important factor in learning a language.* (Muneer, Low scorer)

In short, both high and low-scoring participants viewed good reading as an understanding of a text, and good readers as those who can pronounce words accurately, summarise a text, read rapidly and have a large vocabulary.

The students' perceptions about reading seem to be in-line with their reading practices. Both high and low-scoring students emphasised reading as a process involving accuracy and vocabulary. It was only a few high-scoring students who also mentioned reading as summarising. Reading as comprehension was mentioned by both high and low-scoring students, although their perceptions of

comprehension were not clearly established. They could have meant the comprehension of individual words, or sentences. In a nutshell, therefore, their perceptions about reading closely matched their reading processes at a lower level.

4.7 Students' perceptions about writing

The students' perceptions about writing were the second factor which influenced their performance in the reading-to-write task. Their writing perceptions might have contributed to their emphasis on lower-level reading processes and not employing the higher-level reading processes. The students' perceptions about writing were:

- writing is difficult,
- writing is about grammar,
- writing is about correct spelling,
- writing is good handwriting,
- a good writer has a lot of vocabulary.

The students' writing perceptions, and the total occurrences of these views, are presented in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7
Students' Perceptions of Writing and their Total Occurrences

Sub-themes	***Total of responses (H: high-scorers; L: low-scorers)***
Writing is difficult	3 (H-1; L-2)
Writing is about grammar Writing is about correct spelling	9 (H-4; L-5)
Writing is good handwriting	3 (H-2; L-1)
A good writer has a lot of vocabulary	6 (H-2; L-4)

Writing for students was seen as a difficult activity, and this difficulty was mostly associated with grammar and spelling. These are some of the students' responses:

"*It was difficult to write at the beginning and is still difficult now. I think writing is not an easy thing, so I started memorising spelling and grammar and writing good grammar and spelling and I get good marks".* (Sami, High scorer)

*"Writing is a difficult process, but I feel that I am much better now. My teachers helped me in improving my English writing" (*Researcher: *How did they help you?) They helped me write correct spelling and [no] grammatical mistakes".* (Khalid, Low scorer)

Students also considered grammar and correct spelling to be important aspects of writing. These are some of their responses:

A good writer is someone who can write well, despite the fact that "*writing is*

tricky, in the sense that it requires the memorisation of words' spelling, as well as the use of proper grammar". (Bader, High scorer)

"*Good writing, well, just good spelling, punctuation and grammar, I think they are essential in writing".* (Muneer, Low scorer)

Students also viewed successful writing as someone having good handwriting. The students thought of good handwriting as an essential aspect of writing. In order to discover more about the students' thoughts on writing, they were asked in the pre-protocol interviews about their perceptions on the subject. These are some of their responses:

A good writer is "*a writer who writes correct spelling, grammar and has good handwriting".* (Bader, High scorer)

"*It is important to write correct spelling, grammar to get good grades. Also, good handwriting makes it look better and teachers give marks for that".* (Hatim, High scorer)

Both high and low-scoring students thought of a good writer as someone who has a large vocabulary. The students were asked in pre-protocol interviews about their perceptions of the aspects of a good writer. Here are some of their responses:

"*A good writer is one who can use a huge amount of vocabulary to improve his writing".* (Hatim, High scorer)

A good writer is "*a writer who uses plenty of words in his writings".* (Ziad, Low scorer)

In a nutshell, the students' perceptions about writing showed that both high and low-scoring participants viewed writing as a difficult activity, and thought that it was about correct grammar, spelling, and good handwriting. The examples given above show that their understanding of writing was that it is about those basic skills. The post-protocol interviews also revealed that both the high and low-scoring participants rated good grammar and spelling highly. Although the post-protocol interviews did not focus on the students' perceptions of reading or writing, their responses included references to grammar and spelling.

For example:

"*I focused on grammar and spelling when writing".* (Rami, High scorer)

"*I started by reading and understanding the texts, then writing correct spelling and grammar".* (Ziad, Low scorer)

The students' perceptions are in-line with their practices that were identified in the think-aloud protocols; that is, perceiving reading and writing as mostly language focus activities, students were also focusing on linguistic and comprehension processes in their think-aloud reading.

4.8 Missing the purpose of the reading-to-write task

In addition to the role of the students' reading and writing perceptions in their reading-to-write task performance, their failure to consider the aim of the task might have also had an impact on their performance in the reading-to-write task. That is, the reason for the students' focus on lower-level reading processes is that they had missed the reading purpose. The observation of their performance of the

task and their reading and writing perceptions in the post-protocol interviews revealed that the students did not consider a reading purpose when undertaking the task. That is, the analysis of the way in which the students started the task and how many of them considered the task instructions before reading the text established that none of them had read the task instructions prior to the task. Also, in the post-protocol interviews, none of the students mentioned the task instructions. For instance,

"*I started by reading the two passages, analysing them and trying to understand them, and then writing".* (Sami, High scorer)

"In the beginning, I tried to focus on understanding the ideas and translating the difficult words ... I tried to use the dictionary because some words were difficult". (Khalid, Low scorer)

As these results show, all of the students, whatever their scoring level, missed the task purpose and did not consider the task instructions.

4.9 Summary

This chapter presented the reading for writing processes used by high and low-scoring students in the reading-to-write task. The higher-level reading processes were: goal setting, monitoring, inferencing, creating a text-level structure and building a mental model. The lower-level reading processes were: establishing propositional meaning, syntactic parsing, lexical access and word recognition. This chapter has also presented the students' reading and writing perceptions, and compared them with their reading and writing practices. The results showed that

both the high- and the low-scoring participants relied on the lower-level reading processes, such as establishing propositional meaning and lexical access, the most and did not utilise comprehension reading processes at all, with the exception of only a few high-scoring students (such as Sami and Salman). The high-scoring students did, however, consider the propositional meaning substantially more times than the low-scoring students, and the low-scoring students focused on the meaning of vocabulary more frequently than the high-scoring students.

This chapter also presented the factors which affected the students' performance in the reading-to-write task, which were their perceptions about reading, their perceptions about writing, and their lack of understanding of the aim of the task. The results showed that both high- and low-scoring students viewed reading as understanding the text, and viewed a good reader as one who pronounces words accurately, who is a good summariser, who reads rapidly, and who has a large vocabulary. They also viewed writing as a difficult activity, believing that it is about grammar, correct spelling and good handwriting. They also viewed a good writer as one who has a large vocabulary. The students' perceptions of reading and writing were in-line with their reading practices, as they focused on accuracy and vocabulary in reading and basic skills in writing such as grammar, spelling, and good handwriting. In addition, their reading and writing perceptions showed that they did not consider a reading purpose while conducting the reading-to-write task.

The students' reading for writing processes used in the reading-to-write task and the factors which affected their performance in that task will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 5: Discussion

5. Introduction

The current study was designed to investigate the reading processes employed by Saudi EFL students when conducting integrated reading-to-write academic tasks. A cognitive reading theory was adopted to understand reading, since understanding reading from the cognitive viewpoint is regarded as an essential base of knowledge for students to be successful in their academic studies (Raphael et al., 2014; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Reading from a cognitive perspective is defined as a mix of text input, appropriate cognitive processes and background knowledge (Grabe, 2009). To put it another way, reading is considered to be made up of a number of different processes and knowledge bases which are organised in diverse ways. Depending on their reading goals, readers can read texts in a variety of ways and combinations of ways (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007; Kuzborska, 2019).

In the following sections, I discuss the meaning, importance, and relevance of the results of the current study as well as evaluating them and then compare them with the results of previous research. I first discuss the reading processes used by Saudi EFL undergraduate students obtained from the think-aloud verbal reports and then consider the lack of any relationship between reading and writing found in this study. Finally, the students' reading and writing perceptions and how they might have affected their reading-to-write task will be discussed.

5.1 The reading processes used by high- and low-scoring writers

The study investigated the reading processes which Saudi EFL undergraduate students used when undertaking reading-to-write tasks and compared the differences between high- and low-scoring students in their use of reading processes. The data obtained from the think-aloud verbal reports showed that higher-level reading processes (comprehension reading processes) were almost entirely absent from the students' reading. Instead, all the students, both the high- and low-scoring writers, predominantly employed lower-level reading processes (linguistic reading processes). The few higher-level reading processes which only high-scoring students (Sami, Salman, Hatim and Bader) used were monitoring and text structure, and the most-used lower-level reading processes used by all the students were propositional meaning formation, lexical access and syntactic parsing. Propositional meaning was however used by high-scoring writers more times than low-scoring writers, whereas lexical access was predominantly used by the low-scoring student writers.

The results of the study confirmed those of previous research on reading-to-write performance. For instance, Esmaeili (2002) discovered that his student participants, both high and low scorers, relied heavily on lower-level reading processes such as recalling words and phrases as meaning units from the reading text, which improved their writing performance. Similarly, Shi (2004) found that both high- and low-scoring participants relied significantly on lower-level reading processes such as borrowing words and phrases from the source reading texts. In the same vein, Cumming *et al*. (2006) found that both high- and low-scoring writers relied on lower-level reading processes such as borrowing words and phrases from

the reading texts. That is, rather than paraphrasing, the more proficient writers in the reading-to-write task summarised the majority of the substantive topics expressed in the source reading texts using words and phrases verbatim from the source materials. The researchers added that the students used various syntactic structures and lexical access reading processes. Similarly, Plakans (2008) reported that some high- and low-scoring participants in her study used lower-level reading processes significantly when summarising the reading texts, such as borrowing ideas, lexical access and syntactic parsing.

In the Middle Eastern context, in the United Arab Emirates in particular, Gebril and Plakans (2009) carried out a study in an English-language preparation course, and Plakans and Gebril (2012) conducted a study in a naturalistic situation, and both made the same findings as the current study that Arab L2 students relied on lower-level reading processes. For instance, Gebril and Plakans (2009) found that all the participants, both high and low scorers, used the source reading materials to generate ideas and construct viewpoints; when engaged in the reading-to-write task, they borrowed words and phrases from the reading texts. Similarly, Plakans and Gebril (2012) found that both high- and low-scoring Arab L2 learners relied significantly on the source reading texts by borrowing terms and phrases from them in their own writings. They added that the students depended on summarising the texts and re-reading most of the time, indicating that they depended heavily on the reading materials. In addition, in the Saudi context, Alhujaylan (2020) carried out a study in a naturalistic context and found that the participants in both the control and the experimental groups tended to rely on lower-level reading processes significantly, such as lexical access and syntactic parsing, which was in line with the results of the current study.

Moreover, the results of the current study partially agreed with those of some previous research on reading-to-write performance. For example, Plakans (2009), Plakans and Gebril (2013), Zhang (2013) and Zhao and Hirvela (2015) found that their participants in general relied heavily on lower-level reading processes such as lexical access, syntactic parsing and borrowing terms and phrases from the source texts. These processes were mostly common among low-scoring participants; for example, Zhang (2013) found that the control group relied on lower-level reading processes of borrowing words and phrases from the source texts, whereas the experimental group was able to reduce the amount of borrowing from the source texts by considering the task's goal, planning throughout the task and producing well-written texts. Along similar lines, Zhao and Hirvela (2015) found that their L2 low-scoring participants relied significantly on lower-level reading processes such as decoding and borrowing words and phrases from the source text.

On the other hand, the results of the current study do not support those of some previous research investigating students' reading-to-write performance. For example, in contrast to the findings of this study, Plakans (2009) found that goal setting, global and mining processes were a feature of high-scoring students. Similarly, Zhao and Hirvela (2015) found that text structure knowledge and rhetorical reading processes (considering the reader's and writer's rhetorical contexts, their stance and their purposes of reading and writing such a text) were mostly used by their L1 high-scoring students.

Based on the current study's results which are in conformity with many previous studies (Alhujaylan, 2020; Cumming *et al.*, 2006; Esmaeili, 2002; Gebril

and Plakans, 2009; Plakans, 2008; Plakans and Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004), and partially in conformity with some other studies (Plakans, 2009, Plakans and Gebril, 2013; Zhang, 2013; Zhao and Hirvela, 2015), several teaching implications are provided. These are intended for L2 teachers in general and Saudi EFL teachers (in particular in chapter 6 section 6.1), such as teaching reading in connection with writing, designing simplified teaching materials to help students improve their reading processes, focusing on teaching various reading processes such as goal setting, inferencing, monitoring, creating text-level structure, and building a mental model.

5.2 The role of reading in reading-to-write tasks

According to the study's results, the role of reading in writing remains unclear. It could be expected that good use of higher-level reading processes would be made by high-scoring students to perform a task successfully, but this was not the case in this study. Instead, the results show that the formation of propositional meaning rather than the predominant consideration of individual words could have contributed to the writing task. High-scoring students were less concerned about the meaning of individual words and paid more attention to the meaning of propositions, and this could have helped them to write their essays more successfully.

The results of the current study on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks were partially in conformity with the findings of Esmaeili (2002), Cumming *et al*. (2006), Gebril and Plakans (2009) and Plakans (2008), whose studies were all conducted in English-language preparation courses. They found that high-scoring participants tended to rely more on propositional meaning reading

processes than individual words. For example, Esmaeili (2002) investigated the connection between reading and integrated writing and found that high-scoring participants relied significantly on recalling content (semantic meaning units) from the reading text and used them in their writing. Similarly, Cumming *et al*. (2006) examined the writing features of the reading-to-write task and found that high-scoring writers relied on lower-level reading processes such as borrowing phrases from the reading texts. The researchers reported that even in exceptionally successful compositions, phrases were borrowed from the source reading text, such as phrases which are often common in everyday language (for example, 'at the same time'), making textual borrowing quite common in the high-scoring students' writings. That is, instead of paraphrasing, high-scoring writers in the reading-to-write task summarised the bulk of the substantive subjects presented in the source reading texts using phrases verbatim from the source materials. Similarly, Gebril and Plakans (2009) looked into the traits of writing which emerged from integrated reading-writing tasks as well as the methods which the writers used to achieve them. They found that high-scoring Arab participants relied on the source texts when writing; that is, they used phrases from the reading texts to construct their arguments and elaborated on their ideas when performing the reading-to-write task. Plakans (2008) examined the reading effect on reading-to-write performance and found that high-scoring students had missed the reading purpose and relied heavily on the source materials, borrowing phrases when summarising the reading texts in their own writing.

Furthermore, the results of the current study also agree with the results of the studies conducted in naturalistic contexts (Alhujaylan, 2020; Shi, 2004; Plakans & Gebril, 2012). Those studies found that high-scoring students relied on

propositional meaning rather than lexical access. For instance, Shi (2004) examined the role of reading in reading-to-write performance and discovered that high-scoring participants relied on borrowing words and phrases as meaning units, which helped them in their writing. Similarly, Plakans and Gebril (2012) looked at how Arab undergraduate students used sources in their writing, how they helped their writing performance, and how language proficiency affected their synthesis essays and found that high-scoring students borrowed terminology and phrases from the source reading texts. They also reported that high-scoring students spent the majority of their time summarising and re-reading the texts, implying that they primarily relied on the reading materials in their essays. In addition, Alhujaylan (2020) explored how the writing performance and the total writing scores of EFL Saudi graduate students differed when the writing process was thematically related to a reading passage compared with a paper on a given topic with no or little reading practice. The findings showed that high-scoring participants in the experimental group relied on lower-level reading processes significantly, such as borrowing words and phrases from the source texts, which helped them to elaborate on them in their essays.

These results demonstrate that L2 students in general and Saudi EFL students in particular, tend to rely heavily on lower-level reading processes such as grammar and vocabulary when conducting reading-to-write tasks, and do not use higher level-reading processes such as goal setting, inferencing and monitoring. Such practices can be due to some internal or individual factors, such as language proficiency, lack of motivation and anxiety, as well as external factors or socio-cultural factors such as reading and writing teaching methods at the school and

university levels and the use of L1 Arabic as a medium of instruction. These factors are discussed in detail in the next section.

5.3 Factors affecting the students' reading and writing performance

As the study's results showed, the participants did not take advantage of many higher-level reading processes, which could therefore explain why they missed the reading purpose. That is, the participants did not use higher-level reading processes effectively as they used them only a few times. However, as the research on reading suggests, any reading requires the use of both higher- and lower-level reading processes, and that the use of particular processes depends on the reading purpose (Alhujaylan, 2020; Al-Omrani, 2014; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; 2013; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). In this study, the reading was designed for writing purposes, and although lower-level reading processes were important for completing the task, the use of higher-level reading processes, such as background knowledge activation, the use of different types of inferences, text structure formation, or goal setting were paramount for successfully completing the task. The students' reliance on lower-level reading processes in the current study might have been caused by their beliefs about reading and writing, and this will be discussed in the next section.

5.3.1 Reading and writing perceptions in reading-to-write tasks

The students in the current study were found to be reading and writing without considering the purpose of the task and were predominantly focused on understanding the text and the translation of new words. In contrast, native speakers and ESL participants in previous studies (Plakans, 2009; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015)

used higher-level reading processes such as global, mining and rhetorical reading processes, which might have been caused by their beliefs about reading and writing. These reading processes are significant in purposeful reading tasks such as reading for writing as they enable readers to generate meaning from the writers' hints in order to understand the writers' intentions (Tierney & Pearson, 1983). The reader and the writer are in negotiation during this process, and a phrase or term does not appear out of nowhere, but rather is part of a wider dialogue or ongoing discourse (Bakhtins, 1981; 1984).

The current study investigated the participating students' reading and writing perceptions to provide further explanations for the reading processes which they had used during the reading-to-write task. The results showed that they had mostly viewed reading from a linguistic perspective and had focused on the translation of unknown words. Their perceptions of good readers were those who read rapidly, have a huge amount of vocabulary and can comprehend and summarise a text. These students' perceptions were also in line with their reading processes, as they tended to focus on linguistic processes in their performance of the task. For example, in accordance with their belief that reading is translating words and understanding sentences was their reliance on propositional meaning formation and lexical access. In terms of the students' perceptions about writing, they held a similar view. For them, writing was a complicated activity requiring correct grammar, spelling, punctuation and good handwriting. Such beliefs about writing might have also contributed to their focus on individual words and sentences in reading and the transfer of this knowledge to their writing.

The results of the current study are in line with those of previous research into students' beliefs about reading (Aunario, 2004; Fader, 1976; Kara-Soteriou, 2007; Logan & Johnston, 2009; McNeil, 1976). Investigating young learners, those studies found that beliefs play an important role in reading performance. Beliefs guide readers' reading behaviour and can adversely affect their reading comprehension outcome. For example, McNeil (1976) was particularly interested in Fader's (1976) notion regarding his 'Hooked on Books' or 'English in Every Classroom' programme, which argued that students might learn to enjoy reading and writing. McNeil looked at what children thought about reading and came to the conclusion that pleasure reading could benefit young learners. The findings showed that children with higher self-esteem outperformed those with lower self-esteem in reading and writing.

Similarly, Aunario (2004) examined the relationship between reading attitudes and short story scores. She showed that differences in attitudes toward reading between younger and older elementary students affected their reading performance and that there was a significant relationship between students' beliefs and their reading comprehension. In other words, students with positive beliefs towards reading outperformed those with negative beliefs. In the same vein, Kara-Soteriou (2007) examined the role of positive and negative beliefs on reading comprehension and discovered that high-scoring readers held positive beliefs about reading which enabled them to consider the reading purpose and the text's type when reading, whilst low-scoring readers were found to have negative beliefs about reading, which affected their reading comprehension as they were not able to consider the reading purpose or identify the text's type or ideas. Logan and Johnston (2009) also investigated students' attitudes about reading and found that

reading comprehension ability was affected by the participants' reading beliefs. That is, the students were found to have higher reading comprehension scores, to read more often and to have a more positive attitude towards reading.

In addition, using adult learners to investigate the role of students' beliefs on reading comprehension, Schraw (2000) and Alshamrani, (2003) found that the students' beliefs affected their reading and writing performance. For example, Schraw (2000) investigated the function of transmission and transaction beliefs in undergraduates' production of meaning from a narrative text and found that transaction beliefs influenced the readers' responses favourably, particularly in the form of thematic and critical reactions, as well as their overall interpretation. Transmission beliefs, on the other hand, were unrelated to any measure of text comprehension.

In the Saudi EFL context, Alshamrani (2003) investigated nine EFL undergraduate students' ideas and attitudes about the role of extensive reading on writing in qualitative research. The participants were classified as 'low advanced' and 'advanced' after completing an extensive course in a three-month ESL programme called Reading Club. The researcher found that the students held positive attitudes and beliefs towards the role of extensive reading on writing, indicating that extensive reading had helped them to improve their writing performance. The students' improvement was shown in their use of more vocabulary (the lexical access reading processes) and grammar, which was in line with the views about reading and writing expressed by the participants in the current study.

In addition, the results of the current study agreed with those of previous studies of students' beliefs about writing (Fageeh, 2003; Lavelle, 1993; Mateos *et al*., 2011; Palmquist & Young, 1992; White & Bruning, 2005), which found that students' beliefs about writing affected their writing performance by affecting their confidence and performance when writing. For example, Palmquist and Young (1992) investigated whether writing is an innate ability which some individuals have and others do not and found that undergraduate students who felt that writing was an intrinsic ability were less confident in their ability to become effective writers and believed that their writing skills were underestimated. Lavelle (1993) looked at students' emotional and personal engagement as well as considering the audience when writing. He classified the students' engagement with writing tasks into two levels: deep and surface. He found that students who engaged deeply with writing performed better and considered the audience, whilst surface-level writers were less engaged in their writing, used fewer writing processes, and were less aware of their audience and the writing process. Similarly, two studies by Mateos *et al*. (2010) and White & Bruning (2005) examined the impact of students' reading beliefs (transaction and transmission) on their writing and found that writers with strong transaction views earned substantially higher grades in writing, whereas students with strong transmission beliefs received significantly worse grades.

In the Saudi EFL context, Fageeh (2003) investigated Saudi EFL students' beliefs about their writing challenges, linguistic difficulties, composing processes and awareness of the rhetorical contrasts between English and Arabic and found that their beliefs about writing had a substantial impact on their writing abilities. That is, the students believed that writing is solely about basic writing processes such as grammar and spelling and that was displayed in their written products.

These previous results confirmed that the students' perceptions play a significant role in their performance in reading and writing activities. The participants in the current study relied heavily on lower-level reading processes, and did not take advantage of higher-level reading processes. This was due to their beliefs about reading and writing, as they believed that reading was merely about grammar, vocabulary, reading rapidly, understanding and summarising a text, while writing was merely about spelling, punctuations, and good handwriting.

In addition, language proficiency level (Aunario, 2004; Bruning, 2005; Fageeh, 2003; Mateos *et al.*, 2011; White & Kara-Soteriou, 2007) and gender (Aunario, 2004; Logan & Johnston, 2009) were found to be significant factors which might affect students' reading and writing performance. In the Saudi context, these factors have also been reported as significant factors affecting Saudi students' reading and writing performance (Al-Khairy, 2013; Al-Nujaidi, 2003; Alrabai, 2014; Alrabai, 2016; Alrahaili, 2013; Alrashidi & Phan, 2015; Elyas & Picard, 2010; Ismail, 2015; Rahman & Alhaisoni, 2013).

The Saudi students' beliefs in reading and writing in the current study might also explain why they failed to consider the reading purpose because focusing solely on the lower-level reading and writing processes would not enable them to consider the reading purpose. Moreover, the students' performance and perceptions might have been caused and shaped by some individual factors such as language proficiency, lack of motivation and anxiety; instructional factors such as reading and writing teaching methods at school and university levels; and socio-cultural factors such as the use of L1 Arabic as a medium of instruction. These factors will

be discussed, as well as teaching implications for L2 teachers (especially Saudi reading and writing teachers) in the following sections.

5.3.2 The impact of language proficiency on reading and writing performance

Previous research in the Saudi context has shown that Saudi EFL students are frequently characterised as having a low English language proficiency level, which could be one of the major factors affecting their reading and writing performance (Alghammas, 2020; Al-Khairy, 2013; Alrabai, 2014a; 2014b; 2016; Alrashidi & Phan, 2015). Most Saudi high-school graduates have a low level of English proficiency, so they have a difficult time completing schoolwork or connecting with their peers and teachers in their first year of university (Alghammas, 2020; Al-Khairy, 2013). Ansari (2012) stated that more than half of Saudi university students are unable to read or write in English. This depressing figure highlights a substantial impediment to learners' academic performance, and some teachers think that teaching reading and writing is difficult for students (Alghammas, 2020). This is because teachers in English departments who are responsible for completing a specified syllabus might find it difficult to begin with their students from scratch, which might therefore affect the learning process (Alghammas, 2020).

In addition, in regard to the use of reading and writing processes in reading-to-write tasks, Al-Omrani (2014) reported that Saudi L2 students tended to focus on lower-level reading and writing processes because of their poor English language proficiency level. That was in line with the current study's results, which showed that both high- and low-scoring students depended primarily on lower-level reading processes. Al-Omrani's (2014) conclusion was confirmed by

Alhujaylan's (2020) findings. That is, although the researcher reported progress in the experimental group students' performance (high-scoring participants), after the integrated teaching intervention the progress was mainly in grammar and vocabulary, which are considered lower-level reading and writing processes.

Previous research on the role of language proficiency on reading and writing performance (Abbott *et al*., 2010; Carrell & Connor, 1991; Cumming *et al*., 1989; 2005; Graber-Wilson, 1991; Kennedy, 1985; Llach, 2010; Risemberg, 1996) found that students' language proficiency level has a significant effect on their reading and writing performance, which confirms the findings in the Saudi context. Loban (1963), for example, studied students from third to sixth grade and found a positive relationship between reading and writing performance and their language proficiency level. This relationship increased when students' reading and writing skills improved in the higher grades, according to the findings of that study. In a longitudinal study, Abbott *et al*. (2010) tracked two young learners from first to fifth and third to seventh school grades for four years and found a substantial link between their reading and writing performance and their language proficiency level.

Similarly, Kennedy (1985) examined adult readers' deliberate behaviours when writing from sources, to determine whether these behaviours clustered at recognisable stages in the reading-writing process, and whether the processes were the same for able and less able readers. It was found that high-scoring students outperformed low-scoring students in the writing task, and that reading ability had an effect on the quantity of notes taken and the depth of the notes' content. Similarly, Cumming *et al.* (1989) studied the mental processes of fourteen adult

Anglophone students of French who completed reading and summarising tasks and found that the students employed the same proportion of higher-order problem-solving skills when writing and reading. These procedures differed depending on the students' competency level and were linked to the quality of the written summaries which they produced. Risemberg (1996) investigated the impact of students' reading and writing proficiency levels on the organising and transforming processes which they engaged in while undertaking reading and writing tasks. The level of reading and writing proficiency was found to have an impact on the use of problem-solving behaviours and the integration of knowledge at many levels (for example, verbatim, propositional). Cumming *et al.* (2005) found differences in scores and source usage owing to language ability level. They reported that mid-level proficiency writers were more likely to paraphrase and plagiarise than high- and low-level proficiency writers, although the least skilled writers summarised, paraphrased and copied less than all the other competence levels.

Previous research in the L2 context has consistently shown that language proficiency level influences students' reading and writing performance (Carrell & Connor, 1991; Carson *et al.*, 1990; Graber-Wilson, 1991; Llach, 2010; Shanahan, 1984). Shanahan (1984) found a significant connection between reading and writing performance and language proficiency among second- and fifth-grade ESL children in terms of grade and competency levels. The findings showed that there were differences in such connections between low- and high-level ESL students, implying that language competence level influenced their reading and writing performance. Similarly, Carson *et al.* (1990) found that ESL students' performance in reading and writing activities was influenced by their reading and writing proficiency levels. Llach (2010) looked into the role of language proficiency in the

relationship between reading and writing abilities, as well as the importance of this connection. The study focused on elementary school Spanish EFL pupils who spoke English at a low to low-intermediate level. There was a substantial association between low-proficiency L2 learners' reading and writing abilities, especially for low-intermediate proficiency learners.

Supporting Llach's (2010) study, which focused primarily on low to low-intermediate young L2 learners, studies with high-proficiency adult L2 learners had previously been undertaken (Carrell & Connor, 1991; Graber-Wilson, 1991). Graber-Wilson (1991) studied intermediate to advanced ESL university students and found that their reading and writing language proficiency and their reading and writing performance had a substantial positive association. Carrell and Connor (1991) looked at the link between intermediate ESL undergraduate learners' reading and writing abilities in both persuasive and descriptive genres by rating their work holistically using the Toulmin approach to writing content analysis. They found a strong link between reading and writing with a high correlation between reading competence and the qualitative writing evaluation using the Toulmin model.

In addition, previous studies on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks also confirm the findings in the Saudi context as they have shown that language proficiency level plays an important role in the performance of reading-to-write tasks (Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans, 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). Students with high English language proficiency levels outperformed those with low levels in reading-to-write tasks. For example, Plakans (2009) found that high-scoring students focused on higher-level reading

processes such as goal setting, global and mining reading processes, whilst low-scoring students focused on lower-level reading processes such as word-level processes. Along a similar line, Zhao & Hirvela (2015) found that their high-scoring student focused on rhetorical reading processes whilst their low-scoring student focused on lower-level reading processes such as lexical access processes.

Therefore, L2 teachers in general (and Saudi teachers in particular), need to account for their students' language proficiency levels by designing teaching materials that can support the growth of students' reading processes in accordance with their various levels of language proficiency. Accordingly, teachers need to teach both lower-level and higher-level reading processes to all students, regardless of their levels of language proficiency, while using simplified reading materials so that even low-proficiency students can use their higher-level reading processes.

5.3.3 The impact of the lack of motivation

Saudi EFL students' lack of interest in studying English has been found to have a negative impact on their ability to learn English language skills including reading and writing (Al-Khairy, 2013; Alrabai, 2014b; Khan, 2011). At the University of Taif in Saudi Arabia, for instance, Al-Khairy (2013) examined the primary difficulties Saudi undergraduates have while writing academically in English as a foreign language. He claimed that the lack of motivation among Saudi university freshmen affected their writing abilities. Other factors affecting students' writing performance were weak vocabulary and grammatical skills, unappealing textbooks, a lack of English practice, peer pressure, prior educational experience, the use of inappropriate lexical items, inappropriate teaching methods,

inappropriate English faculty teaching practices and a lack of adequate use of contemporary teaching aids. Fareh (2010) found a lack of motivation towards English language learning, stating that the majority of students were unmotivated and unwilling to study.

The reasons for Saudis' low motivation to learn English are varied and complex, but inappropriate teacher behaviour, high language anxiety, low motivational intensity, and inappropriate methods of teaching English in Saudi Arabia could all be contributing factors (Alrabai, 2014b; 2016). In addition, unappealing textbooks, unsuitable English faculty behaviour, peer pressure, incorrect teaching techniques, insufficient use of current teaching aids and the difficulty of English vocabulary and grammar have also all been found to demotivate Saudi university undergraduates (Al-Khairy, 2013).

Among these demotivating effects, teachers are the most responsible for students' lack of interest (Al-Khairy, 2013; Alrabai, 2014b; 2016). Most EFL English teachers demotivate students since they do not offer lessons in realistic circumstances, do not promote or respect students' participation and ideas, overcorrect students' mistakes, and constantly criticise students' learning attempts (Al-Johani, 2009; Alrashidi & Phan, 2015). Another depressing element is the lack of classroom support for students. EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia usually do not follow up on their students' work to check if they have improved, and students are mostly left alone with no guidance from the teacher (Alrashidi & Phan, 2015). Students' motivation suffers as a result of the lack of teacher interaction, as does their English proficiency. Critical aspects of student motivation are overlooked by EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia (Khan, 2011).

Thus, L2 reading and writing teachers in the Saudi context need to pay close attention to their students' psychological and emotional features, promoting positive affective variables such as motivation, and minimising negative sensations such as language anxiety. Teachers need to be confident, friendly, kind, fair, outgoing, happy, considerate, supportive of students, cognizant of students' individual characteristics and dynamic in their presentations when it comes to motivating learners. Teachers need to have a strong belief in their students' abilities to succeed and need to provide them with encouragement, positive comments and constructive performance evaluations (Al-Saraj, 2014; Alshahrani & Alandal, 2015; Javid, 2014; Mohammed, 2015).

5.3.4 The impact of language anxiety

One key explanation for Saudi learners' low English achievement might be anxiety, which is common among the majority of Saudi EFL students (Alrabai, 2016). Most students in this setting appear hesitant to participate in classroom discourse, to offer comments, to ask questions and to engage in class debates, and are overly reliant on their teacher. In the Saudi EFL environment, both male and female learners exhibit the same level of language anxiety (Alrabai, 2014a; 2015; Al-Saraj, 2014; Alshahrani & Alandal, 2015; Javid, 2014; Mohammed, 2015).

When it comes to writing, Saudi students are described as extremely anxious. For instance, Altukruni (2019) carried out a study on the subject of English writing anxiety among Saudi female undergraduate students participating in the preparatory year English-language programme at a Saudi institution. To measure students' levels of writing anxiety in English, analyse the main causes of second-language writing anxiety (such as language classroom anxiety and

cognitive anxiety), determine how writing anxiety affects students' writing performance, and investigate the effects of factors like reading motivation and language proficiency on students' L2 writing anxiety, the researcher developed the English Writing Anxiety Survey (EWAS). Altukruni's (2019) findings revealed that Saudi students had moderate reading motivation, high cognitive anxiety and high anxiety when writing in English. Writing anxiety had a negative impact on the students' writing abilities. Students' reasons for writing anxiety included a lack of confidence, a fear of making mistakes and a fear of negative evaluation.

In line with Altukruni's findings, students' fear of negative evaluation, communication anxiety and language tests have been found to be the primary sources of language anxiety among Saudi EFL learners (Alrabai, 2014a; 2015; Al-Saraj, 2014; Alshahrani & Alandal, 2015; Javid, 2014). EFL Saudi teachers' qualities and actions are important elements which elicit students' fear (Al-Saraj, 2014). Lack of teacher support, unsympathetic teachers, negative student performance evaluations, teachers' lack of time for personal attention, their threatening questioning styles, intolerance of learners' errors, harsh correction or overcorrection of students' mistakes, assessment procedures which rely primarily on written tests, and students' feeling of being judged by the teacher or wanting to impress the teacher are examples of these practices (Alrabai, 2014a; 2016).

A threatening classroom environment, a lack of learner involvement in class discussions and decision making, competitive learning conditions, overcrowded EFL classes, a lack of learner involvement, a ready-made EFL curriculum which is often more concerned with the quantity than the quality of content, and strict classroom rules in Saudi Arabian schools are all factors which

have been found to contribute to language anxiety in the Saudi EFL context (Tanveer, 2007). Saudi EFL learners' low perceived self-esteem, as well as their timid and hesitant personalities when attempting to communicate in a foreign language, are further significant causes of their language anxiety (Hamouda, 2013).

Many Saudi Arabian learners have significant language anxiety as a result of their preconceptions about learning English as a foreign language, such as that mastering a foreign language is an overwhelming task which requires special learning abilities and intelligence, that younger language learners are more successful than adults, that learning a foreign language is simply a matter of memorising vocabulary words and grammatical rules, and that a learner is expected to be fluent in the language.

Therefore, to reduce learner anxiety, EFL Saudi teachers need to act as role models for their students, refraining from strong criticism, overcorrecting errors or blaming students when they make mistakes, pressuring students to compete and publicly comparing the performance or grades of various students. Teachers also need to address the misunderstandings and beliefs which students hold which hinder their learning. EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia need to review a number of recent materials such as teaching aids, textbooks, research results and government initiatives since they provide practical strategies for dealing with students' concerns (Hashemi & Abbasi, 2013; Javid, 2014; Kondo & Ling, 2004; Nagahashi, 2007; Tallon, 2008; Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009).

5.3.5 Reading and writing teaching methods at the school level

One of the main factors that has affected Saudi students' reading and writing activities is the teaching methods used in schools and universities. In Saudi schools,

due to the dominance of standard teaching methods such as GTM, Saudi students are largely engaged in lower-level reading and writing processes such as translating reading texts from the target language into their Arabic L1, and learning lists of vocabulary and grammatical concepts, which they must then use in various exercises set by their teachers in the classrooms (Alqahtani, 2019; Al-Seghayer, 2011; Assulaimani, 2019). Furthermore, the finished product is used to evaluate the pupils' reading and writing abilities, with no emphasis on the process. Since the teachers are the major source of information, the students simply do what they are told (Alqahtani, 2019).

In addition, the dominance of the ALM teaching method, which was based on the notion that focusing on students' listening and speaking skills will improve their reading and writing skills in the long run, resulted in neglecting reading and writing skills and the sequence of the four skills in school was changed to listening, speaking, reading and finally writing (Alqahtani, 2019).

Memorisation and rote learning have an effect on Saudi students' critical thinking and problem-solving ability (Fareh, 2010). Saudi students prefer to think in their L1 before translating their thoughts into English, which results in illegible compositions. Ali and Ramana (2018) stated that in order to pass exams, EFL Saudi students place a high value on memorisation and copying, whereas the language component receives less attention. The lack of reading and writing activities that fit students' needs and interests, as well as opportunities for students to practise English in real-life circumstances, are principal factors contributing to their low reading and writing achievements. Therefore, when the CLT was introduced in response to the dominance of the GTM and ALM teaching techniques because it

emphasises the need to improve students' ability to use the target language in order to understand its functions, it was found to be ineffective in Saudi schools due to a lack of opportunities for students to engage and communicate (Alqahtani, 2019).

Furthermore, due to the large number of students in reading and writing classes, instructors are frequently unable to provide personal feedback to all students by checking their comprehension or writing accuracy (Alharbi, 2017; Alrabai, 2016).

5.3.6 Reading and writing teaching methods at the university level

One of the primary issues with teaching reading and writing at the university level in Saudi Arabia is that they are taught separately without acknowledging the link between them (Alghonaim, 2018; Alhujaylan, 2020; Al-Omrani, 2014). This was clearly demonstrated in the setting section, as the English Department's study plan showed that reading and writing courses are taught separately. The lack of attention in the language classroom to the reading and writing relationship is one of the main reasons for the inadequacy of reading and writing in English among Saudi EFL students at the college level (Al-Omrani, 2014; Fageeh, 2003). Students' reading and writing deficiencies are exacerbated by the separation of reading and writing instruction in EFL classrooms, which results in a severe lack of attention to the reading-writing interaction (Al-Dosari, 2016; Alghonaim, 2018). Teaching reading without teaching writing limits the development of reading abilities and vice versa (Hao & Sivell (2002). That is, the students' reading knowledge and skills cannot be transferred to writing if reading is not included in writing instruction. As a result, EFL students might struggle with language and rhetoric when beginning reading

or writing assignments, especially when reading for the purpose of writing (Alghonaim, 2018; Alhujaylan, 2020).

The connection between reading and writing was emphasised by Al-Dosari (2016), Alghonaim (2018), Alhujaylan (2020), Almalki and Soomro (2017), Almansour and Alshorman (2014), Al-Omrani (2014), Alqadi (2013), Mekheimer and Aldosari (2013), Pysarchyk and Yamshynska (2015) and Zaiter (2019) who all asserted that connecting reading and writing in instruction is effective for improving reading and writing performance. For example, an evaluation of the effectiveness of an integrated holistic teaching strategy for reading and writing was undertaken by Mekheimer and Aldosari (2013). They employed a pre-test/post-test control group design in a quasi-experimental format to assess the instructional efficiency of an integrated holistic teaching strategy. The results suggested that the integrated skills treatment which was employed in the study had a significant impact on the students' performance in reading and writing skills taught in an integrated, holistic manner. Compared with their counterparts in the control group, the experimental group participants improved their scores in the examined language competencies, reading and writing. In a similar vein, Zaiter (2019) emphasised the need to link reading and writing in the classroom. He believed that it is critical to teach reading and writing together since one cannot improve without the other. Connecting reading and writing in the classroom could benefit students by fostering communication, developing thinking skills, constructing logical and persuasive arguments in their writings, allowing students to reflect on and re-evaluate their ideas later, providing and receiving criticism, and preparing for school and work.

Furthermore, since most reading and writing classes are silent, students take a passive role in their education (Alkubaidi, 2014). Teachers' dominance of the learning process, including finishing lectures before the time limit, leaving reading and writing activities for students to do at home, and relying on oral conversations to engage with good students who usually give correct answers while ignoring the poor ones, affected students' language learning achievement, particularly in reading and writing (Alkubaidi, 2014).

Most lecturers who teach reading encourage students to interpret the entire text word by word and memorise various grammatical rules and huge vocabulary lists, and then assess the students' reading based on these characteristics (Alharbi, 2017; Elmayantie, 2015; Masadeh, 2015). Furthermore, when students participate in reading exercises and give incorrect responses, their teachers tell them the correct answers without explaining why their incorrect answers were incorrect in the first place. Students are unable to successfully interact with a reading text as a result of the teachers' reliance on these one-way teaching approaches. That is, students are only taught decoding reading skills and are not taught how to use comprehension reading skills such as goal setting, inferencing and monitoring, which are important in reading for the writing activities which are common in Saudi Arabian English undergraduate programmes (Al-Omrani, 2014; Alghonaim, 2018; Al-Dosari, 2016).

Teachers, on the other hand, focus on the product-oriented approach when teaching writing, in which students examine model texts and undertake various activities which draw their attention to significant characteristics of a text, which they subsequently imitate in their own writing (Al-Khasawneh, 2010). In Saudi

colleges, writing teaching focuses on the surface level of the phrase, such as grammatical perfection, rather than the meaning or function of the language, resulting in students' incapacity to communicate meaning to their readers (Alghammas, 2020; Alharbi, 2017; Alkodimi & Al-Ahdal, 2021). Furthermore, some teachers create their own teaching assistance materials which are less successful than they could be because they lack a professional touch (Al-Seghayer, 2014). There are no specific writing textbooks or resources, meaning that there is no established curriculum to guide and support students in learning to write successfully (Alharbi, 2017). As a result, students are unable to express themselves or produce coherent texts. This was demonstrated by Al-Zubeiry (2020), who tested the writing talents of Saudi male and female undergraduate students and found that their written output contained incorrectly structured and related phrases. They also lacked the ability to formulate a coherent topic statement and back it up with enough evidence. The primary challenges found to affect students' written texts included writing a subject statement, organising ideas, using coherent linkages and reader orientation.

The main causes of students' weak reading and writing skills are, in general, a lack of English resources and inappropriate instructional methods (Alghammas, 2020). The lack of exposure to the language in a natural setting has harmed Saudi students' ability to read and write in English. Saudi students' reading and writing abilities are likely to be influenced by the cultural and linguistic differences between their L1 and L2 (Al-Zubeiry, 2020). Due to a dearth of authentic reading and writing activities, Saudi pupils are not exposed to authentic reading and writing patterns in the L2 context.

Furthermore, there is a lack of contact and collaborative learning in reading and writing classrooms, as well as a lack of the use of technology which could help learning and increase students' reading and writing motivation (Alghammas, 2020). One of the causes of students' poor reading and writing abilities, particularly the latter, is a lack of collaborative learning and of the use of modern technologies (Al-Khairy, 2013). Students are hesitant to speak the target language because of their inadequate communication abilities and as a result, they lose interest in studying because of the lack of contact in the classroom.

In addition, by looking at the solutions proposed by previous researchers to improve Saudi EFL students' reading and writing, it seems that the focus was on extensive reading to improve writing. That is, previous studies on the effect of reading on writing-only tasks, in particular, have highlighted the importance of extensive reading for improving Saudi students' English language skills, including reading and writing, as well as their English language proficiency level. They have argued that extensive reading might help Saudi students to improve their writing performance and have emphasised that Saudi EFL teachers should focus on teaching extensive reading (Al-Dosari, 2016; Al-Khairy, 2013; Almansour & Alshorman, 2014; Mekheimer & Aldosari, 2013; Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015; Tsai, 2006). For instance, Almansour and Alshorman (2014) explored how an extensive reading programme affected the writing skills of Saudi EFL university students and found that the experimental group outperformed the control group. This demonstrated that an extensive reading programme could have a significant positive impact on students' writing skills. Similarly, Al-Dosari (2016) carried out a study at King Khalid University to evaluate the effects of extensive reading on writing in an integrated manner during the teaching of EFL students studying

writing. The researcher came to the conclusion that integrated instruction of the extensive reading activity had a direct impact on the quality of writing because it promoted literacy development and helped students in properly considering the genre of writing during the learning process. He found that the experimental group's performance in both writing and reading comprehension had improved, which he attributed to the emphasis on presenting writing skills alongside other skills and sub-skills in both reading and writing. He also stated that using integrated skills in the classroom might help students to enhance their overall language competency in reading and writing, particularly the latter.

This claim was also supported by previous L2 research on the role of reading on writing-only tasks which argued that L2 teachers should focus on extensive or pleasure reading to improve students' reading and writing skills while also raising the motivation of ESL learners (Carson *et al*, 1990) and of EFL learners (Alqadi, 2013). For example, Carson *et al.* (1990) examined the relationship between reading and writing in different languages and modalities of L2 and found that L2 literacy development is a complex issue for literate adult ESL learners, and that extensive reading helped the students enhance their writing skills.

In the EFL context, Alqadi (2013) investigated the extent to which extensive reading had an impact on the development of writing performance of EFL freshman Arab learners and found that it had a positive impact on the students' grammatical accuracy. To put it another way, the findings of that study showed that extensive reading improved learners' paragraph-level writing as well as their grammatical correctness. The learners' ability to read and interact with texts

containing a variety of structures, word forms and referential phrases was positively affected.

Moreover, on the effect of reading on reading-to-write tasks in the Saudi context, Al-Omrani (2014) agreed with the previous studies on the role of reading on writing-only tasks and argued that extensive reading is significant in improving Saudi students' writing performance in reading-to-write tasks. As that study, in particular, was a theoretical review of the topic, it did not investigate the students' reading and writing performance in reading-to-write tasks. Similarly, Alhujaylan (2020) conducted an empirical study to investigate Saudi students' writing performance in reading-to-write tasks and found that after the students had been taught reading in relation to writing for several months, their writing performance had improved in terms of vocabulary and grammar. The researcher highlighted that extensive reading might improve writing performance in reading-to-write tasks. As the researcher only based her findings on the students' written product scores, she did not investigate their reading or writing processes. Therefore, although the students' performance improved in their writing, it appeared that the improvement was mainly in lower-level reading and writing processes such as vocabulary and grammar, which are not enough for conducting reading-to-write tasks successfully (Kuzborska, 2018; Plakans, 2009; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015). This was also evident from the students' performance in the reading-to-write task in the current study, as they failed to consider the reading purpose because they relied heavily on lower-level reading processes (such as vocabulary and grammar).

Therefore, it is important to note that although extensive reading could help students to improve their English reading and writing skills as well as their English

proficiency level, it might not be sufficient for purposeful reading tasks such as reading for writing. Such tasks require the use of higher-level reading processes to enable readers to engage with these tasks successfully, such as goal setting, inferencing and monitoring (Plakans, 2009). Since reading and writing tasks vary based on the readers' and writers' purposes (Hyland, 2009; Johns *et al.*, 2006; Swales, 1990), these reading processes enable readers to construct meaning based on their own purposes using the writers' hints presented in the reading texts (Hirvela, 2004). In contrast, in extensive reading, the readers' purposes might not be essentially linked with writing performance as it depends mainly on the habit of reading for a longer period of time and mostly for pleasure using interesting reading materials in a relaxed environment (Krashen, 1984). So focusing solely on teaching extensive reading would leave Saudi students without training on how to read for a purpose and therefore unable to perform effectively in purposeful reading tasks such as reading for writing tasks.

Therefore, L2 teachers in general (and Saudi teachers in particular) need to adopt contemporary teaching methods based on students' needs, goals and preferred learning styles, rather than using outdated teaching approaches which undervalue learners' communicative competence. Additionally, they need to allow students to talk and actually use the language both in the classroom and in real-life situations outside class. In this case, communicative language instruction (CLT) could be a viable choice. Extracurricular activities which inspire students' imaginations and creativity also need to be included to help them to think beyond the content of the pre-made curriculum.

Educators need to use technology to their advantage and invest in offering the best learning possibilities for students. Students need to have consistent access to technology as lack of access can lead to a lack of enthusiasm for online classes. Authenticity and technological equipment, according to Alharbi (2015), are crucial for establishing a lively classroom and avoiding boring texts and assignments. To improve the quality and efficacy of learning, laptop computers, cell phones and YouTube EDU channels could be used in the EFL classroom.

5.3.7 The use of L1 Arabic as a medium of instruction

Moreover, the extensive use of Arabic as L1 in teaching English as L2 in Saudi EFL classes has an impact on students' reading and writing skills (Alkhatnai, 2011; Alhawsawi, 2013; Almutairi, 2008; Alnofaie, 2010; Alshammari, 2011; Fareh, 2010). Saudi students write in English but include Arabic grammar, punctuation, word order and articles, making it difficult for readers to understand their English writings. They are taught how to use rules, academic words and phrases, but they still do not appear to understand the language. Many of them make mistakes when writing simple sentences, paragraphs or other types of written discourse (Farooq & Wahid, 2019; Mohammad, 2015; Kurt & Atay, 2007).

Students are encouraged to think in the L1 and then translate their thoughts into the L2 when the L1 is used as the medium of instruction in language classes (Richard & Rodgers, 2001; Shaikh, 1993). Teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching English as L2 could have resulted in their extensive use of the L1 Arabic in instruction. Al-Abdan (1993) recruited 451 Saudi male and female teachers to investigate their actual use of Arabic in the classroom in order to establish the proportion of Arabic L1 use in Saudi English language lessons. It was found that

75% of the teachers used Arabic in class for 10% of the time, 54.5% used Arabic for grammar and the majority (87.6%) used Arabic to explain abstract terms. Similarly, Alshammari (2011) studied thirteen Saudi teachers and 95 students to see how they felt about using native Arabic in EFL classes. The majority of the students (61%) and teachers (69%) agreed that Arabic should be used in the English classroom for a variety of purposes, such as teaching grammatical rules, introducing new vocabulary and giving test instructions. The teachers believed that learning Arabic saved time and enhanced student comprehension, and that their learning of Arabic was more successful. The teachers' lack of skill and confidence in using English, as well as their desire to make their job easier, appear to be the primary reasons for using the L1 in EFL classrooms in Saudi Arabia (Alhawsawi, 2013; Rabab'ah, 2005).

Teachers' reliance on this ineffective educational method, using Arabic in teaching English, is a major issue which obstructs Saudi students' ability to communicate in English and has negative consequences (Alrabai, 2016). First, using Arabic as a medium of instruction limits students' exposure to English by giving them little or no opportunity to practise and speak the target language, so limiting their communication ability. In Saudi EFL courses, the preference for Arabic has resulted in the use of English becoming infrequent. As a result, despite being in an EFL situation in which classroom practice is crucial due to a shortage of opportunities to speak English outside the classroom, Saudi students usually lack the motivation to speak English in the classroom with their classmates and teachers (Alrabai, 2016).

Furthermore, the dominance of Arabic as the country's official language and primary medium of communication has diminished the importance of English among Saudi students including reading and writing (Al-Mashary, 2006; Alqahtani, 2011; Khan, 2011). This approach has led students to believe that English is useless in both their academic and their social lives, resulting in poor English performance (Alqahtani, 2011). Saudi students might not understand why they should bother learning English or why they need to study English in this situation when they can get what they need using their native Arabic (Alharbi, 2015). Besides, most Saudi students have misunderstandings about the value of learning English; particularly, many believe that studying English is unnecessary since they will attend universities or find professions where English is not required when they graduate from high school. Those students view English as a subject to be studied purely for the sake of achieving the required test score, rather than as a tool for everyday communication (Zaid, 1993).

The lack of exposure to English in Saudi Arabia is due to the prevalence of Arabic as L1. Saudi students have access to the internet, which they can use to practise English on a regular basis, but many prefer to use their Arabic L1 to access the internet and engage in their daily lives. This could be due to Saudi students' belief that English is only for academic purposes and not for everyday use. Saudi students engage with their family members, peers, friends and classmates in Arabic, and have few, if any, opportunities to speak English in regular interactions. They might therefore find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a high level of English fluency and competency due to their lack of exposure to English in regular life routines (Khan, 2011). Alharbi (2015) agreed with Khan's findings that the lack of realistic situations for practising English communication skills outside the

classroom is a hindrance to obtaining desired language results in Saudi EFL contexts since it limits students' opportunities to speak English.

Thus, classroom interactions between the teacher and students need to be conducted in the target language in order to maximise learners' exposure to the language. The use of Arabic as L1 by teachers needs to be limited to the lowest possible levels and only when using English becomes impractical. Learners need to be encouraged to practise English outside the classroom by using social media and watching English-language media such as television shows. Students should have access to an English library and online resources such as electronic English newspapers, articles, journals, magazines and stories, as well as the ability to apply information from these sources in classroom activities (Alrabai, 2016).

5.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have provided a comparative analysis of the results of the present study with those of previous research on the role of reading in a reading-to-write task. The results of the current study complement many previous findings on the process of the reading-to-write task by providing information about Saudi EFL undergraduate students' use of reading processes and beliefs and how different processes and beliefs might contribute to students' writing performance.

As the results have shown, the participants in this study mostly relied on lower-level reading processes such as establishing propositional meaning and lexical access, and they did not use higher-level reading processes effectively, such as inferencing, monitoring and text structure, and this reliance might have been due in general to their beliefs about reading and writing. The students viewed reading as understanding the reading texts by translating new words and focusing on

grammar. They regarded good readers as those who read rapidly, have a large vocabulary and understand and can summarise texts. They also viewed writing as a complex activity which is solely about correct grammar, spelling and punctuation, and good handwriting. However, although the results regarding the role of reading in writing remain inconclusive, there is some evidence to suggest that the use of some reading processes such as proposition formation might be helpful when writing is assessed on the relevance of content and the organisation and development of ideas. Further studies are therefore needed to establish how specific reading processes contribute to specific writing tasks.

In addition, I have discussed the factors which influence learners' reading and writing abilities. The participating students' reading and writing performance might have been influenced by their beliefs about reading and writing, which may have been influenced and formed by some of the internal or individual factors such as the impact of language proficiency, the impact of motivation, and the impact of anxiety; and external factors or socio-cultural factors such as reading and writing teaching methods at the school and university levels and the use of L1 Arabic as a medium of instruction. Also, I have provided teaching implications for L2 teachers in general and Saudi teachers in particular based on these factors.

Chapter 6: Contributions, Implications, Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

6. Introduction

The findings of this study have generated several pedagogical implications. Although most of these implications are related to the provision and improvement of students' reading and writing skills in the Saudi context, some inferences can also be drawn from this study to contribute more generally to L2 teacher development. In this chapter, I first discuss the contributions and implications of the findings of the study and then acknowledge its limitations and make some recommendations for future research.

6.1 Contributions and teaching implications

The review of the reading-to-write research literature showed that there have been several studies on the role of reading in a reading-to-write task and that they have varied in focus and context. For example, there are some studies which investigated the reading-to-write processes using both L1 and ESL learners with quite high English language proficiency levels (Cumming *et al.*, 2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Shi, 2004; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015), whereas the present study was conducted in an EFL context using EFL Saudi learners with a rather low English language proficiency level, as was reported by previous research in the Saudi context (Alghammas, 2020; Al-Khairy, 2013; Alrabai, 2014a; 2016; Alrashidi & Phan, 2015). In addition, a larger number of studies of the effects of reading on writing used placement tests in which the effects of time constraints could have greatly influenced students' performance in the task (Cumming *et al.*,

2005; Delaney, 2008; Esmaeili, 2002; Gebril & Plakans, 2009; Plakans, 2008; 2009; Plakans & Gebril, 2013; Watanabe, 2001; Yang, 2009; Zhang, 2013). Although few studies have been conducted using more natural reading-to-write tasks (Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015), they nonetheless focused on the investigation of individual reading processes such as borrowing words and phrases, or rhetorical reading processes (Shi, 2004; Zhao & Hirvela, 2015), rather than a range of various higher and lower reading processes. Few studies have been conducted to investigate the reading-for-writing processes using think-aloud protocols (Plakans & Gebril, 2012); instead, the focus has been more on the correlation of test scores rather than the investigation of specific reading processes and their effects on writing.

Furthermore, in the Saudi context, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, only one empirical study on the role of reading in reading-to-write tasks has been undertaken (Alhujaylan, 2020), but that study merely provided the students' writing scores before and after the instructional intervention, with no information about their reading or writing processes in either reading-to-write or writing-only tasks. Additionally, because it was a quantitative study and dealt only with numbers, it is impossible to tell what factors (such as task demands, individual or socio-structural) influenced the students' performance in the tasks. In addition, Al-Omrani (2014) conducted a study to draw attention to crucial linkages between reading and writing by exploring the importance of extensive reading in reading-to-write tasks, and urged for more research on the subject. Given these gaps in the literature, the current study is considered an important contribution to the field of reading and writing.

Although the findings of the study did not provide conclusive evidence of the role of reading in writing, it has shed more light on the reading processes of EFL students with low writing scores. Importantly, it has confirmed that students with low writing scores tend to rely on lower-level reading processes and that this reliance could have prevented them from using higher-level reading processes. By focusing on lower-level reading processes, students devoted all their memory resources to comprehending texts at a lower level and had no memory left for the use of higher-level resources (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007). Furthermore, the findings have shown that in line with the previous research (Alghonaim, 2005; Alshamrani, 2003; Aunario, 2004; Fader, 1976; Fageeh, 2003; Kara-Soteriou, 2007; Lavelle, 1993; Logan & Johnston, 2009; Mateos *et al.*, 2011; McNeil, 1976; Palmquist & Young, 1992; Schraw, 2000; White & Bruning, 2005), beliefs play an important part in reading and writing performance. Beliefs guide students' reading and writing behaviour and can negatively influence their reading and writing outcome.

Based on the study's findings, the following teaching implications are proposed. L2 reading and writing teachers in the EFL programmes at Saudi universities need to be aware that reading and writing should be taught in connection with each other. In this regard, one of the most consistent findings from two decades of study on the relationship between reading and writing is that they should be taught together, and that combining both literacy abilities improves learning in all domains (Flower *et al.*, 1990; Hirvela, 2004). Furthermore, Carson and Leki (1993) asserted that reading can serve as the foundation for writing and is nearly always the case in academic settings. EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia should therefore emphasise to their pupils the necessity of reading in completing writing

tasks. More broadly, Saudi educational officials are recommended to emphasise the role of reading in the development of writing abilities among Saudi students at all levels of education and in all relevant curriculums.

The results of this study reinforce the assertions of Fageeh (2003), Mekheimer and Aldosari (2013), Almansour and Alshorman (2014), Al-Omrani (2014), Al-Dosari (2016), Almalki and Soomro (2017), Alghonaim (2018), Zaiter (2019) and Alhujaylan (2020) that the reason for students' weak reading and writing abilities is the lack of emphasis on the connection between reading and writing in the language classroom in EFL college writing classes in Saudi universities (such as the English Department at UB). Reading and writing have been taught separately in the BA English programme at UB (see the Setting section), indicating that connecting reading and writing in instruction is a pedagogical phenomenon to which the EFL teachers at UB should pay more attention, especially realising that reading is not secondary to writing; these two literacy skills work in tandem toward one goal: literacy development (Al-Omrani, 2014; Hirvela, 2004).

Furthermore, L2 reading and writing teachers, especially teachers in Saudi Arabia and in UB in particular, are strongly encouraged to explicitly teach students various reading processes and draw their students' attention to how these processes interact with different reading purposes. Saudi undergraduate students in particular also need extensive training on higher-level reading processes such as background knowledge activation, the use of different types of inferences, text structure activation and goal setting. These reading processes are important in purposeful reading tasks such as reading for writing because they enable readers to derive

meaning from the writers' clues and so comprehend the writers' purposes (Tierney & Pearson, 1983).

Teachers should also design teaching materials which can help to develop students' reading processes in accordance with their different language proficiency levels. That is, regardless of students' language proficiency levels, teachers should still teach them both lower-level and higher-level reading processes but they should use simplified reading materials so that even low-proficiency students can draw on their higher-level reading processes and not continue to stumble over the difficulty of language in texts.

6.2 Limitations and directions for future research

The limitations of the study should be acknowledged. Although the current empirical study is critical as it investigated the role of reading in a reading-to-write task in the Saudi context, more specifically, the reading processes employed in a reading-to-write task, it was however conducted in a college with male students only. Future studies could therefore involve female students in order to facilitate useful comparisons.

In addition, a multiple case study model was employed involving a small number of participants. Although case studies usually have a small sample and are intended to gain an in-depth and comprehensive understanding of particular cases rather than to generalise statistical findings (Duff, 2012; 2014), the use of a larger sample to obtain a more comprehensive picture of students' reading and writing processes would be important.

Furthermore, the participants in the current study were third-year undergraduate students and the findings consequently only showed the reading processes of students at this educational level. Further studies involving students at different educational levels, such as first-year undergraduate students or postgraduate students, would be likely to produce different results and enable comparisons to be made. It would be also important to compare students' reading processes at different educational levels as this information would be especially important for curriculum designers and subject tutors.

The current study was limited because it was focused on students in an English Department. Although the findings have provided important information on how English major students performed a reading-to-write task in this specific academic subject, studies of students' reading and writing processes are also needed in different academic disciplines. As recent research on expert readers and writers has shown, reading and writing practices differ greatly by academic discipline (Hyland, 2009; Johns *et al*., 2006; Swales, 1990).

In summary, therefore, future research could focus on the role of reading in writing in different academic contexts with students of different language proficiencies, studying in different academic disciplines and at different educational levels. Future research could also consider a longitudinal research design and investigate reading and writing processes over time.

References

Abbott, R. D., Berninger, V. W., & Fayol, M. (2010). Longitudinal relationships of levels of language in writing and between writing and reading in grades 1 to 7. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(2), 281-298.

Abdan, A. A. (1993). A Field Study of the Use of Arabic in EFL Classrooms in the Saudi Intermediate Public Schools. *Journal of King Saud University, 5*(2), 396-426.

Abkar Alkodimi, K., & Mohammed Hassan Al-Ahdal, A. A. (2021). Strategies of teaching writing at Saudi tertiary-level institutions: Reality and expectations. *Arab World English Journal, Volume 12*.

Abromitis, B. (1994). The role of metacognition in reading comprehension: Implications for instruction. *Literacy Research Report, 19,* 1- 31.

Alamri, M. (2011). Higher education in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *11*(4), 88-91.

Al Asmari, A. A. (2015). Communicative language teaching in EFL university context: Challenges for teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *6*(5), 976.

Al Dameg, K. A. (2011). The suitable age for learning foreign languages in public education. *Damascus University Journal, 27*, 753-811.

Aldegether, R. (2020). Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030: Approaches to Multicultural Education and Training. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *12*(8), 92-102.

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading.* Cambridge University Press.

Al-Dosari, H. (2016). Effects of an Integrated Reading / Writing Approach on Improving Writing Skills of EFL Students. *Dirasat Educational Sciences, 43*(1), 759-769.

Alebaikan, R. (2010). *Perceptions of blended learning in Saudi universities.* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Exeter University, UK.

Alexander, P., & Jetton, T. L. (2000). 'Learning from text: a multi-dimensional and developmental perspective.' In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, *3* (285-310). Longman.

Alghammas, A. (2020). The weaknesses of English writing skills among undergraduate Saudi students majoring in English at Qassim University: a perspective of English faculty. *Available at SSRN 3621267*.

Al-Ghonaim, A. (2005). *ESL college students' beliefs and attitudes about reading-to-write in an introductory composition course: a qualitative study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Alghonaim, A. S. (2018). Explicit ESL/EFL Reading-writing Connection: an Issue to Explore in ESL/EFL Settings. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(4), 385.

Alharbi, H. (2015). Improving Students' English Speaking Proficiency in Saudi Public Schools. *International Journal of Instruction, 8*(1), 105-116.

Alharbi, N. S. M. (2017). *An investigation into the academic writing: Difficulties of Saudi Postgraduate Students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Exeter University, UK.

Alharbi, Y. G. (2019). A review of the current status of English as a foreign language (EFL) education in Saudi Arabia. *Global Journal of Education and Training*, *1*(2).

Alhawsawi, S. (2013). *Investigating student experiences of learning English as a foreign language in a preparatory programme in a Saudi university*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Sussex, Brighton, UK.

Alhujaylan, H. (2020). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Integrating Reading and Writing Pedagogy in EFL Setting and Teachers' Perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, *13*(5), 177-190.

Al-Issa, A., & Al-Bulushi, A. (2010). Training English language student teachers to become reflective teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(4).

Al-Johani, H. M. (2009). *Finding a way forward the impact of teachers strategies, beliefs and knowledge on teaching English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Strathclyde, UK.

Allamnakhrah, A. (2013). *Teaching critical thinking in Saudi Arabia: a study of two pre-service teacher education programs*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of New South Wales, Australia.

Ali, S. S., & Ramana, V. L. (2018). Academic writing challenges at Universities in Saudi Arabia and solutions. *International Journal of English Language and Humanities*, *4*(10), 291-298.

Al-Khairy, M. A. (2013). Saudi English-Major Undergraduates' Academic Writing Problems: a Taif University Perspective. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(6), 1-12.

Al-Khasawneh, F. M. S., & Maher, S. (2010). Writing for academic purposes: Problems faced by Arab postgraduate students of the college of business, UUM. *ESP World*, *9*(2), 1-23.

Alkhatnai, M. (2011). *Learning styles of EFL Saudi college-level students in online and traditional educational environments*. PhD Thesis. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, PA.

Alkubaidi, M. A. (2014). The Relationship between Saudi English Major University Students' Writing Performance and Their Learning Style and Strategy Use. *English Language Teaching*, *7*(4), 83-95.

Almalki, M. S., & Soomro, A. F. (2017). Practitioners' Perspectives on the Application of Integration Theory in the Saudi EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(6), 93-102.

Almansour, N. & Alshorman, R. (2014). The effect of an extensive program on the writing performance of Saudi EFL university students. *International Journal of Linguistics, 6*, 247-264.

Al-Mashary, A. (2006). *The problems of teaching English to the secondary*

schools students in KSA from teachers and supervisors perspectives. Master's Thesis. King Saud University: Riyadh, KSA.

Almutairi, N. H. (2008). *The influence of educational and sociocultural factors on the learning styles and strategies of female students in Saudi Arabia*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Leicester, UK.

Alnofaie, H. (2010). The attitude of teachers and students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools: a case study. *Novitas-Royal, 4*(1), 64-95.

Al-Nujaidi, A. (2003). *The relationship between vocabulary size, reading strategies, and reading comprehension of EFL learners in Saudi Arabia*. PhD Dissertation. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Al-Omrani, A. H. (2014). Integrating reading into writing instruction in the EFL programs at Saudi Universities. *Arab World English Journal*.

Alqadi, K. & Alqadi, H. (2013). The effect of extensive reading on developing the grammatical accuracy of the EFL freshmen at Al-Bayt University. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*, 106-113.

Alqahtani, M. (2011). *An investigation into the language needs of Saudi students studying in British postgraduate programs and the cultural differences impacting on them.* Doctoral dissertation. University of Southampton, UK.

Alqahtani, A. S. (2019). The use of Edmodo: Its impact on learning and students' attitudes toward it. *Journal of Information Technology Education Research*, *18*, 319.

Alrabai, F. (2014a). A Model of Foreign Language Anxiety in the Saudi EFL Context. *English Language Teaching, 7*(7), 82-101.

Alrabai, F. (2014b). Motivational practices in English as a foreign language classes in Saudi Arabia: Teachers 34 beliefs and learners perceptions. *Arab World English Journal, 5*(1), 224-246.

Alrabai, F. (2016). Factors underlying low achievement of Saudi EFL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *6*(3), 21-37.

Alrahaili, M. (2013). *Predictors of L2 attitudes and motivational intensity: a cross-sectional study in the Saudi EFL context.* PhD thesis. University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia.

Alrashidi, O., & Phan, H. (2015). Education context and English Teaching and learning in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: an overview. *English Language Teaching, 8*(25), 33-44.

Alsamadani, A., & Ibnian, S. (2015). The relationship between Saudi EFL students' attitudes towards learning English and their academic achievement. *International Journal of Education and Social Science, 2*, 92-102.

Al-Saraj, T. M. (2014). Foreign language anxiety in female Arabs learning English: Case studies. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 8*(3), 257-278.

Al-Seghayer, K. (2011). *English teaching in Saudi Arabia: Status, issues, and challenges*. Hala.

Al-Seghayer, K. (2014). The four most common constraints affecting English teaching in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *4*(5), 17.

Alshahrani, M., & Alandal, A. (2015). An investigation of anxiety among elementary school students towards foreign language learning. *Studies in Literature and Language, 11*(3), 29-40.

Alshammari, M. M. (2011). The use of the mother tongue in Saudi EFL classrooms. *Journal of International Educational Research, 7*(4), 95-102.

Alshamrani, H. M. (2003). *The attitudes and beliefs of ESL students about extensive reading of authentic texts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA.

Altukruni, R. (2019). *English writing anxiety in Saudi undergraduate female students*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA.

Al-Zarah, L. N. (2008). *An investigative study of the female initial teacher preparation programme in Saudi Arabia in an Islamic context: perceptions of the key participants*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Durham, UK.

Al-Zubeiry, H. Y. A. (2020). Presupposition Triggers in British and Saudi English Newspaper Opinions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *10*(7), 734-743.

Anderson, N. (2003). Reading. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language Teaching* (pp. 67-86). New York: McGraw Hill.

Ansari, A. A. (2012). Teaching of English to Arab students: Problems and remedies. *Educational Research*, *3*(6), 519-524.

Assulaimani, T. (2019). The future of teaching English in Saudi Arabia. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *7*(8), 1623-1634.

Aunario, J. (2004). *Reading self-concept and intrinsic motivation in cooperative learning.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of the Philippines-Diliman.

Baker, L. (2002). 'Metacognition in comprehension instruction.' In C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: research-based best practices* (pp. 77- 95). New York: Guilford Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*: *Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544- 559.

Berghoff, B. (1997). *Stance and Teacher Education: Understanding the Relational Nature of Teaching*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA.

Birch, B. M., & Fulop, S. (2007). *English L2 reading: Getting to the bottom*. Routledge.

Bowles, M. A. (2010). *The think-aloud controversy in second language research*. Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: a practical guide for beginners*. Sage.

Brown, A. L. (1985). `Metacognition: The development of selective attention strategies for learning from texts.' In H. Singer & R.B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (3rd ed.) (pp. 501-526). New mark, DE: International Reading Association.

Brown, A. L. & Palincsar, A. S. (1989). 'Guided cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition.' In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honour of Robert Glaser* (pp. 393-451). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.

Cain, K. & Oakhill, J. (2007). 'Issues of causality in children's reading.' In D. McNamara (Ed.), *Reading* (47- comprehension. Comprehension strategies 71). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Carrell, P. L., & Connor, U. (1991). 'Reading & writing different genres.' In *Twenty-fifth annual conference of TESOL.* New York, USA.

Carroll, J. B. (1981). Twenty-five years of research on foreign language aptitude. *Individual Differences and Universals in Language Learning Aptitude*, *83*(117), 867-873.

Carson, J. E., Carrell, P. L., Silberstein, S., Kroll, B., & Kuhn, P. A. (1990) Reading-writing relationships in first and second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 24,* 246- 266.

Carson, J. G. (1993). 'Reading for writing: Cognitive Perspectives.' In J.G. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives, pp. 85-104*. Heinle and Heinle.

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

Casanave, C. P. (2003). Looking ahead to more socio-politically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship: (but should it be called 'post-process'?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(1), 85-102.

Cassany, D., & Comas, P. (1989). *Describir el escribir*. Paidcs Argentina.

Charters, E (2003) The use of think-aloud methods in qualitative research: an introduction to think-aloud methods. *Brock Education Journal 12*(2): 68-82.

Chi, M. T. H., Bassok, M., Lewis, M. W., Reimann, P., & Glaser, R. (1989). Self-explanations: how students study and use examples in learning to solve problems. *Cognitive Science*, *13*, 145-182.

Christiansen, M. A. (1965). Tripping writing and omitting readings in freshman English: an experiment. *College Composition and Communication, 16,* 122-124.

Cohen, A. D. (2000). Exploring strategies in test taking: Fine-tuning verbal reports from respondents. *Learner-directed Assessment in ESL*, 127-150.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. New York: Longman.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th edn). Routledge.

Cowan, J. (2019). The potential of cognitive think-aloud protocols for educational action-research. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *20*(3), 219-232.

Cox, B. E. (1994). Young children's regulatory talk: Evidence of emerging metacognitive control over literary products and processes. *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*, *4*, 733-756.

Crabtree, B. F. & Miller, W. L. (1999). *Doing qualitative research*. (2nd edn) Sage, pp.18-20.

Creswell, J. W. (2003).' A framework for design.' In *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 9-11.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd edn). Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd edn). Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, *39*(3), 124-130.

Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The Foundation of Social Research.* London: Sage.

Crotty M. (2003). *The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Cumming, A., Rebuffot, J., & Ledwell, M. (1989). Reading and summarizing challenging texts in first and second languages. *Reading and Writing: an Interdisciplinary Journal, 2*, 201-219.

Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Baba, K., Erdosy, U., Eouanzoui, K., & James, M.

(2005). Differences in written discourse in independent and integrated prototype tasks for next generation TOEFL. *Assessing Writing*, *10*, 5-43.

Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Baba, K., Eouanzoui, K., Erdosy, U., & James, M. (2006). *Analysis of discourse features and verification of scoring levels for independent and integrated prototype writing tasks for new TOEFL* (TOEFL Monograph No. MS-30). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Day, R. & J. Bamford.1998. *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Delaney, Y. A. (2008). Investigating the reading-to-write construct. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7*(3), 140-150.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research.* (2nd edn). London: Sage.

Denzin N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*.

DeVaus, D. A. (1993), *Surveys in Social Research* (3rd edn), London: UCL Press.

DeVries, D. (1970). Reading, writing frequency, and expository writing. *Reading Improvement, 7,* 14-19.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Duff, P. (2012). *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics*. Routledge.

Duff, P. (2008). *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Duke, N., & Pearson, P.D. (2002). 'Effective practices for developing reading comprehension'. In A. Farstrup & S. Samuels (Eds.), *What Research has to say about Reading Instruction*. (pp. 205-42). International Reading Association.

Eckhoff, B. (1983). How reading affects children's writing. *Language Arts, 60,* 607-612.

Edge, J., & Richards, K. (1998). May I see your warrant, please? Justifying outcomes in qualitative research. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 334-356.

Ehrlich, M. F. (1996). 'Metacognitive monitoring in the processing of anaphoric devices in skilled and less skilled comprehenders'. In C. Comoldi & J. Oakhill (Eds.), *Reading comprehension difficulties* (pp. 221-249). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eisterhold, J. C. (1990). 'Reading-writing connections: Toward a description for second language learners.' In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing* (pp. 88-101). Cambridge University Press.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1991). 'Better stories and better constructs – the case for rigor and comparative logic'. *Academy of Management Review*, *16*, 620-627.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(1), 25-32.

Elmayantie, C. (2015). The use of grammar translation method in teaching English. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *5*(2), 125-132.

Elyas, T. (2008). The attitude and the impact of American English as a global language within the Saudi education system. *Novitas-Royal, 2*(1), 28-48.

Elyas, T., & Picard, M. (2010). Saudi Arabian educational history: impacts on English language teaching. *Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues, 3*(2), 136-145.

Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis*. MIT Press.

Ernest, P. (1994). *An introduction to research methodology and paradigms.* Educational Research Monograph Series, School of Education, University of Exeter, UK.

Esmaeili, H. (2002). Integrated reading and writing tasks and ESL students' reading and writing performance in an English language test. *Canadian Modern Language Journal, 58*(4), 599-622.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1-4.

Evanechko, P. Ollila, L. & Armstrong, R. (1974). An investigation of the relationship between children's performance in written language and their reading ability. *Research in the Teaching of English, 8,* 315-326.

Eysenck, M.W., & Keane, M.T. (2005). *Cognitive Psychology: a Student's Handbook* (5th edn). Psychology Press.

Fader, D. (1976). *The new hooked on books.* New York: Berkley Publishing Corporation.

Fageeh, A. (2003). *Saudi college students' beliefs regarding their English writing difficulties*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Fareh, S. (2010). Challenges of teaching English in the Arab world: Why can't EFL programs deliver as expected? *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, *2*(2), 3600-3604.

Farooq, O., & Wahid, R. (2019). L1 and its effect on EFL writing: a descriptive framework. *Opción: Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, *24*, 792-806.

Faruk, S. (2014). Saudis' attitude towards English: trend and rationale. *Professional Communication and Translation Studies, 7*, 173-180.

Ferguson-Hessler, M. G., & de Jong, T. (1990). Studying physics texts: Differences in study processes between good and poor performers. *Cognition and Instruction*, *7*(1), 41-54.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2004). *Teaching ESL composition: purpose, process, practice.* New York: Routledge.

Fish, S. (1981). Why no one's afraid of Wolfgang Iser. *Diacritics*, *11*(1), 2.

Flahive, D., & Bailey, N. (1993). Exploring reading/writing relationships in adult second language learners. *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives*, 128-140.

Flower, L., Stein, V., Ackerman, J., Kantz, M. J., McCormick, K., & Peck, W. C. (1990). *Reading to Write: Exploring a Cognitive and Social Process*. Oxford University Press.

Garner, R., & Alexander, P. A. (1994). *Beliefs about text and instruction with text*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gebril, A. (2006). *Independent and integrated academic writing tasks: a study in generalizability and test method*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.

Gebril, A., & Plakans, L. (2009). Investigating source use, discourse features, and process in integrated writing tests. *Spaan Fellow Working Papers in Second or Foreign Language Assessment*, *7*, 47-84.

Gergen, K. J. (2003). Action research and orders of democracy. *Action Research*, *1*(1), 39-56.

Gibson, B (1997). Taking the test: Using verbal report data in looking at the processing of cloze tasks. *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics 8*: 54-62.

Gillham, B. (2000). *The Research Interviews.* Continuum.

Glazer, J. I. (1973). *The effect of literature study on the ability of the 4th and 6th grade pupils to create writing stories.* National Institute of Education. (Eric Document ED 095538).

Goodman, K. S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, *6*(4), 126-135.

Gordon, C. J., & Braun, C. (1982). Story schemata: Metatextual aid to reading and writing. *New Inquiries in Reading Research and Instruction*, 262-268.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Pearson Education.

Grabe, W. (2003). '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). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Graber-Wilson, G. (1991). Can a reading comprehension score predict writing achievement among ESL university students? *The ORTESOL Journal*, *12*, 50-66.

Graham, S., Schwartz, S., & MacArthur, C. (1993). Knowledge of writing and the composing process, attitude toward writing, and self-efficacy for students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26,* 237-249.

Green, A. (1998). *Verbal Protocol Analysis in Language Testing Research: a Handbook*. Cambridge University Press.

Grix, J. (2004). *The Foundations of Research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grobe, S. F. & Grobe, C. H. (1977). Reading skills as a correlate of writing ability in college freshmen. *Reading World, 15,* 50-54.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Guvendir, E (2014) Using think-aloud protocols to identify factors that cause foreign language reading anxiety. *The Reading Matrix 14*(2): 109-18.

Habbash, M. (2011). *Status change of English and its role in shaping public education language policy and practice in Saudi Arabia: A postmodernist critical perspective*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Exeter, UK.

Hagens, V., Dobrow, M.J., & Chafe, R. (2009). Interviewee transcript review: Assessing the impact on qualitative research. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *9*, 47-56.

Hagler, A. (2014). A study of attitudes toward western culture among Saudi university students. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives, 11*(1), 1-14.

Hamouda, A. (2013). An exploration of causes of Saudi students' reluctance to participate in the English language classroom. *International Journal of English Language Education, 1*(1), 17-34.

Hannu, K., & Pallab, P. (2002). A comparison of concurrent and retrospective verbal protocol analysis. *American Journal of Psychology*, *113*(3), 387-404.

Hao, X., & Sivell, J. (2002). *Integrating Reading and Writing in EFL Composition in China*.

Hasan, O. E. (1985). An investigation into factors affecting attitudes towards science of secondary school students in Jordan. *Science Education, 69,* 3-18.

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 Application* (pp. 1-55). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Helder, A., Van Leijenhorst, L., Beker, K., & Van den Broek, P. (2013). Sources of comprehension problems during reading. *Unravelling the behavioural, neurobiological, and genetic components of reading comprehension*, 43-53.

Hertzum, M., & Holmegaard, K. D. (2013). Thinking aloud in the presence of interruptions and time constraints. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, *29*(5), 351-364.

Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 109-131.

Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting Reading and Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction*. University of Michigan Press.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge University Press.

Horiba, Y. (2000). Reader control in reading: effects of language competence, text type, and task. *Discourse Processes, 29*, 223-267.

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and non-successful second language learners. *System*, *5*(2), 110-123.

Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching Second Language Reading* (p. 107). Oxford University Press.

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: an advanced resource book*. Routledge.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2009). Academic lexis and disciplinary practice: Corpus evidence for specificity. *International Journal of English Studies*, *9*(2).

Ismail, N. M. (2015). EFL Saudi Students' Class Emotions and their Contributions to their English Achievement at Taif University. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 7*(4), 19-42.

Jack, E. P., & Raturi, A. S. (2006). Lessons learned from methodological triangulation in management research. *Management Research News*.

Jalongo, M. R., Fennimore, B. S., & Stamp, L. N. (2004). The acquisition of literacy: Reframing definitions, paradigms, ideologies, and practices. *Contemporary Perspectives in Language Instruction and language Policy in Early Childhood Education, 26,* 65-86.

Janzen, J., & Stoller, F. L. (1998). Integrating strategic reading in L2 instruction. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 12*(1), 251-69.

Janzen, J. (2001). `Strategic reading on a sustained content theme'. In J. Murphy & P. Byrd (Eds.), *Understanding the courses we teach: Local perspectives*

on English language teaching (369-89). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Javid, C. Z. (2014). Measuring Language Anxiety in an EFL Context. *Journal of Education and Practice, 5*(25), 180-192.

Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, role and context: Developing academic literacies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kendeou, P., Van Den Broek, P., Helder, A., & Karlsson, J. (2014). A cognitive view of reading comprehension: Implications for reading difficulties. *Learning disabilities research & practice*, *29* (1), 10-16.

Kennedy, M. (1985). The composing process of college students writing from sources. *Written Communication, 2*, 434-456.

Khan, I. (2011). Learning difficulties in English: Diagnosis and pedagogy in Saudi Arabia. *Educational Research, 2*(7), 1248-1257.

Kim, Y. (2010). Measuring the value of succession planning and management: a qualitative study of multinational companies. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *23*(2), 5-31.

Kirby, J.R., & Pedwell, D. (1991). Students' approaches to summarization. *Educational Psychology 11,* 297-307.

Koda, K. (2007). Reading and language learning: Crosslinguistic constraints on second language reading development. *Language Learning*, *57*, 1-44.

Koenke, K. (1984). ERIC/RCS Report: An Examination of the Construct of Reader-Text Relationship. *English Education*, *16*(2), 115-120.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Writing: research, theory and application.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis.* New York: Longman.

Kress, G. (1990). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *11*, 84-99.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a post-method pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(4), 537-560.

Kurt, G., & Atay, D. (2007). The effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. *Online Submission*, *3*(1), 12-23.

Kuzborska, I. (2010). *The relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in reading instruction to advanced learners of English in a Lithuanian University context*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex, UK.

Kuzborska, I. (2011). Links between teachers' beliefs and practices and research on reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *23*(1).

Kuzborska, I. (2015). Perspective taking in second language academic reading: a longitudinal study of international students' reading experiences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 20*, 149-161.

Kuzborska, I. (2018). Interactive Reading Strategies. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-7.

Kuzborska, I., & Soden, B. (2018). The construction of opposition relations in high-, middle- and low-rated postgraduate ESL Chinese students' essays. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 34*, 68-85.

Kuzborska, I. (2019). Rhetorical reading for writing strategies. *Journal of ELT Research*, 1-7.

Lampert, M. (1984). Teaching about thinking and thinking about teaching. *Curriculum Studies, 16,* 1-18.

Lavelle, E. (1993). Development and validation of an inventory to assess processes in college composition. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *63*(3), 489-499.

Leki, I. (2001). 'Hearing Voices: L2 students' experiences in L2 writing courses.' In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 17-28). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lewis, H. (1990). *Acquisition of values*. San Francisco, CA: Harper.

Lincoln, Y & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Sage.

Linderholm, T., Virtue, S., Tzeng, Y. & van den Broek, P. (2004). Fluctuations in the availability of information during reading: Capturing cognitive processes using the Landscape Model. *Discourse Processes, 37*, 165-86.

Llach, M. D. P. A. (2010). Examining the role of L2 proficiency in L2 reading-writing relationships. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, *18*, 35-52.

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D.T. & Voegtle, K.H. (2006). *Methods in Educational Research: from theory to practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Logan, S., & Johnston, R. (2009). Gender differences in reading ability and attitudes: Examining where these differences lie. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *32*(2), 199-214.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second Language Research: Methods and Design*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mahboob, A., & Elyas, T. (2014). English in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *World Englishes, 33*, 128-142.

Mandinach, E. B., Gummer, E. S., & Muller, R. D. (2011). The complexities of integrating data-driven decision making into professional preparation in schools of education: It's harder than you think. In *Report from an invitational meeting. Alexandria, VA: CNA Analysis & Solutions*.

Masadeh, T. S. Y. (2015). Performance of Saudi English language teachers in reading comprehension classes. *SAGE Open*, *5*(4), 2158244015621598.

Mason, J. (2002). Observing and Participating *Qualitative Researching* (2nd edn). London: Sage.

Mateos, M., Cuevas, I., Martín, E., Martín, A., Echeita, G., & Luna, M. (2011). Reading to write an argumentation: the role of epistemological, reading and writing beliefs. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *34*(3), 281-297.

McLellan, E., MacQueen, K. M., & Neidig, J. L. (2003). Beyond the qualitative interview: Data preparation and transcription. *Field Methods*, *15*(1), 63-84.

McNeil, E. (1976). Hooked on research. In D. Fader (Ed.), *The new hooked on books* (pp. 92-148). New York: Berkley.

Mekheimer, M. A. & Aldosari, H. S. (2013). Evaluating an Integrated EFL Teaching Methodology in Saudi Universities: a Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4(*6), 1264-1276.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Jossey-Bass.

Micek, A. (1994). *Effects of dedicated reading on ESL writing.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, USA.

Michener, D. M. (1985). *A quasi-experimental study of the effects of reading aloud to third grad students as reflected in their written composition skills.* Dissertation Abstract International*, 46,* 1545A.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. Sage.

Miller, R. L., & Brewer, J. D. (Eds.). (2003). *The A-Z of social research: a dictionary of key social science research concepts*. Sage.

Ministry of Education. (2022). The emergence of general and higher education https://www.moe.gov.sa/ar/aboutus/aboutministry/pages/about.aspx

Ministry of Education. (2022). Teaching English from the first grade in primary schools in 2022 https://www.moe.gov.sa/ar/mediacenter/MOEnews/Pages/en-tech-1443-25.aspx

Mohammed, A. (2015). EFL effective factors: Anxiety and motivation and their effect on Saudi College student's achievement. *Arab World English Journal, 6*, 201-218.

Mohammad, T. (2015). Phonological, Morphological and Syntactical Influences of Mother Tongue on Arab Learners. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *4*(1), 54-65.

Moskovsky, C., Alshahrani, M., Ratcheva, S., & Paolini, S. (2015). Aptitude as a predictor of second language achievement: an investigation in the Saudi Arabian context. *Arab World English Journal, 6,* 3-21.

National Reading Panel (US), (2000). *Teaching children to read: an evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.

Nesi, S., & Gardner, H. (2012). *Genres across the disciplines: Student writing in higher education*. Cambridge University Press.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19,* 317-328.

Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social Research Methods qualitative and quantitative approaches*, (5th edn), Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Newby, P. (2010). *Research Methods for Education* (pp. 221-262). Pearson.

Newman, I., Benz, C. R., & Ridenour, C. S. (1998). *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum*. SIU Press.

Nelson, N. (2008). The reading–writing nexus in discourse research. In C. Bazerman (Ed.), *Handbook of research on writing: History, society, school, individual, text* (pp. 435–450). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nelson, N., & Calfee, R.C. (1998). The reading–writing connection, viewed historically. In N. Nelson & R.C. Calfee (Eds.), *The reading–writing connection: Ninety-seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1-52). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review, 84,* 231-259.

Nouraldeen, A. S., & Elyas, T. (2014). Learning English in Saudi Arabia: a socio-cultural perspective. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *2*(3), 56-78.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and education research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62,* 307-332.

Palmquist, M., & Young, R. (1992). The notion of giftedness and student expectations about writing. *Written communication*, *9*(1), 137-168.

Paris, S. G., & Hamilton, E. E. (2014). The development of children's reading comprehension. In *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 56-77). Routledge.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation Methods* (2nd edn). Sage.

Penney, C. G. (1975). Modality effects in short-term verbal memory. *Psychological Bulletin 82*, 68-84.

Perfetti, C., Landi, N., & Oakhill, J. (2005). 'The acquisition of reading comprehension skill.' In M. Snowling & C. Hulme (Eds.), *The Science of Reading* (pp. 227-47). Blackwell.

Plakans, L. M (2008). Comparing composing processes in writing-only and reading-to-write test tasks. *Assessing Writing*, *13*, 111-129.

Plakans, L. M (2009). The role of reading strategies in integrated L2 writing tasks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*(4), 252-266.

Plakans, L.M, & Gebril, A. (2012). A close investigation into source use in integrated second language writing tasks. *Assessing Writing, 17*(1), 18-34.

Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2013). Using multiple texts in an integrated writing assessment: Source text use as a predictor of score. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*, 217-230. Doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2013.02.003.

Pressley, M. (1998). *Reading instruction that really works*. Guilford Press.

Pressley, M. (2000). 'What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of?' In: *Handbook of Reading Research*. Ed. by M. Kamil et al. Vol. 3. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 545–561.

Pring, R. (2000). *Philosophy of Educational Research.* London/New York, Continuum.

Pysarchyk, O. L., & Yamshynska, N. V. (2015). The importance of integrating reading and writing for the EFL teaching. *Advanced Education*, (3), 77-83.

Raba'ah, G. (2005). Communication problems facing Arab learners of English. *Journal of Language and Learning, 3*(1).

Radnor, H. (2002). *Researching your professional practice: Doing interpretative research*. Buckingham: Open University.

Rankin, J. M. (1988). Designing thinking-aloud studies in ESL reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 4*(2), 119-130.

Raphael, T. E., George, M., Weber, C. M., & Nies, A. (2014). Approaches to teaching reading comprehension. In *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 473-493). Routledge.

Reid, J. (1993). 'Historical perspectives on writing and reading in the ESL classroom.' In J.G. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives* (pp. 33-60). Heinle and Heinle.

Rhoder, C. (2002). Mindful reading: strategy training that facilitates transfer. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 45*(6), 498-512.

Richard, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Risemberg, R. (1996). Reading-to-write: self-regulated learning strategies when writing essays from sources. *Reading Research and Instruction, 35*, 365-383.

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers*. London: Sage.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem*. London: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1985). Viewpoints: Transaction versus interaction: A terminological rescue operation. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 96-107.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994). 'The transactional theory of reading and writing.' In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell and H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 1055-1092). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Rubin, J. (1994). *Handbook of Usability Testing. How to plan, design, and conduct effective tests*. Wiley.

Rudduck, J. (1993). 'The theatre of daylight: Qualitative research and school profile studies.' In M. Schatz (Ed.), *Qualitative voices in educational research* (pp. 8-22). London: Falmer Press.

Russo, J. E., Johnson, E. J., & Stephens, D. L. (1989). The validity of verbal protocols. *Memory and Cognition*, *17*(6), 759-769.

Saleh, M. A. (1986). Development of higher education in Saudi Arabia. *Higher Education*, *15*(1), 17-23.

Salem, N. (2006). *The role of motivation, gender and language learning strategies in EFL proficiency*. Unpublished Master's thesis. The American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon.

Salomon, G., & Perkins, D. N. (1998). Chapter 1: Individual and social aspects of learning. *Review of Research in Education*, *23*(1), 1-24.

Schmalhofer, F., McDaniel, M. A., & Keefe, D. (2002). A unified model for predictive and bridging inferences. *Discourse Processes, 33*(2), 105-132.

Schmitt, M.C., & Bauman, J.F. (1990). Meta comprehension during basal reader instruction: Do teachers promote it? *Reading Research Quarterly 29*, 1-13.

Schommer-Aikins, M. (2004). Explaining the epistemological belief system: introducing the embedded systemic model and coordinated research approach. *Educational Psychologist, 39*, 19-29.

Schraw, G. (2000). Reader beliefs and meaning construction in narrative text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*(1), 96.

Schraw, G., & Bruning, R. (1999). How implicit models of reading affect motivation to read and reading engagement. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3*(3), 281-302.

Shaikh, A. (1993). *Methods of teaching English as a foreign language: a comparative study of traditional and modern approaches*. Lahore, Pakistan: Carvan Book House.

Shanahan, T. (1984). Nature of the reading–writing relation: an exploratory multivariate analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *76*(3), 466.

Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. G. (1986). An analysis and comparison of theoretical models of the reading–writing relationship. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *78*(2), 116.

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication, 21*, 171-200.

Singhal, M. (2006). *Teaching reading to adult second language learners: Theoretical foundations, pedagogical applications, and current issues*. Reading Matrix.

Smagorinsky, P. (1989). The reliability and validity of protocol analysis. *Written Communication*, *6*(4), 463-479.

Smagorinsky, P (2001) Rethinking protocol analysis from a cultural perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 21*: 233-45.

Soteriou, J. K. (2007). Exploring students' beliefs about reading. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, *11*(2), 135.

Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: a longitudinal case study. *Written communication*, *14*(1), 3-62.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stratman, J. F., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (1994). Reactivity in concurrent think-aloud protocols: issues for research. *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology*, *8*, 89-111.

Streb, C. K., Voelpel, S. C., & Leibold, M. (2008). Managing the aging workforce: Status quo and implications for the advancement of theory and practice. *European Management Journal*, *26*(1), 1-10.

Surmiak, A. (2018, September). Confidentiality in qualitative research involving vulnerable participants: Researchers' perspectives. In *Forum: Qualitative social research* (Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 393-418). Freie Universität Berlin.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Tanveer, M. (2007). *Investigation of the factors that cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in learning speaking skills and the influence it casts on communication in the target language*. Master's Thesis. University of Glasgow, UK.

Taylor, B. M., & Beach, R. W. (1984). The effects of text structure instruction on middle-grade students' comprehension and production of expository text.

Reading Research Quarterly, 134-146.

Thesen, L. (1997). Voices, discourse, and transition: In search of new students in Grade 1. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 61-84.

Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, *60*(5), 568-580.

Trabasso, T. & Bouchard, E. (2002). 'Teaching reader how to comprehend texts strategically' In C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 176-200). Guilford Press.

Tsai, J. M. (2006). Connecting reading and writing in college EFL courses. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *12*(12), 465-485.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2010). *Global education digest 2010: Comparing education statistics across the world*. Montreal, Canada: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

University of Bisha. (2022). *English Department*. https://www.ub.edu.sa/ar/sab/DepartmentDetails.aspx?id=19

Ur Rahman, M. M., & Alhaisoni, E. (2013). Teaching English in Saudi Arabia: prospects and challenges. *Academic Research International*, *4*(1), 112.

Urquhart, A. H., & Weir, C. J. (1998). *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice*. Longman.

Van Someren, M., Barnard, Y. F., & Sandberg, J. (1994). *The think aloud method: a practical approach to modellin*g. London: Academic Press, p.11.

Vannoni, M. (2015). What are case studies good for? Nesting comparative case study research into the lakatosian research program. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *49*(4), 331-357.

Victori, M., & Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. *System*, *23*(2), 223-234.

Wade, S. E. (1990). Using think aloud to assess comprehension. *Reading Teacher*, *43*(7), 442-51.

Wade, S. E., Schraw, G., Buxton, W. M., & Hayes, M. T. (1993). Seduction of the strategic reader: effects of interest on strategies and recall. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28*, 93-114.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical Reading in Language Education*. Springer.

Wallen, N., & Fraenkel, J. (2001). Samples and population. *Educational Research: a guide to the process*, 125-153.

Ward, L., & Traweek, D. (1993). Application of a metacognitive strategy to assessment, intervention, and consultation: a think-aloud technique. *Journal of School Psychology*, *31*(4), 469-485.

Watanabe, Y. (2001). *Read-to-write tasks for the assessment of second language academic writing skills: investigating text features and rater reactions*. *University of Hawai'i at Manoa*

Weir, C., & Khalifa, H. (2008). A cognitive processing approach toward defining reading comprehension. *Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes*, *31*, 2–10.

Wellington, J. (2015). *Educational research: Contemporary issues and practical approaches*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

White, M. J., & Bruning, R. (2005). Implicit writing beliefs and their relation to writing quality. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 30*, 166-189.

Widdowson, H. G. (1983). *Learning purpose and language use*. Oxford University Press.

Wolcott, H. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yang, H. C., & Plakans, L. (2012). Second language writers' strategy use and performance on an integrated reading-listening-writing task. *Tesol Quarterly*, *46*(1), 80-103.

Yin, R. K. (2003). Design and methods. *Case Study Research*, *3*(9.2).

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Designs and Methods* (4th edn). Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2012). Case study methods: *In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long.*

Zaid, M. A. (1993). *Comprehensive analysis of the current system of teaching English as a foreign language in the Saudi Arabian intermediate schools*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. University of Colorado at Boulder.

Zaiter, W. (2019). Reading and Writing Skills: the Challenges of Teaching at College Level. *Online submission*.

Zeman, S. S. (1969). Reading comprehension and writing of second and third graders. *The Reading Teacher, 23,* 144-50.

Zhang, C. (2013). Effect of instruction on ESL students' synthesis writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*, 51–67. Doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.12.001.

Zhao, R., & Hirvela, A. (2015). Undergraduate ESL students' engagement in academic reading and writing in learning to write a synthesis paper. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *27*(2), 219-241

Zwann, R., & Rapp, D. (2006). 'Discourse comprehension'. In M. Traxler & M.A. Gernsbacher (Eds.), *Handbook of Psycholinguistics* (2nd edn), (pp. 725-64). Academic Press.

Appendices

Appendix A. Applied Linguistics course description

Course Specifications

Course Title:	Applied Linguistics
Course Code:	333ENG-2
Program:	BA, English
Department:	Department of English
College:	College of Arts
Institution:	University of Bisha

December 2018

Table of Contents

A. Course Identification....3
6. Mode of Instruction (mark all that apply)....3
B. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes....4
1. Course Description....4
2. Course Main Objective....4
3. Course Learning Outcomes....4
C. Course Content....4
D. Teaching and Assessment....5
1. Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes with Teaching Strategies and Assessment Methods....5
2. Assessment Tasks for Students....5
E. Student Academic Counseling and Support....6
F. Learning Resources and Facilities....6
1.Learning Resources....6
2. Facilities Required....6
G. Course Quality Evaluation....7
H. Specification Approval Data....7

A. Course Identification

1. Credit hours: 2
2. Course type a. University ☐ College ☐ Department √ Others ☐ b. Required √ Elective ☐
3. Level/year at which this course is offered: Year (3), Level (6)
4. Pre-requisites for this course: 231Eng-3
5. Co-requisites for this course: NA

6. Mode of Instruction

No	Mode of Instruction	Contact Hours	Percentage
1	Traditional classroom	25.5	85%
2	Blended		
3	E-learning	4.5	15%
4	Correspondence		
5	Other		

7. Actual Learning Hours (based on academic semester)

No	Activity	Learning Hours
Contact Hours		
1	Lecture	30
2	Laboratory/Studio	
3	Tutorial	
4	Others	
	Total	30
Other Learning Hours*		
1	Study	20
2	Assignments	5
3	Library	5
4	Projects/Research Essays/Theses	10
5	Exams	10
	Total	50

B. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes

1. Course Description

General Description:

This course familiarizes the students with the various sub-disciplines in the field of Applied Linguistics. However, it concentrates mainly on providing a comprehensive picture of the theoretical foundations of language learning and teaching as well as information about classroom research and activities. Topics include language learning and teaching, first language acquisition, age and acquisition, human learning etc. The students get the opportunity to understand the history of foreign language teaching as well as the getting the clear vision of the modern methods and techniques in foreign language teaching. The students learn the peculiarities of language testing for various language skills. This course prepares learners to conduct action research and to develop a research topic that will help them when taking Thesis.

2. Course Main Objective

By the end of the course, learners will be able to:

1. **Show their knowledge about the definition and areas of applied linguistics**
2. **Explain the difference between the first and the second language acquisition.**
3. **Recognize the non-linguistic factors affecting language learning**
4. **Describe the characteristics of foreign language teaching and learning.**
5. **Use language learning strategies in language acquisition. .**
6. **Show the difference between the types of tests and testing.**
7. **Determine the reliability and validity of the tests.**
8. **Use language testing for various language skills.**

3. Course Learning Outcomes

	CLOs	Aligned PLOs
1	**Knowledge:**	
1.1	Recognize the methods and principles of teaching languages.	K2
1.2	Explain the process of evaluating listening, speaking, reading, writing and grammar tests.	K2
2	**Skills :**	
2.1	Demonstrate critical and analytical thinking.	S1
2.2	Analyze different methods of teaching.	S1
3	**Competence:**	
3.1	Develop interpersonal skills and capacity to carry out responsibilities in professional sectors.	C1, C5
3.2	Develop techniques of various teaching methods.	C3

C. Course Content

No	List of Topics	Contact Hours
1	Introduction to the areas of Applied Linguistics	2
2	Human Learning	2

3	Approaches to second language acquisition	2
4	The Grammar Translation Method	2
5	The Direct Method	2
6	The Audio-lingual Method	2
7	The Silent Way	2
8	Total Physical Response	2
9	Communicative Language Teaching	2
10	Testing and Evaluation: an Introduction	2
11	Types of Tests and Testing	2
12	Types of Tests and Testing	2
13	Reliability and Validity of Tests	2
14	Testing and Evaluation of Foreign Language Skills	2
15	Revision	2
Total		30

D. Teaching and Assessment

1. Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes with Teaching Strategies and Assessment Methods

Code	Course Learning Outcomes	Teaching Strategies	Assessment Methods
1.0	**Knowledge**		
1.1	Recognize the methods and principles of teaching languages.	Lecturing. Discussion Corrective feedback. Pair/Group Work. Demos. Cooperative Learning	Quizzes. Assignments. Activities (Online-classroom-homework). Term/Final exams.
1.2	Explain the process of evaluating listening, speaking, reading, writing and grammar tests.		
2.0	**Skills**		
2.1	Demonstrate critical and analytical thinking.	Lecturing. Presentation. Report on a method of teaching. Pair/Group Work. Demos.	Quizzes. Assignments. Activities (Online-classroom-homework). Term/Final exams.
2.2	Analyze different methods of teaching. Evaluate and compare different methods of teaching.		
3.0	**Competence**		
3.1	Develop interpersonal skills and capacity to carry out responsibilities in professional sectors.	Lecturing. Presentation. Corrective feedback. Pair/Group Work. Demos. Eclectic methods	Quizzes. Assignments. Activities (Online-classroom-homework). Term/Final exams.
3.2	Develop techniques of various teaching methods.		

2. Assessment Tasks for Students

#	Assessment task*	Week Due	Percentage of Total Assessment Score
1	Quizzes	-----	10%

#	Assessment task*	Week Due	Percentage of Total Assessment Score
2	Midterm	9-11	20%
3	Activities (class-online)	-----	10%
4	Assignments	-----	5%
5	Participation	-----	5%
6	Final Exam	16th	50%

E. Student Academic Counseling and Support

Arrangements for availability of faculty and teaching staff for individual student consultations and academic advice :

1- Each student is assigned an academic advisor on the Electronic Academic System (https://registration.ub.edu.sa/bisha/init).
2- The college and department academic counseling committees provide support for students (www.ub.edu.sa/web/sab/-6).
3- Teachers are available for 5 hours weekly in their offices for individual students' consultation and academic advice.

F. Learning Resources and Facilities

1. Learning Resources

Required Textbooks	1. Brown, D. H. (2014). Principles of language learning and teaching (6th ed.). New York: Longman.(Chapters 2,4,8,10) 2. Larsen-Freeman, Diana (2011) Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching (third edition), Oxford University Press (Chapters 1,2,3,4,8,9) 3. Hughes, Arther. (2003). Testing for Language Teachers (Second Edition). UK. Cambridge. (Chapters: 1,3,4,5, 11,12,13)
Essential References Materials	1. Madsen, Harold S. (1983) Techniques in Testing. New York: Oxford University Press. 2. Davies, A. & Mitchell, K. (2007). An Introduction to Applied Linguistics. UK. Edinburgh University Press.
Electronic Materials	Web Sites, Facebook, Twitter, etc.
Other Learning Materials	Such as computer-based programs/CD, professional standards or regulations and software.

2. Facilities Required

Item	Resources
Accommodation	Computerized Language Labs: maximum student number—20
Technology Resources	Electronic whiteboards, movable whiteboards, projectors and educational software, cables to connect laptops to projectors and either speakers or CD players for audio educational materials.
Other Resources	• Language Labs • Projectors High-speed internet and intranet

Item	Resources
	connections

G. Course Quality Evaluation

Evaluation Areas/Issues	Evaluators	Evaluation Methods
Effectiveness of teaching	• Students • Teacher • Program Coordinator Peer Reviewers	• Questionnaires. • Direct feedback. • Peer reviews reports. • Class observations and reviews. • Annual staff reports. Course and program reports.
Effectiveness of assessment	• Teacher Program Coordinator	• Questionnaires • Direct feedback. • Peer reviews reports. • Class observations and reviews. • Annual staff reports. • Course and program reports. Exam paper evaluation
Achievement of CLOs (course learning outcomes)	• Teacher Program Coordinator	• Exam results analysis. Course and program reports.
Quality of learning resources	• Teacher Program Coordinator	• Questionnaire. Course and program reports.
Effectiveness of improvement plans	• Teacher Program Coordinator	Course and program reports.

H. Specification Approval Data

Council / Committee	Department Council
Reference No.	01/01/17/39-39
Date	17/07/1439H

Appendix B. Research Methods course description

Course Specifications

Course Title:	Research Project
Course Code:	422ENG-2
Program:	BA, English
Department:	Department of English
College:	College of Arts
Institution:	University of Bisha

December 2018

Table of Contents

A. Course Identification **3**

6. Mode of Instruction (mark all that apply) 3

B. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes **4**

1. Course Description 4
2. Course Main Objective 4
3. Course Learning Outcomes 4

C. Course Content **5**

D. Teaching and Assessment **6**

1. Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes with Teaching Strategies and Assessment Methods 6
2. Assessment Tasks for Students 7

E. Student Academic Counseling and Support **7**

F. Learning Resources and Facilities **7**

1.Learning Resources 7

2. Facilities Required 8

G. Course Quality Evaluation **8**

H. Specification Approval Data **8**

A. Course Identification

1. Credit hours: 2
2. Course type a. University ☐ College ☐ Department ☑ Others ☐ b. Required ☑ Elective ☐
3. Level/year at which this course is offered: Year (4), Level (8)
4. Pre-requisites for this course: 421ENG-2
5. Co-requisites for this course: NA

6. Mode of Instruction

No	Mode of Instruction	Contact Hours	Percentage
1	Traditional classroom	25.5	85%
2	Blended		
3	E-learning	4.5	15%
4	Correspondence		
5	Other		

7. Actual Learning Hours (based on academic semester)

No	Activity	Learning Hours
Contact Hours		
1	Lecture	30
2	Laboratory/Studio	
3	Tutorial	
4	Others	
	Total	30
Other Learning Hours*		
1	Study	15
2	Assignments	5
3	Library	10
4	Projects/Research Essays/Theses	20
5	Others	
	Total	50

B. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes

1. Course Description

This undergraduate course is a practical course that follows a theoretical course, Basics of Scientific research in English. It guides students to research a particular literary, linguistic or translation subjects in depth by engaging and making critical use of the necessary theoretical tools and information technology. It focuses on selecting a study topic, formulating inquiry questions, organizing and writing a literature review, and selecting appropriate research designs and methodologies for data collection and analysis. It is a sequential course, in terms of students are guided, (step by step), to conduct a research paper that will be submitted at the end of the semester once the study is completed. By the end of the course, students will complete a full research project that includes an introduction, problem statement (significance of study), literature review, methods of data collection and analysis, findings, discussion, conclusions, and a list of references.

In summary, the course helps undergraduate students of English become novice researchers.

2. Course Main Objectives

The objectives of the course are to enable the students to:

1. Go through from idea to topic to title of a research paper;
2. Develop the design of their own research including aim, objective, research questions, significance, and delimitations, etc.;
3. Get familiarized with the published information related to their topic and how to dig for and document it;
4. Choose the methodology for their research;
5. Collect their data, analyze it, and generate results and discussion;
6. Conclude their research and give recommendations for the future researchers;
7. Write references using APA, MLA latest format;
8. Submit a proof-read research project of their own;
9. Consolidate their research and academic skills to present research findings in a spoken form.

3. Course Learning Outcomes

	CLOs	Aligned PLOs
1	**Knowledge:**	
1.1	Describe the concepts of researching.	K.3
1.2	Recognize library archiving system of books and journals and the searching techniques for e-resources.	K.3
1.3	Identify the nature and mechanism of conducting research.	K.3
1.4	Explain various stages of research along with the requirements of each stage.	K.3
2	**Skills :**	
2.1	Practice writing a research on linguistics, literature or translation studies.	S.1
2.2	Analyze research questions and collect relevant data.	S.5
2.3	Test results obtained from research.	S.5
3	**Competence:**	
3.1	Choose a topic from academic fields to make it their specialization.	C.2
3.2	Plan their research according to the norms of the discipline.	C.2
3.3	Choose modern technology and software to complete their research	C.3

	CLOs	Aligned PLOs
	projects.	
3.4	Prepare research project independently.	C.3

C. Course Content

No	List of Topics	Contact Hours
1	Orientation and General revision of the ideas of research methods in English.	2
2	Introduction to writing research: Guidelines for writing a research project and providing students with examples of: a. the conditions for maintaining ethics of research, b. and avoiding plagiarism and subjectivity in research writing, c. Major research themes in English linguistics, literature and translation	2
3	3- Theoretical discussion focusing on how to write a research proposal and plan for a research paper: a. finding a topic or a research problem, b. formulating research questions, or hypothesis, c. selecting the suitable data collection methods, d. selecting the suitable approach of analysis, e. selecting techniques of result interpretation and discussion, f. providing the students with samples of general research articles in linguistics, literature and translation, focusing on the main elements of the typical research paper, and explaining how researchers of these articles formulate the titles and the other elements of the papers.	6
4	For getting experiential knowledge: a. a visit to be paid by the teacher and students to the University library to get full knowledge about the archiving system of books, journals and the available digital resources in the web. b. how to perform searching using Google and others types of scientific searching tools and sites on the web.	2
5	Students submit research proposals and get feedback to start their research proposals. The instructor discusses with all the students: a. the selected topics of research. b. the importance and limitation of the selected research topic and c. the relation between the title and the research questions or hypotheses d. the related literature or theoretical background and its organization and its relations to the variables of the research, e. the suitability of the selected data collection approaches and data analysis methods	4
6	Showing the students, the various styles of referencing system and how to write document and the right way to record references, a focus will be on (APA and the MLA style).	2
7	Helping students in Discussing the findings of the research projects and the recommendations.	5

8	Students incorporate corrections and feedback from their guides for the first drafts.	5
9	They submit the final draft of their research for evaluation and oral viva voce.	2
Total		30

D. Teaching and Assessment

1. Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes with Teaching Strategies and Assessment Methods

Code	Course Learning Outcomes	Teaching Strategies	Assessment Methods
1.0	**Knowledge**		
1.1	Describe the concepts of researching.	Lectures / Seminar	Activities and Exam Quizzes Assignments
1.2	Recognize library archiving system of books and journals and the searching techniques for e-resources.	Lecture and visiting library	
1.3	Identify the nature and mechanism of conducting research.	Lectures and Group Discussions	
1.4	Explain various stages of research along with the requirements of each stage.	Lectures and Cooperative Learning	
2.0	**Skills**		
2.1	Practice writing a research on linguistics, literature or translation studies.	Class practice Task Based activities Blackboard Discussion Forum Cooperative Learning	Term Paper and/or Presentation
2.2	Analyze research questions and collect relevant data.		
2.3	Test results obtained from research.		
3.0	**Competence**		
3.1	Choose a topic from academic fields to make it their specialization.	Assignments Presentation	Presentation Activities Term Paper
3.2	Plan their research according to the norms of the discipline.		
3.3	Choose modern technology and software to complete their research projects.		
3.4	Prepare research project independently.		

2. Assessment Tasks for Students

#	Assessment task*	Week Due	Percentage of Total Assessment Score
1	Section-wise timely submission of research project	-	10%
2	Blackboard discussion forum	-	15 %
3	Proposal	6 , 7	30%
4	Research paper	15	30 %
5	Defense	16	15 %
	Total		100 %

E. Student Academic Counseling and Support

Arrangements for availability of faculty and teaching staff for individual student consultations and academic advice :

1- Each student is assigned an academic advisor on the Electronic Academic System (https://registration.ub.edu.sa/bisha/init).
2- The college and department academic counseling committees provide support for students (www.ub.edu.sa/web/sab/-6).
3- Teachers are available for 5 hours weekly in their offices for individual students' consultation and academic advice.

F. Learning Resources and Facilities

1.Learning Resources

Required Textbooks	Anthony C. Winkler, Jo Ray McCuen-Metherell (2012).*Writing the Research Paper A Handbook*. Boston, USA. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
Essential References Materials	http://student.ucol.ac.nz/library/onlineresources/Documents/APA_Guide_2017.pdf
Electronic Materials	https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_style_introduction.html http://www.citethisforme.com/au/referencing-generator/apa https://guides.unitec.ac.nz/apareferencing/webpages
Other Learning Materials	The SAGE Handbook of Online Research Methods Nigel G Fielding, Raymond M Lee, Grant Blank - 2016

2. Facilities Required

Item	Resources
Accommodation	Classroom, Conference room for Defense
Technology Resources	Porjector or smart board, SPSS latest edition, Antconc
Other Resources	

G. Course Quality Evaluation

Evaluation Areas/Issues	Evaluators	Evaluation Methods
Effectiveness of Research Projects Effectiveness of teaching	Supervisors, Peer reviewers, Researchers	Feedback from researchers, supervisors' observations, head of departments' reports
Effectiveness of assessment	Supervisory Committee, Supervisors	Informal evaluation of Research Proposals and Formal / Summative assessment of Theses
Achievement of course learning outcomes	Departmental council Curriculum Review Committee Supervisory Committee, Supervisors	Department Council meetings to discuss and finalize proposals made by the Curriculum Review
Quality of learning resources	Department Academic Committee, Library Committee, LMS trainers	Meetings and trainings

H. Specification Approval Data

Council / Committee	Department Council
Reference No.	01/01/17/39-39
Date	17/07/1439H

Appendix C. The study plan in the English Department

المستوى الدراسي الأول (Level 1)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
	2	الثقافة الإسلامية (1) Islamic Culture (1)	111 سلم
	2	المهارات اللغوية Language Skills	201 عرب
	3	الاستماع والتحدث (1) Listening and Speaking (1)	110 إنج
	3	القراءة والاستيعاب (1) Reading Comprehension (1)	111 إنج
	3	الكتابة (1) Writing (1)	112 إنج
	3	القواعد (1) Grammar (1)	113 إنج
	16 وحدة	6 مقررات (6 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المستوى الدراسي الثاني (Level 2)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
	2	الثقافة الإسلامية (2) Islamic Culture (2)	112 سلم
110إنج	3	الاستماع والتحدث 2 Listening and Speaking (2)	114 إنج

111إنج	3	القراءة والاستيعاب (2) Reading Comprehension (2)	115 إنج
112إنج	3	الكتابة (2) Writing (2)	116 إنج
113إنج	3	القواعد (2) Grammar (2)	117 إنج
	2	المهارات الدراسية Study Skills	118 إنج
	16 وحدة	6 مقررات (6 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المستوى الدراسي الثالث (Level 3)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
	2	الثقافة الإسلامية (3) Islamic Culture (3)	113 سلم
114 إنج	3	الاستماع والتحدث (3) Listening and Speaking (3)	210 إنج
115 إنج	3	القراءة والاستيعاب (3) Reading Comprehension (3)	211 إنج
116 إنج	3	الكتابة (3) Writing (3)	212 إنج
117 إنج	2	القواعد (3) Grammar (3)	213 إنج
	3	بناء المفردات (1) Vocabulary Building (1)	214 إنج
	16 وحدة	6 مقررات (6 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المستوى الدراسي الرابع (Level 4)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
	2	حاسب آلي Computer	101 حالج
210 إنج	3	الاستماع والتحدث (4) Listening and Speaking (4)	215 إنج
211 إنج	2	القراءة والاستيعاب (4) Reading Comprehension (4)	216 إنج
212 إنج	2	الكتابة (4) Writing (4)	217 إنج
213 إنج	2	القواعد (4) Grammar (4)	218 إنج
214 إنج	3	بناء المفردات (2) Vocabulary Building (2)	219 إنج
	14 وحدة	6 مقررات (6 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المستوى الدراسي الخامس (Level 5)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
	2	الثقافة الإسلامية (4) Islamic Culture (4)	114 سلم
	2	التحرير العربي Arabic Composition	202 عرب
	2	ورشة عمل الخطابة Speech Workshop	310 إنج
	3	مقدمة في اللغويات Introduction to Linguistics	320 إنج
	3	الصوتيات Phonetics	321 إنج
	3	مقدمة في الفنون الأدبية Introduction to Literary Forms	330 إنج
	15 وحدة	6 مقررات (6 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المستوى الدراسي السادس (Level 6)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
217 إنج	3	الكتابة لأغراض معينة Writing for Specific Purposes	311 إنج
	3	التكنولوجيا و تعلم اللغة Technology and Language Learning	312 إنج
321 إنج	3	علم الأصوات Phonology	325 إنج
330 إنج	2	القصة القصيرة Short Story	331 إنج
330 إنج	2	المسرحية Drama	332 إنج
	2	الترجمة (1) Translation (1)	340 ترج
	15 وحدة	6 مقررات (6 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المستوى الدراسي السابع (Level 7)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
217 إنج	3	طرق البحث Research Methods	411 إنج
	3	اللغويات التطبيقية (1) Applied Linguistics (1)	422 إنج
320 إنج	3	علم الصرف Morphology	426 إنج
330 إنج	2	الشعر Poetry	430 إنج
330 إنج	2	الرواية Novel	431 إنج
340 ترج	2	الترجمة (2) Translation (2)	440 ترج
	15 وحدة	6 مقررات (6 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المستوى الدراسي الثامن (Level 8)

المتطلب السابق Pre-requisites	عدد الوحدات Credit Hours	إسم المقرر Course Name	الرقم والرمز Course Code
422 إنج	3	اللغويات التطبيقية (2) Applied Linguistics (2)	423 إنج
218 إنج	3	الإعداد للاختبارات العالمية International Test Preparation	425 إنج
320 إنج	3	علم النحو Syntax	427 إنج
330 إنج	2	الحركات الأدبية الحديثة Modern Literary Movements	433 إنج
340 ترج	2	الترجمة (3) Translation (3)	441 ترج
	13 وحدة	5 مقررات (5 Courses)	المجموع (Total)

المجموع العام **47 مقررا** **120 وحدة**

اللغة الانجليزية المكثفة (1+2)

اللغة الانجليزية العلمية

Appendix D. Pre-protocol interviews

Interviews

INTERVIEW 1: OPENING STATEMENT TO STUDENTS (about 30 min)

I would like to interview you to discover some more about your process of reading-to-write and your attitudes to reading and writing. All the information we learn about your reading and writing process will remain confidential and will only be shared with other researchers for research purposes. There are no 'right' answers to the questions you will be asked, and we are not grading you, but are rather only trying to gain more information on your particular reading and writing processes. The interview will be recorded and at times I shall be writing down some notes just to ensure that I understand all the points you are making.

PRE-PROTOCOL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1- Tell me about your personal history briefly. (General background) Prompts:

• Which part of Saudi Arabia do you come from?

• Do people speak English there?

• Do you have any work experience?

2. **Describe your educational background (general background) Prompts**:

• Did you study in public or private schools?

• Did you come to do your BA straight after your high school?

• Have you had any English courses before joining your BA study?

WRITING

3. **Talk about your experiences in writing in English**. Who/what has influenced your learning of English writing?

4. **How did you use English writing in your classes? Prompts:**

• What kind of writing in English did you have to do for your classes? (Prompt: essay, summary, research paper, none)

• How was English writing scored in your classes? (Prompt: what were the criteria for good English writing?)

• How did you feel about the English writing in your classes?

5. **What are the features of a good writer in the English Department?** LIST AT LEAST THREE FEATURES.

READING

6. **What is reading?**

7. **Talk about your experiences of reading in English. Who/what has influenced your learning of English reading?**

8. **How did you use English reading in your academic classes? Prompts:**

• What kind of reading did you have to do for your studies? (Prompt: textbook reading, research article reading, etc.)

• How did you feel about the English reading in your studies?

9. **What are the features of a good reader in your studies?** LIST AT LEAST THREE FEATURES.

Thank you for your time!

Appendix E. Post-protocol interviews

INTERVIEW 2

POST-PROTOCOL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (about 30 min)

When given an assignment, students often ask teachers, 'What do you want' because they need to figure out how they are supposed to do the assignment. I want to get a sense of both what you decided you ought to do in the task you did and how you decided it. (Show the task instructions and writing assignment to the student and give them some time to look back over the task and assignment.)

FIRST TASK

1. Try to think back to when you did the task. Before you reply to any of my following questions, feel free to look over your first assignment.

- How did you start your task?
- Did you experience any problems/difficulties **before** doing the task? if yes, what are they? What did you do to solve the problems?
- How did you know you were done with the task?
- Did you read your own writing after finishing it? What were the main components of writing that you paid attention to while you made your finished product?

2. What did you think were the most important things that were expected from you in this task? LIST AT LEAST THREE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS.

3. **How did you know that these things were important for the task?** (Prompt: in deciding how to do an assignment, students often use various clues such as information written on the assignment itself, comments that they get from tutors or other students, points that are discussed in class).

4. **Was this task similar to any task you have done before?**

5. **Are you familiar with the topic of the texts? Did the topic affect your reading and writing?**

6. **Do you think talking aloud affected your reading and writing? How?**

7. **Do you normally think in your first language when reading and writing?** (Think-aloud effect)

8. **Do you have any questions for me?**

Thank you for your time!

Appendix F. Reading-to-write tasks given to the English Department students at the University of Bisha

University of Bisha **College of Sciences &Arts** **Department of English**	جامعة بيشة UNIVERSITY OF BISHA	**1st Assignment** **2nd Semester, Level 7** **Subject:** ***Applied Linguistics-1,*** **(ENG 423)**

I. What are the similarities/differences between the Contrastive Analysis approach and the Error Analysis approach? Write a comparative essay using the two articles below. (10 Marks)

1- Lardiere, D. (2009). Some thoughts on the contrastive analysis of features in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research, 25*(2), 173-227.

2- Khansir, A. A. (2012). Error Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 2*(5).

....
....

....
....

....
....

Appendix G. The reading-to-write tasks used in this study

TASKS

Your name:

Your university email address:

Date:

TASK 1

THINKING ALOUD WHILE YOU READ

I am interested in the thoughts that go through your head as you read and write. I am asking you to do these things:

1. Work on the task as you **normally** would if you were alone in your room: read, think, take notes, or just write. (However, don't erase. Simply cross through (like this ~~word~~) anything you don't intend to use.)

2. While you are reading, thinking to yourself, or writing - please SAY OUT LOUD EVERYTHING **that you would say to yourself silently while you think**, even as you are writing something down. Talk **CONSTANTLY** and **LOUDLY** enough into your microphone.

3. I am NOT asking you to explain or justify what you are doing. I want you to focus all your attention on doing the task. Simply **THINK OUT LOUD** as if you were **talking to yourself** as you did the task.

4. You can **use your preferred language**, either Arabic or English, or both, while thinking aloud.

5. You can **use your dictionary** during reading and writing, if you want.

Part 1. Directions: Read the following two passages that are arguing **for two different sides** of the same issue. After you finish reading, you will write an essay

TEXT 1. ***Foreign students and foreign methodologies*****, by Holliday, 1994 (excerpt).**

On the one hand, there are curriculum developers or teachers trying to effect appropriate English language teaching with students who are foreign to them, either at home or abroad. They try to understand students' attitudes and ways of doing things, which, to the outsider, are often unclear. On the other hand, there are teachers and curriculum developers who are native to the countries where they work, and the same nationality as the students they teach. These language educators are trying to make sense of methodologies developed in Britain, North America or Australasia for 'ideal' teaching-learning situations which are very different from their own. In this latter scenario, the question of what *the ideal classroom situation is*, or how far received classroom methodologies *are* the most appropriate, becomes very important. However, we have insufficient data about what really happens between people in the classroom. In addition, we lack this data for the wide range of social settings in which English language education is carried out around the world.

The two problem scenarios represent a basic division in the English language education profession. Current literature on the subject of appropriate methodologies often distinguishes between Western and non-Western or between the developed and the developing world. This literature argues that the transfer of methodologies from the first to the second in each race is problematic because of

different attitudes towards education or lack of resources. However, these distinctions are misleading. There is indeed a problem of technology transfer which is not only in terms of teaching methodology, but in terms of the whole technology of English language education. However, it is not simply a Western-non-Western problem, because it is sometimes difficult to implement the methodology in continental Western Europe. Neither is it simply a developed-developing problem, because there are difficulties in implementing the methodology in developed countries such as Japan. It is rather a problem of English language teaching methodologies developed specifically in Britain, North America and Australasia being implemented almost everywhere else. Almost all the internationally established literature on English language education is published in these countries, which_ at present, seem to have a virtual control on received methodology.

TEXT 2. *A Pedagogy of particularity*, by Kumaravadivelu, 2001 (excerpt)

First and foremost, any post method pedagogy has to be a pedagogy of particularity. That is to say, language pedagogy, to be relevant, must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural environment. A pedagogy of particularity, then, is opposed to the notion that there can be one set of pedagogic aims and objectives realisable through one set of pedagogic principles and procedures. At its core, the idea of pedagogic particularity is consistent with the perspective of situational understanding (Elliott, 1993) which claims that a meaningful pedagogy cannot be constructed without a holistic interpretation of particular situations and that it cannot be improved without a general improvement of those particular situations.

All pedagogy, like all politics, is local. To ignore local needs is to ignore lived experiences. Pedagogies that ignore lived experiences will ultimately prove to be 'so disturbing for those affected by them - so threatening to their belief systems - that hostility is aroused, and learning becomes impossible' (Cole, 1996). A case in point is the sense of disillusionment that accompanied the spread of communicative language teaching. From South Africa, Chick (1996) wonders whether 'our choice of communicative language teaching as a goal was possibly a sort of naive ethnocentrism prompted by the thought that what is good for Europe, or the USA had to be good for KwaZulu' (p. 22). From Pakistan, Shamim (1996) reports that her attempt to introduce communicative language teaching into her classroom met with a great deal of resistance from her learners, making her 'terribly exhausted' and leading her to realise that, by introducing this methodology, she was actually 'creating psychological barriers to learning' (p. 109). From India, Tickoo (1996) points out that even locally initiated pedagogic innovations have failed because they merely attempted to combine them with the methodological framework inherited from abroad, without fully taking into account local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities.

An interesting aspect of particularity is that it is not a thing out there to be searched and rescued. Nor is it an illusion that lives in the fantasy world of productive imagination, unreal and unrealised. From a pedagogic point of view, particularity is at once a goal and a process.

Part 2: Writing an argumentative essay

Directions: Write a well-organised academic essay on the topic below. Your essay will be evaluated on content, organisation and appropriate use of English. You may refer to the reading passages while you are writing.

ESSAY TOPIC: Some people believe that asking a teacher educator from the west to travel to non-western countries to train local teachers of English is a good way of educating local teachers. Others believe that it is important for local educators to train local teachers. **Which position do you support?**

Plan and write an essay supporting your position and using examples and evidence to support your position. Incorporate relevant information from the passages appropriately. Do not copy exact phrases; cite the authors. Make sure to include a conclusion.

Write your essay on the lined paper. Take as much time as you need to write your essay.

Appendix H. Think-aloud protocol practice task

PRACTICE TASK

<table><tr><td>
THINKING ALOUD WHILE YOU READ

I am interested in the thoughts that go through your head as you read and write. I am asking you to do these things:

Work on the task as you **normally** would if you were alone in your room: read, think, take notes, or just write. (However, don't erase. Simply cross through (like this ~~word~~) anything you don't intend to use.)

2 While you are reading, thinking to yourself, or writing - please SAY OUT LOUD EVERYTHING **that you would say to yourself silently while you think** even as you are writing something down. Talk CONSTANTLY and LOUDLY enough into your microphone.

3 I am NOT asking you to explain or justify what you are doing. I want you to focus all your attention on doing the task. Simply THINK OUT LOUD as if you were talking to yourself.

4. You can use **your preferred language**, either your first language or English, or both, while thinking aloud.

5. You can use **your dictionary** during reading and writing, if you want.
</td></tr></table>

Please read the two passages below.

Kabilan, M. K., Ahmad, N., & Abidin, M. J. Z. (2010). Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education? *The Internet and Higher Education*, *13*(4), 179-187.

1. Introduction

In the 48th Annual Japanese Association of College English Teachers (JACET) Convention that was held in Sapporo, Japan (4–6th September 2009), Mark Warschauer delivered an online keynote address live from the United States, entitled ‘Teaching for Global Literacy’. In that keynote, Warshauer argued for the construct of global literacy with the aid of online media. He postulated that ‘computer-mediated communication is one of the oldest yet still most valuable tool of network-based language teaching, as it puts learners in direct contact with others for authentic communication’ (p. 28), and therefore, has positive outcomes for teaching and learning of English. In his lecture, he used computer-mediated communication (CMC) tools, blogs and wikis as examples of online media to promote global literacy. Facebook (FB) was not discussed even though it is one of the leading social networking spaces that applies many of the elements of computer-mediated communication tools (such as synchronous and asynchronous discussion and sharing pictures and video capabilities).

Later in the question-and-answer session, the presenter was asked if FB had been researched or used for the purpose of teaching and learning of English, to which he responded that he had not come across any, and reasoned that FB is more of a social network or space rather than a learning environment for English. Further discussions that took place in the question-and-answer session prompted a study to discern and ascertain if FB could be a space for learning English, especially in the context of Malaysian university education where the standard of English has deteriorated.

Appendix I. The video link of the think-aloud protocol demonstration

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ITu6_KgePzs

Appendix J. The participant consent form

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Project title: The Role of Reading in an Integrated Reading-to-Write Task: A Think-Aloud Study of EFL Undergraduate English Language Students in a Saudi Context

Researcher: Ahmed Alshehri, University of York, UK

The purpose of the project is to investigate the reading-to-write processes which Saudi EFL English students use when completing integrated reading-to-write tasks and determine how these processes relate to the writers' resulting performances.

Research method: Think-aloud protocols, interviews, students' written products

Your participation: You will be asked to attend two sessions. In the first session, you will be interviewed about your previous academic reading and writing experiences. You will then receive a brief explanation of the think-aloud technique and watch two short video demonstrations on the technique. In the second session, you will first practise a think-aloud technique and will then be asked to read three research article introductions and to write an essay. While performing the task, you will be asked to think-aloud using your preferred language, and your performance will be audio- and video-recorded. At the end, you will be interviewed about your performance of the task. All the interviews will be audio-recorded. In addition, you will be asked to give your permission to access your writing assignments grades so that I can compare them with your writing tasks performed in this study. You do not need to tick the box if you do not wish that I access your assignments and their marks.

You will be able to comment on the written transcripts of your think-aloud and your interviews.

Anonymity

The results of the study will be stored by code number. Any information that identifies you will be stored separately from the data.

Storing and using your data

The collected data will securely be stored in password protected files and only the researcher will have access to these secured files. The results will be kept until October 2022 after which time they will be destroyed. The data may be used for future analysis and shared for research or training purposes, but participants will not be identified individually. If you do not want your data to be included in any information shared as a result of this research, please do not sign this consent form. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time during data collection and up to two weeks after the data are collected. If you do so, any data you have provided will be destroyed.

Information about confidentiality

The information which I collect may be used in anonymous format in presentations and publications. Please indicate on the consent form enclosed with a tick mark (✓) if you are happy for this anonymised data to be used in the ways listed.

I hope that you will agree to take part. If you have any questions about the project that you would like to ask before giving consent or after the data collection, please feel free to email Ahmed Alshehri, (aaaa552@york.ac.uk), or the Chair of the Ethics Committee education-research-administrator @york ac.uk.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information.

Yours sincerely

Ahmed Alshehri

CONSENT FORM

Please initial each box if you are happy to take part in this research.

I confirm that I have read and understood the information given to me about the above-named research project and I understand that this will involve me taking part as described above.	
I give permission to access my writing assignments and their marks.	
I understand that the purpose of the research is to examine students' reading processes and their role in writing.	
I understand that data will be stored securely in password protected files and only Ahmed Alshehri will have access to any identifiable data. I understand that my identity will be protected by use of a code.	
I understand that my data will not be identifiable, and the data may be used	
in publications that are mainly read by university academics in presentations	
in presentation that are mainly attended by university academics	
in publications that are mainly read by the public	
in presentations that are mainly attended by the public	

I understand that data will be kept until October 2022 after which it will be destroyed.	
I understand that data could be used for future analysis or other purposes.	
I understand that I can withdraw my data at any point during data collection and up to two weeks after data is collected.	

Your full name: …………………………………………….

Your university email address: …………………………….

THANK YOU!

Appendix K. Think-aloud protocol transcription example

Task

Several L1 programmes have been instituted! Instituted, this like institution, (*reading silently*), **biology, psychology, sociology, linking the compositions to subject matter in another course.** Scholars in psychology, biology, sociology work with other scientists to … , **Investigations of these programmes reveal some obvious advantages: students learn new forms of writing which as professionals they might need; they have more time to write, since there is less reading due to the fact that one subject matter is employed for two courses; and their discussions**, okay, they have time and there is a discussion and they have new forms of writing, **However, the disadvantages of such a programme are equally, if not more, significant, as Wilkinson (1985) and others show, and should be of great concern to the English teacher. first of all, it is difficult for a writing course to have a carefully planned pedagogical,** what, I will look it up using my phone, **furthermore, the timing of assignments is not always optimal. Second, the programme can raise false expectations among the faculty as well as among the students. English faculty, even when they collaborate with content teachers, find they have little basis for dealing with the content.** So, there is a problem between English teachers and specialists about the content, reading the same sentence again, **they therefore find themselves in the uncomfortable position of being less knowledgeable than their students.** Yes, sure, because students, maybe teachers, or students maybe they have searched the topics such as psychology, sociology, biology and they might have a full understanding of these topics more than their teachers and that cause the problem,

they therefore find themselves in the uncomfortable position of being less knowledgeable than their students. Students likewise can resent finding themselves in a situation in which their instructor cannot fully explain or answer questions about the subject matter. Yes, that is a problem and may cause a problem for you teachers read well, **Faigley and Hansen (1985) observed collaborative courses in which completely different criteria for evaluation were applied to students' papers by the two teachers because the English teacher did not recognise when a student failed to demonstrate adequate knowledge of a discipline or showed a good grasp of new knowledge.** That means the evaluation is different in two things and in two cases, two different assessments, (*reading the sentence again*), okay. **The same phenomenon can hold true in L2 writing instruction. Pearson (1983) finds that 'the instructor cannot always conveniently divorce!** Conveniently divorce? What does it mean? Divorce what? I could not get the meaning here; words could be linked but meaning is difficult to understand. For example, he says **This drawback is often mentioned only in passing in articles recommending that English teachers use technical and scientific materials they are not familiar with,** how recommending and then not familiar, perhaps, the first text I got something out of it, it talks about L1 learners and L1 teachers and how learners in terms of writing, if they enter their programme normally they will not outsmart their teachers but when they read a lot in different disciplines they may be more knowledgeable than their teachers and that creates a problem. Moreover, if the students get enrolled in their normal programme such biology, psychology and sociology, in terms of writing, and these are stages which they connect together, teachers have investigated the topic and they found that it has advantages and disadvantages which may affect the student's

perceptions or knowledge and the writing genres which give them more than one option or styles in the writing, and in terms of reading, the information students get from their reading and writing are more than the information they extract from the topic, and I found that it has some disadvantages as Wilkinson mentioned that students may be better than teachers in a certain stage and this causes a problem that teachers would be less knowledgeable than students and may be students found the subject so easy for them or they can answer questions easily, either way would make teachers uncomfortable, this what I have understood so far from the previous text, in brief the more students know about their subjects, the less stressful they get while studying, they find it easy to be confident and get the best of their subjects. I will start now the second text, **Specificity revisited: how far should we go now?** Well, in the first text it was saying how far should we go and here how far should we go now? Why is that? I notice that the previous text was in 1988 and the second one is in 2002 so maybe there is some new information and maybe the tone has changed, **this literature points to the fact that different disciplines identify different types of writing as features of academic literacy and that terms like lab *reports, lectures or memos* imply neither homogeneity**! What does it mean homogeneity? This is new, it seems to be a scientific term; I will look it up, so, teaching methods are different and decide different writing styles for example, features of academic literacy and the term like lab report which is like memos in notes and notetaking in lectures, either homogeneity or difference, (*reading silently*), there is a research confirms that that tasks students do at the university level are concerned with their language proficiency level and the educational system that is being followed by the university, (*reading silently*) **lab reports are common in chemistry,** yes, **programme documentation in computer science,**

sure so true, **and article surveys in maths, (reading silently),** well this first paragraph, some issues are clear to me like features of academic literacy is like terms like lab reports, lectures and memos but in homogenous shape in one common style and this one of kind of writing or new writing style, and I understood that this kind of writing is being taught in universities and for students and it should be suitable for their language proficiency level but undergraduate students, lab reports they present in their chemistry major or the programme documentation in computer science, they do it according to their level in English, (*reading silently*), **This is because successful academic writing depends on the individual writer's projection of a shared context,** that means success in the educational process is based on the writer projection! Projection I think it means suggestions or expectations or maybe I am wrong, let's check, oh it is probability, okay, actually, there are many terms that are beyond my level and I am trying to guess the meaning from the sentences or I may read them again, using scanning and skimming to get what they mean here, better than reading word by word and stopping by each sentence, (*reading for the second time silently*), it seems that the writer gave a clue or a hint that the wiring he is mentioning here in the second text, maybe it means, can we engage the reader into writing effectively or not? And the first topic was about the kinds and style of writing and the teachers give their students more information about common styles in writing, this is what I understand from the first text, and that style has disadvantages as well, one of the major disadvantages that teacher will not feel secure in terms of his information, or the student may reach a level at which he cannot demonstrate the knowledge, and cannot grasp the knowledge properly , and for the second text I will scan it now so I can get what is means, however it is apparent that it talks about academic writing such as lab

reports, memos, and they are forms of academic writing and I don’t know why they are kinds of academic writing because I have no background on memos or lab reports or mathematical assignments but I understand that the academic writing of academic literacy are beneficial for academic students for their education level but undergraduate level students do lab reports and documentation and sometime analysis and articles, so maybe it will be useful for them as a step for them.

Appendix L. High-scoring student's writing example

I think train a local teachers by a westeren ~~teacher~~ teachers educators is a good way ~~of educating~~ in education system. The local teachers will ~~take the~~ ~~na~~ gain the language skills ~~as~~ from a native educator, and then passed these skills ~~with better way~~ in high quality to their students. However, if the local educator train the local teachers, the teachers will gain the skills and knowledge of language but in less quality unless their educator trained by westren educator and has ~~a~~ an excellent level in the language. Furthermore, the Westren educator will transfer the education methodology and apply this methodology in his teaching, which will develop a education system in host country. Finally, I can summary my ~~of~~ thoughts in this sentence, transfer the teaching education from developed conturies to ~~dow~~ developing contries is clear in teaching local teachers by Westren educators.

Appendix M. Low-scoring student's writing example

① L1 and L2; several L1 programs have been instituted to introduce student to the methods os inquiry in various disiplines. And The same phenomenon can hold true in L2 writing instruction.

② wilkinson 1985: English teachers have collaborated with teachers in other disciplines such as biology.

③ Faigley and Hansen; psychology and sociology linking the compositions to subject matter in another course.

④ students learn new forms writing, which as professionals they might need they have more time to write since.

⑤ Hill, Soppelsa, west; This drawback is osten mentioned only in passing in articles recommending that English teachers use

Appendix N. The inter-rater reliability scores

Names	***Rater 1***	***Rater 2***	***Rater 3***	***Average***
Muneer	1	2	2	1.6
Ziad	2	2	2	2
Sami	4	4	5	4.3
Kamal	2	2	3	2.3
Hatim	4	4	3	3.6
Bader	4	4	3	3.6
Jawad	2	1	2	1.6
Khalid	2	2	1	1.6
Salman	4	3	3	3.3
Rami	3	3	3	3

Appendix O. HOD consent form

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, BISHA UNIVERSITY CONSENT FORM

Project title: The Role of Reading in an Integrated Reading-to-Write Task: A Think-Aloud Study of EFL Undergraduate English Language Students in a Saudi Context.

Researcher: Ahmed Alshehri, University of York, UK.

Project aim: The project aims to explore the reading-to-write processes which Saudi EFL English students use when completing integrated reading-to-write tasks and determine how these processes relate to the writers' resulting performances.

Student participation: Students will be asked to attend two sessions. In the first session which will last approximately 30 minutes, they will be interviewed about their previous academic reading and writing experiences. In the second session, which will last approximately three hours, they will be asked to read three research article introductions and to write an essay. While performing the task, they will be asked to think-aloud and their performance will be audio- and video-recorded. In addition, they will be asked to give their permission for the researcher to access their Grade Point Average (GPA) and their grades in their reading and writing assignments so that we can compare them with their writing tasks performed in this study.

The accessed data will securely be stored in a password protected research file, and only the researcher will have access to these secured files. The results will be kept until October 2022 after which time they will be destroyed.

The data will also be used in presentations and publications anonymously. Participants will be able to withdraw from the study at any time during data collection and up to two weeks after the data are collected.

Information about confidentiality

This is a PhD project and the information which I collect may be used in an anonymous format in presentations and publications. Please indicate on the consent form enclosed with a ‘0’ if you are happy for this anonymised data to be used in the ways listed.

If you have any questions about the project that you would like to ask before giving consent or after the data collection, please feel free to email Ahmed Alshehri (aaaa552@york.ac.uk), or the Chair of the Ethics Committee education-research-administrator @york.ac.uk.

CONSENT FORM

Please initial each box if you are happy to take part in this research.

I have read and understood the information given to me about the study and give my permission to Ahmed Alshehri to collect the requested data.	
I have understood the aims and procedures of the research and acknowledge the responsibility for granting my permission to collect the data.	

I confirm that I have read and understood the information given to me about the above-named research project and I understand that this will involve the department's students taking part as described above.	
I give permission for the researcher to access the students' reading and writing assignments and their marks after obtaining the students' permission.	
I understand that the purpose of the research is to examine students' reading processes and their role in writing.	
I understand that data will be stored securely in password protected files and only Ahmed Alshehri will have access to any identifiable data. I understand that the student's identity will be protected by use of a code.	
I understand that the student's data will not be identifiable and the data may be used ...	
in publications that are mainly read by university academics in presentations	
in presentations that are mainly attended by university academics	
in publications that are mainly read by the public	
in presentations that are mainly attended by the public	
I understand that data will be kept until October 2022 after which it will be destroyed.	
I understand that students can withdraw their data at any point during data collection and up to two weeks after data is collected.	

Head of the Department's signature:……………………………………………

Print name: ……………………………………………………………………….

Researchers' signature: ………………………………………………………

Print name: ……………………………………………………………………….

Date: …………………………………………………………………………………