

118373-

OKUMA BECERİSİNİ KULLANARAK
DÜŞÜK SEVİYELİ HAZIRLIK OKULU
ÖĞRENCİLERİNE YAZILI ANLATIM
BECERİSİNİ ÖĞRETME İLE İLGİLİ
BİR ÇALIŞMA

A STUDY OF TEACHING WRITING
THROUGH READING TO LOW LEVEL
PREP-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mete ÖZÇELİK
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)
ESKİŞEHİR, 1996

Atatürk Kültür Merkezi
Mektep Kütüphanesi

ANADOLU UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

A STUDY OF TEACHING WRITING THROUGH READING TO LOW
LEVEL PREP-SCHOOL STUDENTS

BY
 Mete ÖZÇELİK

Thesis of Master of Arts
Advisor : Yrd.Doç.Dr. Şeyda ÜLSEVER

ESKİŞEHİR
AUGUST, 1996

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada, yazılı anlatım çalışmaları öncesinde kullanılan okuma parçalarının yazılı anlatım becerisini etkileyip etkilemediğini ve bu etkinliğin yazılı anlatım becerisi içindeki beş alt beceriyi -içerik, kompozisyon planı, sözcük dağarcığı, dilin kullanımı, yazım kuralları ve noktalama işaretleri- hangi düzeyde etkilediğini belirleyebilmek için, Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi Hazırlık sınıfından 10 öğrenci deney ve 10 öğrenci kontrol grubu olmak üzere 20 öğrenci seçilmiş ve çalışmada verileri elde etmek ve karşılaştırmak için ön test ve son test olmak üzere iki kompozisyon konusu kullanılmıştır.

Çalışma süresince deney grubu ile yapılan çalışmalarda kompozisyon konusu verilmeden önce konu ile ilgili okuma parçaları verilmiş ve bunlar üzerinde tartışılmıştır. Kontrol grubuna ise yalnızca kompozisyon konusu verilmiş ve yazmaları istenmiştir.

“The ESL Composition Profile” (Hughey, 1983: 140) kullanılarak elde edilen veriler iki grup arasında farklılık olup olmadığını belirleyebilmek için t-test ile değerlendirilmiştir.

Çalışma sonuçlarında gruplara göre uygulanan yöntemin farklılığından iki grup arasında toplam not ve alt beceri notlarında belirli farklılıklar gözlenmiştir. Toplam notu oluşturan alt beceri notlarında iki grup arasında ve grupların kendi içlerinde içeriğin sunulmasında yazılı anlatım çalışmaları öncesinde kullanılan okuma parçalarının notları belirli bir şekilde arttırdığı gözlenmiştir. Her iki grup kendi içinde incelendiğinde yazım kurallarının doğru ve noktalama işaretlerini yerinde kullanabilme becerisi dışında diğer tüm yazılı anlatım becerilerinde yazılı anlatım öncesinde kullanılan okuma parçalarının öğrencilerin notlarını belirli bir şekilde arttırdığını, bu çalışma sonuçları açık bir şekilde göstermektedir.

Sonu olarak, yazılı anlatım alıřmaları ncesinde kullanılan konu ile ilgili okuma paralarının yazılı anlatım becerisini olumlu ynde etkilediėi ve bu yntemin kullanılması halinde ėrencilerin daha bařarılı olacaėı sylenilebilir.

ABSTRACT

This study which consists of five chapters investigates whether the writing process of low level EFL students improves if it is taught through reading with the help of reading texts. In this study, 20 low level prep-school students were used as study subjects. 10 of them were in the experimental group and the other 10 were in the control group. The experimental group was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts but control group was not exposed to pre-writing activities during the study.

In Chapter I, the background to the problem is discussed. In this part, the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, its assumptions and limitations, and definitions of the terms used in this study are also introduced.

Chapter II reviews literature relevant to the study.

Chapter III is concerned with research design, selection of subjects, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

In Chapter IV, the data obtained from the tests administered to the experimental and control group are statistically calculated and interpreted. And also the statistical interpretations are discussed.

Chapter V gives the summary of the study, implications for teaching writing, and makes suggestions for further studies.

The statistical results indicate that reading had an effect on writing : teaching writing through reading with the help of reading texts produced a significant increase in the ESL Composition Profile total scores and in the ESL Composition Profile Components; in Content, Organization, Vocabulary, and Language Use.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Yrd. Doc. Dr. Seyda ULSEVER for her valuable guidance throughout this study.

I am also indebted to Mr. Jack Dallas HICKS who was a great help to me in reading and evaluating writing papers and also contributing to my thesis with his valuable comments and guidance.

I am especially grateful to Mr. Yasar ODUL for the statistical interpretation of this study.

I am also very grateful to Mr. Adnan EFE, Ridvan TUNCEL, and Hakan AVCI for their help on various aspects of the study.

I must also express my appreciation to the students who volunteered to take part in the study as the subjects.

Finally, my greatest appreciation is to my family for their understanding and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZGEÇMİŞ	i
ÖZET	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	x

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Introduction	1
1.1. Background to the Problem	1
1.1.1. Definitions of Writing	1
1.1.2. Writing in Communicative Language Teaching	4
1.2. Problem	6
1.3. Purpose of the Study	6
1.4. Significance of the Study	8
1.5. Assumptions	9
1.6. Limitations of the Study	9
1.7. Definitions of the Terms	10

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0. Introduction	12
2.1. Attitudes Towards Writing in Foreign Language Teaching	13

2.2. Approaches to Teaching Writing	16
2.2.1. The Controlled Approach	16
2.2.2. Free-Writing Approach	17
2.2.3. The Paragraph Pattern Approach	17
2.2.4. The Grammar-Syntax Organization Approach	18
2.2.5. The Communicative Approach	18
2.2.6. The Process Approach	19
2.3. How students learn to write	19
2.4. Reading-Writing Connections in L1	21
2.4.1. The Directional Hypothesis	22
2.4.2. The Non-Directional Hypothesis	23
2.4.3. The Bidirectional Hypothesis	23
2.5. The Reading-Writing Connections in L2	24
2.6. Integrating Reading and Writing	25

CHAPTER III

THE METHOD

3.1. Research Design	29
3.2. Selection of Subjects	30
3.3. Data Collection Procedures	31
3.4. Data Analysis	32
3.4.1. The ESL Composition Profile	32
3.4.2. Analytical Procedures	34

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

4.1. Analysis of Data	36
4.2. Discussion	46

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary of the study	50
5.2. Implications for Teaching Writing	52
5.3. Suggestions for Further Studies	53

BIBLIOGRAPHY	54
--------------	----

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 The Reading Text Used in Composition 1 for the Experimental Group	59
Appendix 2 The Reading Text Used in Composition 2 for the Experimental Group	61
Appendix 3 The Reading Text Used in Composition 3 (post test) for the Experimental Group	63
Appendix 4 The ESL Composition Profile	65
Appendix 5 Table 1- The Results of the PSC (pre-test) Total Scores of the Experimental Group and Control Group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities	66
Appendix 6 Table 2- The Results of the post test scores of the Experimental Group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading and Control Group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities	67
Appendix 7 Statistical Tables	68

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

C	: Content
O	: Organization
V	: Vocabulary
L	: Language Use
M	: Mechanics
N	: The Total Number of Scores
X	: The Mean Scores
SD	: Standard Deviation
d.f.	: Degrees of Freedom
SE	: Standard Error
t	: t - Test Value
p	: Probability
ESL	: English as a Second Language
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
PSC	: Pre-study Composition
<	: Smaller than
>	: Bigger than
et al.	: and others

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1. Mean value of the PSC total scores of the groups	37
Table 4.2. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in post test	38
Table 4.3. Mean value of the PSC total scores and post test total scores of the students within experimental group	39
Table 4.4. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Content in post test	40
Table 4.5. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Organization in post test	41
Table 4.6. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Vocabulary in post test	43
Table 4.7. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Language Use in post test	44
Table 4.8. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Mechanics in post test	45

CHAPTER I

1.0. Introduction

1.1. Background to the problem

1.1.1. Definitions of Writing

Some linguists define writing as "all of the various activities which involve transfer thought to paper." (Dvorak 1986:145). Whereas some others define writing as "writing is far more than a way of recording language by means of visible marks." (Hirsch 1977:97).

A broader definition is given by Arapoff (1978:200) "writing is much more than an orthographic symbolization of speech; it is most importantly, a purposeful selection and organization of experience." That is, besides having a number of mechanical devices such as spelling, punctuation and capitalization, she also expects an effective piece of writing to have a clear purpose and organized body of facts, opinions or ideas.

Widdowson (1978:62) defines writing as "the production of sentences as instance of usage". He says that sentences are used to create a discourse and each sentence has a particular value as a part of this discourse.

Walters (1991:17) combines the term "composition" and the term "writing". According to Walters, composition can be defined as "the system or aggregate of grammatical rules, lexical items and rhetorical patterns which are needed by an individual to produce a finished text. Writing is the application of these rules to produce a text.

As seen from the diversity of definitions, writing has always been one of the problematic language skills to teach and evaluate both in ESL and EFL classrooms. Due to the fact that there had not been much research on writing until 60's, it was considered to be a complementary course to teaching grammar. The skill of writing has gained importance in foreign language learning over the last 30 years. When the audio - lingual approach dominated language teaching in the 1950 -60's, writing was made use of by teachers only as a means of reinforcing EFL and ESL grammatical patterns. Earlier, writing teachers have traditionally tended to evaluate the products rather than the process of writing (Braddock et.al, 1963:121). Instructors attributed students deficiencies in writing to their lack of linguistic competence which can simply be defined as the mastery of grammar and appropriate language use. They have been concerned with language acquisition, errors, correctness and form (Widdowson, 1978:38) or practice in written grammar (Taylor 1976:309) hoping that by doing so, they would help their students improve the quality of writing. At the end of the audio-lingual era and changes in language teaching approaches, the teaching of writing to nonnative speakers also has become more important and now stands in equal status to the other skills which are listening, speaking and reading. Raimes (1987:36-40) claims that "writing should not be seen as simply one of the four skills- that are reading, speaking, listening, writing- and the one usually

considered last and emphasized least. Writing is required if it is used just for testing and practice". However, as stated by Clifton (1968:1-4) writing is one of the most difficult two skills to be fully understood and applied by language learners because it is a fact that they feel themselves helpless and hopeless when they are forced to write on a particular topic without any supportive activities which serve also to practice other skills. For example, most of the students lack the necessary background information and the vocabulary which are required to handle the topic more effectively and efficiently in writing. They also feel the need for some materials available at any time in order to understand the topic better. That is the reason why language teachers feel themselves more comfortable with reading materials in a writing class. Furthermore, the context of reading prepares the students to the forthcoming writing activity in terms of vocabulary, rhetoric, and the ideas to help them initiate production.

Teaching students how to write is probably the least understood and least researched area in the traditional EFL curriculum (Paulston 1972:86). Writing is the last and perhaps most difficult skill students learn. Teachers are often confused about how to approach writing instruction and many see it only as a way to reinforce oral skills. Skill in writing is a basic necessity for most language learners. A person who is in the academic environment needs writing to write reports and term papers, whereas a person who is not in the academic environment needs to write letters, messages, memos, and the like. Writing is as natural as speaking, making music, painting, or acting. It is a personal creative expression with roots in our spontaneous needs for communicating with ourselves and others. Like other arts, there is sometimes a mystery implied in its practice, but also like other arts it is something anyone can take part in at some level. Jacobus (1989:17) points out that "Writing is the art of using language well, both in terms of thought and expression".

1.1.2. Writing in Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative language teaching enables learners to compose creative, meaningful functional writing. Communicative Language Teaching means little more than an integration of grammatical and functional teaching. Littlewood (1981:1) states, "one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language." And also, it means using procedures where learners work in pairs or groups employing available language resources in problem-solving tasks. Widdowson (1978:40) states that "to compose sentences is not the only ability we need to communicate. Communication takes place when we make use of sentences, to perform a variety of different acts of an essentially social nature". Writing is a comprehensive ability involving grammar, vocabulary, conception, rhetoric, and other elements; it has everything to do with listening, speaking, and reading. Therefore, writing must be integrated with all the other language courses. Writing effectively should not be observed putting sentences together as a sequence. Writing involves more than just producing sentences. To write a piece of acceptable prose one must be able to write a series of sentences that are logically connected. So far, many classroom writing procedures have been developed by ELT researchers for teaching writing. For instance, sentence combining, forming a paragraph and rewriting it, and free composing are only some of the techniques in writing. However, as stated by Hughey et al. (1983), students can not just "pick up" the writing skill as they learn the other skills in foreign language classes. He concludes that students need to develop: an understanding of a grammar system that is quite different from their own, a sense of how the builds and develops, a vocabulary in order to express their ideas and a recognition the rhetorical structure of the language for reaching to the fluency in writing the target language.

When writing skill is considered from the communicative language teaching/learning perspective, it is obvious that students need background knowledge as well as grammatical knowledge on the topic assigned. This background knowledge can be supplied with the help of reading materials to a large extent.

In other words, reading before writing may help students to shape their ideas. Reading authentic printed materials and articles related with the given topic will connect learners in activities which create real life situations in EFL classrooms. Students can have new vocabulary and structure from the reading texts brought into the classroom by the teacher. Reading texts have a much wider range of purposes than just the transmission of information and their message can be more than simply factual. Reading texts are also used to provide samples of the language in action. Through analysis or imitation, students are encouraged to use texts as models for their own language performance. According to Clifton (1986:1-4) the "two R's" are very important for language learners. They are reading and writing. Reading before any writing activity must be the primary and necessary procedure to provoke and motivate learners for a successful composing. By choosing reading texts, the teacher can motivate students to involve themselves in work in a particular topic area, and that the foreign language will be "naturally" used as the medium in which this work will be carried out. When the students read various texts, their command of English grows, as does their sophistication in working with ideas and texts. Their confidence grows as well. Using reading texts in writing courses allows students to become knowledgeable about the topic. As their knowledge grows, vocabulary and linguistic forms grow with it.

However, at the beginning levels, the compositions written by the students can be fairly short and complicated, but later the students may use the ideas

gained from their earlier reading about the given topic and the style and the explanation of the topic become more clear and exciting.

1.2 Problem

Many language teachers complain that the standard of written English among the students is still low. Writing is the most difficult of the four skills for EFL students. Therefore learners often face writing courses with anxiety. They may have no idea about "What to write" and "How to begin". Language teachers overhear students saying "I do not have anything to write. I can not think of a good start and do not know what to include in because I have not read anything about this topic.", which leads writing teachers to enhance teaching writing through the use of reading materials. The problem is that with lack of content and self-confidence, no student can write a good composition. In general, it becomes much harder for students to judge exactly how to make their language appropriate to the context. Therefore a lot of reading exercise is thought to be necessary before they start to write.

In this study the effect of reading as a pre-writing activity is going to be discussed. In other words this study will attempt to answer the following question:

Will there be any difference between the two groups of students who are exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of articles related with the given topic, and printed authentic materials like newspapers and magazines and those who are not exposed to pre-writing activities?

1.3. Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to find out whether the writing process of low level EFL students could be supported through reading materials. After reading the text, it is hoped that the students will have the knowledge of "what to say" and

"how to say" about the topic. Arapoff (1965:201) points out that the problem caused by the students' limited knowledge of grammar and vocabulary can be solved with the help of a reading text related to the writing topic, since reading before writing would help students organize their ideas to be productive.

The study will supply answers to the following questions. These questions will be considered as the null hypotheses of the study as well.

P1: To achieve the purpose of this study, the following questions will be answered:

1. Is there a significant difference between the PSC (Pre-study Composition- pre-test) total scores of experimental group and control group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities?

2. Is there a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in post test?

P2: To see whether there will be any difference within the groups themselves, the following question will be asked:

3. Is there a significant difference between the total scores of the students within experimental group in the PSC when the group was not exposed to pre-writing activities and in post test when the group was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts?

P3: To see whether there will be any significant difference between experiment group and control group in the ESL Composition Profile Components which are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, the following question will be asked:

4. Is there a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Content in post test?

5. Is there a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Organization in post test?

6. Is there a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Vocabulary in post test?

7. Is there a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Language Use in post test?

8. Is there a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Mechanics in post test?

This study also tries to investigate the relationship between writing and reading. It is hoped that, by doing so, teaching writing will be improved and low level students will be able to write longer and more coherent compositions.

1.4 Significance of the study

This study is going to assist Anadolu University Faculty of Communication Sciences prep- class writing teachers to find out an effective way in teaching writing and to make students enjoy writing courses in the EFL contexts. Although we can not generalize the findings of this study to every EFL situations and EFL students, the findings of the study will be beneficial to:

- a. field researchers who are planning to do further research on writing process of low level students in EFL contexts,
- b. the EFL teachers who are curious about the factors involved in writing process of low level students,
- c. those teachers who are in search of possible solutions in order to improve and use different applicable teaching writing skill in writing classrooms

1.5 Assumptions

In this study, the following assumptions are taken as starting points:

- a. The research method has been proven to be given enough data for descriptive studies and the data has been reliable enough to drive some conclusions.
- b. The earliest research and other written materials like articles as the source have been accepted as reliable and valid.
- c. A careful descriptive analysis of low level students' writings will supply enough information about the writing process of study subjects and enable the researcher to deepen the discussions.

1.6 Limitations of the study

- 1. This study is going to be carried out in the Faculty of Communication Sciences involving total 20 prep-school students as study subjects.
- 2. To evaluate the written products the assistance of three graders who are university writing teachers will be included in the study.
- 3. In this study, there is going to be one control group which includes 10 students and one experiment group including 10 students.
- 4. Each group will write 4 compositions during the term.

5. The students in the experiment group will write their compositions with the help of reading texts related with the topic, but the control group will be required to write compositions about a given topic without having that help.

6. This study is limited to the low-level prep-school students.

1.7 Definitions of the Terms

The following terms which will be used through the present study need to be defined in order to avoid possible confusion.

Writing: Writing is a generic term to refer to all of the various activities that involve transferring thought to paper (Dvorak, 1986).

Reading: Reading is one of the basic language skills which could be simply defined as a process whereby one looks at and understand what has been written on text (Williams, 1991).

Language Proficiency: This term is interchangeably used with linguistic competence except that as a notion, it also carried a performance-based meaning, too. It had the meaning of the level of mastery on English grammar and structure as well as the vocabulary. In this study, it is used to mean the Michigan Placement Test scores.

ESL: English as a second language

EFL: English as a foreign language

PSC: Pre-study Composition, Composition which is written before the actual study.

Authentic Material: Willis (1981) defines authentic texts as real texts designed not for language students but for native speakers (e.g. newspapers).

Integrated Skills: Integrated skills are when the main language skills are practiced in conjunction with each other (Willis 1981).

Composition: Skills involved in effectively developing and communicating an idea or making a point (Dvorak 1986).

Content: Understanding of the subject, discussing main point with sufficient details, using information clearly (Hughey 1983 : 142).

Organization: Developing and concluding paragraphs, controlling ideas clearly (Hughey 1983: 143).

Vocabulary: Facility with words and ideas to convey intended information, attitudes and feelings (Hughey 1983:143).

Language Use: Using well-formed and complete sentences with appropriate complements, effective complex constructions of sentences, agreement between sentence elements (Hughey 1983: 144).

Mechanics: Correct spelling, correct use of punctuation marks and capital letters and paragraphing (Hughey 1983: 145).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

"I have not written for a few days because I wanted first of all to think about my diary. It is an odd idea for someone like me because it seems to me that neither I - nor for that matter, anyone else - will be interested in the unbosomings of a thirteen-year-old school girl. Still, what does that matter? I want to bring out all kinds of things that lie buried deep in my heart."

Anne Frank

Writing may help a child develop his ideas and values and gain much insight into his own mind and heart and those of his fellows. Writing during the adolescent years becomes a means of individual growth and an intellectual exercise for the exploration of ideas. However, writing skill is far more

demanding for most people than speaking. This may be due to the fact that writing is the last of the language skills to receive attention in school.

Even though we have seen the tremendous emphasis on the spoken word, it is obvious that we live in an age in which the written word is of primary importance in the conduct of education, business, and cultural affairs. People are accustomed to regard the ability to write clear, coherent prose as a hallmark of the literate, educated man. Today, the command of the written words is increasing demand in the business world, both as a key to job and to success in it. A recent survey of educators, businessmen, administrators, and members of the professions placed improvement in written composition first in their recommendations about English teaching today. According to the educators, the ability to write clearly, concisely, and accurately is the qualification most needed for success in business, education or the professions.

2.1. Attitudes Towards Writing in Foreign Language Teaching

The significance and function of writing in foreign language teaching has been ignored for many years. Most of the text books which are designed to teach English under the traditional approach demonstrate the traditional ordering of skills as the following:

Listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The main reason in this ordering which is stated by Dvorak (1986:148), was the general belief about the natural order of language acquisition-comprehension before production, oral before written. Another reason that was accepted by the traditional approaches, is that writing is a less useful skill than speaking, reading, and listening. The thoughts and the attitudes of most language teachers towards writing have also been important in ordering language skills. According to most of them, to develop writing skills is not the aim of foreign

language learners because of struggling to acquire this kind of skill in their native language (Trojanovich 1974 : 435).

The researchers like Saporta (1978: 268), have distinguished between written and spoken forms of the language. Naturally, this has influenced the notions about the importance and the place of writing in foreign language teaching.

Therefore, writing has gained an important role in teaching English besides listening, speaking and reading. The methodologists have started to design writing course syllabuses which have preceded the publishing of special text books improving only writing skills.

According to Raimes, the famous methodologist, writing should be a part of foreign language syllabus not only because of the fact that people have to communicate with each other in writing but also writing helps students learn. Raimes gives three explanations:

1. Writing reinforces the grammatical structures, idioms and vocabulary that we have been teaching our students.

2. Students find new ways of expressing themselves. Because the need of transferring thought into writing forces them to find out the right word, the right structure.

3. When the students write, they become very involved with the new language; the effect to express the ideas and the constant use of eye, hand and brain is a unique way to reinforce learning (1983: 3).

Raimes (1987: 36-40) presents six different purposes for teaching writing in EFL classrooms:

1. Writing for reinforcement : Teacher asks the students to write in order to reinforce something they have just learned or a grammatical concept they have

just been introduced to. The students are required to copy sentences or paragraphs to do sentence exercises to drill the grammatical forms. In these exercises, teachers provide most of the sentences and the students either complete the sentences by adding a word or words or transform the sentences (e.g., rewrite a positive sentence as a negative, rewrite a statement as a question).

2. Writing for training: Writing for training is similar to writing for reinforcement but it differs in that it is not limited to the reinforcement of grammatical structures. Writing used for the purpose of training initially presents students the patterns of linguistics and rhetorical forms that might be new to students and gives students practice in using and manipulating these new patterns. These forms are practiced through transformation exercises, sentence combining, forming a paragraph from the given sentences, and controlled composition exercises.

3. Writing for imitation: Teachers' purpose is more to use writing for imitation. They want their students to become familiar with rhetorical and syntactic forms of language. Teachers can choose models of content or form as a stimulus for writing. Therefore they might use exercises like dictation, paraphrasing, guided writing or analyzing a piece of writing and producing a similar one.

4. Writing for communication: With the influence of communicative competence as a goal in language learning in the 1970' s (Wilkins 1970, Van Ek 1975, Widdowson 1975), accuracy in writing has shifted to the communication of the writer's purpose and the importance of the audiences. Writing should be a form of communication for the aim of language is to communicate ideas.

5. Writing for fluency: Writing might develop fluency in language. If students are exposed to writing journals, free writing, listing, brainstorming, drafts, revisions, etc., they will be encouraged to invent ideas fluently without being concerned about grammatical accuracy and spelling.

6. Writing for learning: The last category includes the first five purposes, too. Writing can be employed to teach students all other language skills -listening, speaking, reading. It can be seen as a way to learn a language as well as to learn about the subject matter being written about.

All these purposes imply that writing should be employed in language teaching. Starting from this point, teachers have supplied the necessary models for any topic to teach students how language functions in writing.

2.2. Approaches to Teaching Writing

There are a lot of methods of teaching a language. The literature on teaching writing in English provides us with numerous approaches. The following sub-sections will explain briefly the most common approaches to teaching writing.

2.2.1. The Controlled Approach

The controlled approach emphasizes accuracy rather than fluency or originality of ideas. The goal of this approach is to enable students to produce error-free writing. The student's work is strictly controlled throughout the writing process. They work on sentence exercises by changing the subjects or words, combining sentences by means of linking words. Students also work on paragraphs. They usually copy or manipulate model paragraphs or construct them

by answering questions. This approach is generally used for the beginners and lower-intermediate levels (Raimes, 1983: 6-7).

The audio-lingual method had three characteristics that affected this approach :

1. Learning a language was seen as a semi-automatic process of forming the right habits.
2. Speech always comes first.
3. Errors had to be prevented.

As a result, this approach to writing that grew out of the audio-lingual method, emphasizes a lot of control, so that few errors are likely. If possible, whatever is written is first practiced orally (Kecik, 1993: 35 ; Heaton 1988).

2.2.2. Free-Writing Approach

It emphasizes both the amount of writing learners can produce, and the content and ideas in the writing. Learners are encouraged to write as much as they can usually about things familiar to them. The quality of writing is less important. The teacher comments on the content, but less on the language, or on accuracy. The belief underlying this approach is that greater accuracy will follow more easily as learners become more used to the act of writing. This approach is mainly intended for intermediate learners who have some familiarity with the language and are already receiving input and instruction studying other skills (Kecik, 1993 : 36 ; Pincas 1982).

2.2.3. The Paragraph-Pattern Approach

This approach is based on the principle that the way of organizing communication differs from culture to culture. In different cultures, people organize the way they express ideas differently. It is the responsibility of the language teachers to show their students the differences in organization in the

native language and in the target language. So this has to be learned together with the new language. Students are given model paragraphs and they are required to analyze the form of them. Putting scrambled sentences into paragraph order choosing or inserting an appropriate topic sentence, inserting or deleting sentences help students to learn how to organize their writing (Raimes, 1983 : 8).

2.2.4. The Grammar- Syntax Organization Approach

This approach adds a further dimension to the paragraph- pattern approach by involving the grammar and syntax aspect of written language. According to this, students are trained to pay attention not only the organization but also to the grammar and syntax. So the message to be conveyed is given not only through a well-organized paragraph but also through accurately structured and linked sentences (Raimes, 1983 : 8).

2.2.5. The Communicative Approach

This approach emphasizes the real life purpose of what is written. Because of this there is a natural focus on the reader. The success or failure of the writing is judged by whether the reader is able to understand it, and do something with it. So errors are important to the extent to which they make the writing difficult for the reader to understand. The importance of the reader means that:

1. Writing is often produced for other learners to read.
2. Outside readers are often named, for example, a pen friend.
3. The language used must be appropriate to the type of writing, so learners are given a lot of opportunity to read and work with examples of similar types before they write (Kecik, 1993 : 39 ; Richards 1986).

2.2.6. The Process Approach

The process approach is the most recent of all six approaches. This approach adds to a further dimension to the communicative approach. It tries to involve learners in thinking about how they write. They have to realize that they can not produce a perfect result the first time. They are given the time for the process to work. So learners are encouraged to:

1. explore thoroughly ideas and possible content, through discussion and brain storming,
2. make detailed plans,
3. write a first draft, which is shared with other learners or the teacher, and commented on for its ideas, not for the correctness of its language,
4. develop one draft into another, clarifying their ideas and content as they do so.

"Time" and "feedback" is what the students need for the discovery of new ideas and the new language forms to express those ideas. This approach provides the students with all these necessities (Raimes, 1983: 10-11 ; Pincas 1982).

2.3. How students learn to write

Many unanswered questions face the teacher of English who tries to discover how students learn to write. Students do not learn to write better by drilling in grammar exercises or learning prescriptive rules about formal grammar. Besides, the ability to write have been accumulating for more than twenty-five years. These explanations and ideas have been reported in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research in the editions published in 1941 and 1960. Comprehensive reports of research on grammar and composition reveal the same findings. Ingrid Strom (1960: 14) summarizes the studies in this way.

"Research reveals that a knowledge of classificatory grammar has little measurable effect on the ability to express ideas accurately or precisely in writing or speaking. Grammatical errors are individual matters and are best attacked through individual instruction. Children and adolescents improve their sentences by having many opportunities, with the guidance of the teacher, for structuring their own thoughts into their own sentences."

More recently, the committee studying research on the teaching of composition evaluated 485 studies with this conclusion:

"In view of widespread agreement of research studies based upon many types of students and teachers, the conclusion can be stated in strong and unqualified terms: the teaching of formal grammar has a negligible, or, because it usually displaces some instruction and practice in actual composition, even a harmful effect on the improvement of writing" (Braddock et al., cit. p 37).

Despite this overwhelming and incontrovertible evidence, large amounts of class time are still being spent on the study of grammar to the neglect of practice in writing and reading. Dora V. Smith (1938: 643-649) reported that surveys of English class activity showed that more classroom time was spent on drill in grammatical forms and work book exercises than on any other single phase of instruction. In many English classrooms this picture has not changed for the better.

As yet, little seems to be known about the relationship between writing and reading. Some studies, as reported by Krashen (1984), tested the significance of reading in improving writing skills. While some studies report increase in writing ability after relatively short periods of reading (Clark, 1935; Heys, 1962; De Vries, 1970) others suggest that good writing is a long-term pay off of

reading (Ryan, 1977; Kimberling et al., 1978). Krashen under his "Input Hypothesis", which claims comprehensible input in teaching language enables the learner to acquire the target language, emphasizes the assistance of reading in improving writing skills. According to him, "development of good writing style occurs via reading for meaning and writing to convey meaning. We gain "competence" in writing.....by understanding messages encoded in written language, by reading for meaning. In this way, we gain a subconscious "feel" for written language. And writing "performance" can be developed via sheer practice (1984: 28-37). He summarizes his approach as "instructions in writing should not focus on teaching from directly, but should instead encourage the subconscious acquisition of form through reading and give students procedures that will facilitate the discovery of meaning and an efficient writing process" (1984: 36). Most teachers feel that students who read widely in good literature tend to write better than those whose reading is limited. Although it is not decisive, the experience of the majority of teachers at the secondary and college level indicate that students learn to write by reading widely and by frequent guided practice in writing, accompanied by suggestions for revision and through discussion and revision of papers.

2.4. Reading Writing Connections in L1

Reading in the writing classroom is understood as the appropriate input for acquisition of writing skills because it is generally assumed that reading passages will somehow function as primary models from which writing skills can be learned, or at least inferred.

Is there evidence that a relationship between reading and writing exists? Stotsky (1983: 627) surveyed first language correlational studies and found the followings:

1. There is correlation between reading achievement and writing ability; better writers tend to be better readers.
2. There is correlation between writing quality and reading experience; better writers read more than poorer writers.
3. There seem to be correlation between reading ability and measures of syntactic complexity in writing; better readers tend to produce more syntactically mature writing than poorer readers.

The nature of this writing-reading link is often thought to be like Krashen's notions about second language acquisition. Krashen (1984 :20) claims that the development of writing ability and of second language proficiency occur in the same way: via comprehensible input with a low effective filter. He theorizes that writing competence derives from large amounts of self motivated reading for interest or pleasure.

These studies suggest that reading and writing are related, but researchers have only recently begun to explore this connection. Research has shown three types of connection between reading and writing.

2.4.1. The Directional Hypothesis

The first hypothesis to be considered is that the reading-writing connection in L1 is *directional* (Eckoff,1983; Taylor and Beach,1984; Stotosky, 1983). That is, reading and writing share structural components such that the structure of whatever is acquired in one modality can then be applied in the other. For example, being able to recognize a rhetorical pattern such as comparison and contrast in a reading passage would allow the reader to eventually reproduce that pattern in writing.

Instruction in reading can be effective in improving writing when it focuses on a common element. Belanger (1987:10) found that there seemed to be no automatic transfer from general improvement courses to written composition.

2.4.2. The Non directional Hypothesis

The second hypothesis of the reading-writing link is that the relationship is *Nondirectional*. Shanklin (1982:89) claims that if reading and writing are both constructive process, constrained by some underlying competence, then must be related. She argues that writing, like reading, is a process of interactive and dynamic activation and refinement of schemata.

Since there is a single cognitive proficiency underlying both reading and writing, improvement in one domain will result in improvement in the other. The initial significant difference between the directional and the nondirectional hypothesis is that the former claims skills to be transferred in only one direction (reading to writing or writing to reading) while the latter accepts them to be transferred in either direction.

2.4.3. The Bidirectional Hypothesis

According to the third and the most complex hypothesis, the reading-writing relationship is *bidirectional*, which includes the claim that reading and writing are interactive, but also claims that they are interdependent as well. Shanahan (1984: 475) found that, as students become more proficient, the nature of the reading-writing relationship changes. It appears that in any given point of development, reading and writing consist of both dependent and independent abilities. Shanahan also found that the reading-writing is superior to the writing-reading, suggesting that more reading information is used in writing than vice versa.

This bidirectional hypothesis is not only the most complex one but also the most comprehensive of the three.

Each of these hypotheses offers a different focus for the reading-writing relationship, and each focus offers the second language writing teacher a valuable perspective on reading-writing interactions in the writing classroom. The

directional one focuses on input in the development of reading and writing skills and suggests the important role that reading must play as information source in the writing class. The nondirectional focuses on the common underlying cognitive processes involved in reading and writing. This hypothesis suggests the way in which writing abilities develop alongside reading abilities, and argues that classroom practices that focus on constructing meaning will enhance the development of writing abilities. Finally, the bidirectional one focuses on the multiple relations and interrelated processes that seem to constitute the reading-writing relationship. It points out the possibility that the reading-writing relationship can be qualitatively different at different stages of development.

2.5 The Reading- Writing Connections in L2

L1 literacy skills can transfer to the second language and are a factor in L2 literacy acquisition. The general process of acquiring L2 writing and reading abilities appears to result from L2 input in much the same way that L1 abilities develop, but also to be influenced by the transfer of L1 literacy skills that affect the quality of L2 reading and writing quite apart from what can be learned from the second language itself.

The fundamental process involved in the L2 reading-writing relationship and the relationship between L1 and L2 literacy skills is *transfer*.

There are three components to consider in a discussion of literacy skills transfer:

1. The Cognitive process involved in writing and reading,
 2. The structural components that underlie writing and reading,
 3. The mechanism that allows the processes and structures to transfer,
- either across languages or across modalities

Explanations and the surveys indicate that the relationship between reading and writing should be exploited and writing teachers need to be explicit

in their teaching of that relationship. Writing teachers who are sensitive to the role that first language reading and writing abilities play in developing second language literacy skills and also to the role that reading ability in the second language writing skills, will be better prepared to help L2 learners utilize those relationships to become proficient second language writers (Carson, 1990).

2.6 Integrating Reading and Writing

Smith describes the process of reading as one that involves both the extraction and the supplying of information and suggests that the latter may be even more important than the former:

"The basic skill of reading lies more in the non-visual information that we supply from inside our head rather than in the visual information that bombards us from print (1982:105)."

When reading, we extract information according to the purpose of our reading, our interests, motivations, and so on; we supply information to make sense of what we read, using our knowledge of the world and our previous experience as readers. Our previous experience as readers enables us to identify and understand cohesion, coherence, rhetorical organization, and conventions of written language; our knowledge of the world enables us to understand concepts and points of view and to integrate them in our experience.

When we write, we also make use of our knowledge of the world and of our experience as readers. That is why most projects are designed to improve students' writing focus on developing reading skills (Henner- Stanchina 1985:67).

In EFL classes reading and writing tasks often depend on each other: sometimes writing is used to check whether students understand what they have read, sometimes reading is used as a preparation for writing tasks. In writing

classes reading is indeed the most frequently used way of providing input, either because teachers use a model or because they select texts on the subject of the composition or ask students to do research on that subject. Furthermore, for EFL students the most frequent contact with the foreign language is through reading. Ineffective reading strategies will have negative effects on students' learning, and on their writing. Teachers tend to overvalue the strategy of reading to extract information while neglecting activities that allow students to make use of their knowledge when reading and writing afterwards.

One way of extracting information from a text is to identify and store the most important information. This is just one reading strategy, and it has to be complemented by others. Students who are trained in this strategy tend to use it for all purposes, particularly when reading as a preparation for subsequent writing, because it provides them with enough information and ready-made correct sentences.

If we aim at better writing, the first step should be the improvement of students' reading strategies, making them aware that when they read they should constantly call upon their experience as readers. The second step should be to help them develop a different attitude towards writing by encouraging them to concentrate on content and on expressing their thoughts clearly, rather than concentrating on avoiding mistakes.

One of the aims of the reading program is to increase the learner's vocabulary stock. Thus, reading a text will help the learner to choose the right vocabulary in compositions. Willis (1981 : 164) states that "students should speak, read and then write". When students are poor at writing compositions, they should be motivated by reading before they start writing.

Yemi Aboderin (1986:38) states that "relevant feature articles in newspapers and magazines within the linguistic levels of pupils can be brought to class for discussion before similar easy topic are assigned."

Reading and writing are often called literacy skills. The term "literacy" indicates that these skills are not acquired as part of the natural process of learning one's first language, but at later stage. Hughey et al (1983: 6) express writing as " an efficient tool to facilitate and reinforce other language skills. Reading, vocabulary and grammar skills are employed in the act of writing,"

While learners are reading, they acquire new vocabulary. Reading reinforces vocabulary skills as language learners endeavor to make suitable word choices for their writing. While learners are reading a text, they master a wealth of morphological information. Recognition of these morphological structures enables learners to build their vocabularies more quickly. Therefore, it seems logical that increased reading experiences will enhance students' control over composition topics integrated into the reading programs. Reading a text will give a confidence in students' independent writing tasks.

Many scholars have commented on the positive relationship between reading and writing, and some of them have reported research findings that confirm such a relationship. Paul O'Dea (1965:328) reports that those who read widely are rewarded in several ways, one of which is increased proficiency in writing, " most clearly seen..... in the areas of diction and sentence structure." Nathan Blount (1973) summarizes several studies that indicate a positive relationship between good writers and good readers. He also summarizes research findings that tend to confirm the positive relationship between reading and writing. This include an investigation by Clark that shows that students who had additional reading made more improvement in grammar and usage than students who studied only formal grammar, and Bagley's findings that students who studied literature wrote better compositions than did students who studied formal grammar.

A few of the experiments concerned with frequency of writing also seem to indicate that students with increased reading assignments write as well as

better than students who write more frequently. In Frank Heys' (1962) experiment to determine whether frequent writing teaches writing, the group who had additional reading and less writing made greater gains on one of the measures of writing improvement than did the group that wrote frequently. Heys concluded that for many students reading is a positive influence on writing ability.

CHAPTER III

THE METHOD

3.1 Research Design

The purpose of this study is to find out whether there is a significant difference between the compositions of the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading and the compositions of the control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities.

In this study, two groups of students who are totally 20 students wrote four compositions. One of the compositions which was PSC -prestudy composition- was written before the actual study. And the other 3 compositions were written by the students during the actual study. In each composition, one of the groups was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and the other group was not exposed to pre-writing activities. They were given a topic and asked to write a composition.

The first composition written before the actual study was accepted as the pre-test and the final composition written at the end of the term was accepted as the post test. And they were analyzed and evaluated according to the component scales suggested in the ESL Composition Profile (Hughey et... al, 1983 : 140), (App.4).

3.2 Selection of Subjects

The study was conducted at the Anadolu University, Faculty of Communication Sciences. The subjects who took part in this study were native speakers of Turkish and their ages ranged from 17 to 20. All of them were preparatory class lower intermediate level students. 20 subjects took place in the study. These students were in two different groups.

The students in the preparatory class are always grouped according to their level of English. At the beginning of the academic year, a placement test is given to determine the students' level of English. In the academic year 1994 - 1995, when this study was administered, the students were put into six groups from A to F. The number of students in each group was between 20 - 27 and their ages were between 17 and 20. Group A had the students with very little English or those who studied another foreign language like French and German at secondary and high schools. Group B and C had also consisted of students who got low grades in the placement test. The students in groups D and E had the intermediate level. And finally, the students who got the highest mark in the placement test were put into the group F.

Among these groups, Group A and C were chosen as the population. Their levels were approximately same and there were 52 students in these groups. Before the actual study, a pilot study was made to choose the subjects among these 52 students. In the pilot study, 52 students were given two tests. First, Michigan Placement Test scores were used as the language proficiency

scores. And secondly, a topic was given and students were required to write a composition to recognize students' current writing proficiency. Both the Michigan Placement Test and the composition were evaluated by the experienced teachers from the faculty, who had been teaching writing for several years. In scoring, the published key of Michigan Placement Test and ESL Composition Profile (Hughey et al., 1983) were used. These tests assisted the researcher determining proper study subjects. After gathering all the data from the above tests, 20 students were chosen randomly among the students who scored between 20 and 30 as subjects of the study.

All of these students were taking the same English courses, namely, Reading, Writing, Grammar, Listening, and Speaking. After the PSC, one of the groups which was experimental group was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and the other group which was control group was not exposed to pre-writing activities for three months.

The study was carried out in the second term of the academic year 1994 - 1995. The experimental group and the control group had studied writing 3 hours a week and for a semester of 16 weeks.

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

In the first writing hour of the term, the pre-study composition was given to both the control and experimental groups. In this pre-test, the students in both groups were asked to write at least three paragraphs on the following topic:

*- What do you think about the standard university exam in Turkey?
Discuss and give some solutions.*

Throughout the study, the students in the control group were not exposed to pre-writing activities and the experimental group was exposed to pre-writing

activities through reading with the help of reading texts. The control group were given a topic and required to write a composition. However, for the experimental group, the reading texts were used. Students read the text answered the comprehension questions and even had the opportunity to be involved in little discussions. This strategy is thought to help them both to reactivate the vocabulary they already have about the topic and gain more through reading and discussions. In other words, the necessary background knowledge leading to a better writing was tried to be supplied. After the reading texts were studied in this way, they were required to write compositions related to reading texts.

3.4 Data Analysis

The compositions of the students in the control group and the experimental group for PSC and the compositions were analyzed and evaluated according to the ESL Composition Profile suggested by Hughey et. al (1983: 140).

3.4.1. The ESL Composition Profile

The ESL Composition Profile is made up of five component scales. These are Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Language Use, and Mechanics. Each component focused on an important aspect of writing and has a varying weight according to its approximate importance for written communication. The total score in the ESL Composition Profile is 100 but this score is not divided equally among five scales. Each component scale has different scores. The scores for each component scale are as follows :

- Content 30, Organization 20, Vocabulary 20, Language Use 25 and Mechanics 5 .

Each scale has four mastery levels: "Excellent to very good", "Good to average", "Fair to poor", and "Very poor".

Here are the components the ESL Composition Profile which suggests a foreign language writer should pay attention to as main elements in composing an effective written discourse, or a teacher should consider while evaluating the written work of a foreign language learner.

1. CONTENT :

The criteria to be considered about the content of the written work are "knowledgeable, substantive, through development of thesis, and relevant to assigned topic".

2. ORGANIZATION:

The second component in the profile form is "Organization". It is examined according to the following concepts: "fluent expression, ideas clearly supported, succinct, well organized, logical sequencing, and cohesive".

3. VOCABULARY :

The third component in the profile is "Vocabulary". The criteria to be considered about the vocabulary of the written work are "sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, and appropriate register".

4. LANGUAGE USE :

Language use is the fourth component in the profile. It is examined according to the following criteria: "effective complex constructions, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions".

5. MECHANICS :

Mechanics is the last component in the profile form. "Demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing and handwriting in a written work determines writer's ability in manipulating the mechanics of a written work.

3.4.2. Analytical Procedures

Each paper in PSC and in Compositions was analyzed and evaluated according to the component scales in the ESL Composition Profile. In order to lessen subjectivity in measuring, to have an objective assessment, and to see if the results to be reliable all the papers were read and marked by three teachers. One of the teachers was native speaker of English and two of them were non-native teachers. The teachers have been teaching writing in the EFL classes for a long time.

Each paper was measured in five separate components and had five different component scores. As it was mentioned before, in the ESL Composition Profile, each component has different weight. Content was scored out of 30, Organization out of 20, Vocabulary out of 20, Language Use out of 25, and Mechanics out of 5. The sum of the scores of the five components gave the total score for the each composition

To have an average score for each paper, the three separate scores for both the five components and total scores given by the three different evaluaters were added up and divided by 3. The results gave us the average scores for each paper. An average score for each paper in PSC (App. 5) , and in post test (App. 6) for each component and total scores were shown in the Appendices part.

In order to analyse the data collected and derive conclusions, statistical techniques were applied. To determine the difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of

reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities, a two-tailed student's t-test for independent samples was applied and the results of two groups were compared at the 0.05 level of significance. To determine the difference within the groups, a two-tailed t-test for correlated samples was applied and the results were compared at the 0.05 level of significance.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

4.1 Analysis of data

The purpose of this study is to find out whether there will be a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and the control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities.

To achieve this goal, the groups were asked to write on three different topics. The compositions both groups were asked to write was accepted as the pre-test. Out of the three compositions both groups of students were asked to write throughout the study, the final composition was taken as the post test. The differences between the groups in PSC (pre-test) and post test were tested by using the t-test for independent samples. The differences between the scores

within the groups in pre-test and post test were tested by using the t-test for correlated samples.

The questions in section 1.3 were investigated by testing 8 null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 1

H: There is not a significant difference between the PSC total scores of control group and experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities.

Table 4.1. Mean value of the PSC total scores of the groups

	Experimental Group	Control Group
Mean value of the PSC total scores	53.8	54.5

t: 0.371

d.f: 18

p< 0.05

The distribution of the differences between the PSC (pre-test) total scores of control group and experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities is summarized in Table 1 (App. 7).

The results show that the control group had the mean value of $\bar{x} = 54.5$ and experimental group had the mean value of $\bar{x} = 53.8$. With the 18 degrees of freedom, the t-value between the control group and experimental group was calculated as $t = 0.371 < 2.101$. As the observed value of $t = 0.371$ is smaller than the value of $t = 2.101$ at the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, there is not a significant difference between the PSC (pre-test) total scores of control group and experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities. Thus, the null hypothesis 1 is accepted.

Null Hypothesis 2

H: There is not a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in post test

Table 4.2. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in post test.

	Experimental Group	Control Group
Mean value of the groups in post test	67.4	57.8

t: 9.543

d.f: 18

p> 0.05

The distribution of the difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in total scores is summarized in Table 2 (App. 7).

As it is shown in Table 2, control group had the mean value of $\bar{x} = 57.8$ and experimental group had the mean value of $\bar{x} = 67.4$. The t value between control group and experimental group was calculated as $9.543 > 2.101$. As the observed value of $t = 9.543$ is bigger than the value of $t = 2.101$ at the 0.05 level of significance. It shows that there is a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in post test. Thus, we reject the second null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 3

H: There is not a significant difference between the total scores of the students within experimental group in the PSC when the group was not exposed

to pre-writing activities and in post test when the group was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts.

Table 4.3. Mean value of the PSC total scores and post test total scores of the students within experimental group

	PSC	Post test
Experimental group	53.8	62.1

t: 12.280

d.f: 9

p> 0.05

The distribution of the differences between the total scores of the students within experimental group in The PSC (pre-test) and in post test is summarized in Table 3 (App.7).

The results of the Table 3 shows that, experimental group had the mean value of $\bar{x} = 53.8$ in the PSC. In post test, the students in experimental group were exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts, the mean value within the same group was calculated as $\bar{x} = 62.1$. As the observed t value was $t = 12.280$ is bigger than t value $t = 2.262$ at the 0.05 level of significance with 9 degrees of freedom. As it is seen, teaching writing with the help of reading texts produced a significant increase in mean scores within experimental group. It means that there is a significant difference between the total scores of the students within experimental group in the PSC when the group was not exposed to pre-writing activities and in post test when the group was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts. Therefore, we reject the third null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 4

H: There is not a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Content in post test.

Table 4.4. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Content in post test.

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
1	22	19
2	22	19
3	21	18
4	23	18
5	24	17
6	23	19
7	24	19
8	24	18
9	23	20
10	23	20
Mean value	22.9	18.7

t: 9.170

d.f: 18

p> 0.05

The distribution of the differences between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Content in post test is summarized in Table 4 (App. 7).

As it is observed from Table 4, the control group had the mean value of $\bar{x} = 18.7$, they are not exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the

help of reading texts. The experimental group had a mean value of $\bar{x} = 22.9$. They are exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts. As the observed value of $t = 9.170$ is bigger than the value of $t = 2.101$ at the 0.05 level of significance with 18 degrees of freedom. As it is seen, teaching writing through reading produced a significant increase in content. Thus, we reject null hypothesis 4.

Null Hypothesis 5

H: There is not a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Organization in post test.

Table 4.5. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Organization in post test.

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
1	15	11
2	14	11
3	13	13
4	13	11
5	14	12
6	13	13
7	13	11
8	12	12
9	15	13
10	14	14
Mean value	13.6	11.9

$t: 3.908$

$d.f: 18$

$p > 0.05$

The distribution of the differences between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Organization in post test is summarized in Table 5 (App. 7).

The findings in Table 5 indicates that there is a significant difference between control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading. As the observed value of $t = 3.908$ is bigger than the t value $t = 2.101$ at the 0.05 level of significance with 18 degrees of freedom. When the Table 5 is discussed from the point of mean scores between the groups, it can be clearly seen that the mean score of control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities is $x = 11.9$ and the mean score of experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts is $x = 13.6$. As it is seen that there is a significant difference between the groups. So, we reject null hypothesis 5.

Null Hypothesis 6

H: There is not a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Vocabulary in post test.

Table 4.6. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Vocabulary in post test.

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
1	14	12
2	15	10
3	14	13
4	15	11
5	14	12
6	16	12
7	16	11
8	15	12
9	15	13
10	16	11
Mean value	15	11.7

t: 7.914

d.f: 18

p> 0.05

The distribution of the differences between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Vocabulary in post test is summarized in Table 6 (App. 7).

As it is shown in Table 6, the mean value of control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities was $\bar{x} = 11.7$ and the mean value of experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts reached the mean value of $\bar{x} = 15$. As the observed value of $t = 7.914$ is bigger than the value of $t = 2.101$ at the 0.05 level of significance with 18 degree of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis 6 is rejected.

Null Hypothesis 7

H: There is not a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Language Use in post test.

Table 4.7. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Language Use in post test.

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
1	12	13
2	13	12
3	12	13
4	13	13
5	13	12
6	12	12
7	14	14
8	14	14
9	14	13
10	13	13
Mean value	13	12.9

t: 0.272

d.f: 18

p< 0.05

The distribution of the differences between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Language Use in post test is summarized in Table 7 (App. 7).

The results in Table 7 show that the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts reached a mean value of $\bar{x} = 13$ and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities reached the mean value of $\bar{x} = 12.9$. The observed value was calculated as $t = 0.272$. As the observed value of $t = 0.272$ is smaller than the mean value of $t = 2.101$ at the 0.05 level of significance with 18 degrees of freedom. So, we accept the null hypothesis 7.

Null Hypothesis 8

H: There is not a significant difference between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Mechanics in post test.

Table 4.8. Mean value of the experimental group and control group in Mechanics in post test.

Subjects	Experimental Group	Control Group
1	3	2
2	3	3
3	3	3
4	4	3
5	3	2
6	2	3
7	2	2
8	3	2
9	3	3
10	3	3
Mean value	2.9	2.6

$t: 1.172$

$d.f: 18$

$p < 0.05$

The distribution of the differences between experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in Mechanics in post test is summarized in Table 8 (App. 7).

Table 8 shows that, control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities had the mean value of $x = 2.6$ and experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts had the mean value of $x = 2.9$. The observed value of $t = 1.172$ is smaller than the value of $t = 2.101$ at the 0.05 level of significance with 18 degrees of freedom. Thus, we accept null hypothesis 8.

4.2 Discussion

The analysis of statistical results of the t-test for independent samples indicated that there is a significant difference in the PSC total scores between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts (App. 5) and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in post test (App. 6). We rejected the second and the third null hypothesis. Because, as the table reflects, the students wrote better compositions when they have gone through a writing syllabus enhanced with reading due to the fact that they were able to initiate their background information as well as to learn how to start and the necessary vocabulary to develop their arguments. Similarly Bagley states that students who studied literature and interested in reading write better compositions than the students who study formal grammar. And also in Frank Heys' (1962) experiment to determine whether frequent writing teaches writing, the group who had additional reading and less writing made greater gains on one of the measures of writing improvement than did the group who wrote frequently. He concluded that reading has a positive influence on writing ability for many students. It was

similarly observed that there is a significant difference between the total scores of the students within the experimental group in the PSC and in post test (Table3) because of the support of reading

As for the analysis of the components in the ESL Composition Profile, the statistical results of the t-test for independent samples showed that there are some differences in some of the components in post test.

In the post test, there is a significant difference in Content (Table 4), Organization (Table 5), Vocabulary (Table 6), Language Use (Table 7) but there is not a significant difference in Mechanics (Table 8).

As it is seen from the findings, there are some differences in the Components between the experimental group and the control group in the post test. These differences will be explained in the following paragraphs. Mostly the total scores of the components showed increase for both groups during the study because of writing lessons in which they learned how to write either with the support of pre-writing activities or not. As one would expect, the experimental group showed higher improvement due to reading materials.

The analysis of statistical results of the t-test for correlated samples showed a significant difference within the experimental group and within the control group in Content. It was easily realized that, pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts helped the students to understand the topic. Students in the experimental group were able to develop more concise and planned thesis on which they based their writing production. Their piece of writing was more knowledgeable, related and substantive because of being given the necessary initiative information. Thus, we can say that, teaching writing through reading with the help of reading texts helped the students who have the greatest difficulty in "What to write".

Although a significant difference was observed in Organization within the experimental group, there is not a significant difference in Organization within

the control group. Students in the experimental group wrote better and longer compositions in terms of organization compared to the control group simply because of the pre-writing activities during which they were exposed to authentic reading given them an idea of good expressions, cohesion, organization as well as logical sequencing. Their writing was found to be more related, clear and continuous in terms of supporting details and questioning.

The statistical results indicated that there is a significant difference in Vocabulary and Language Use within the groups themselves. This means that, teaching writing through reading with the help of reading texts helped students develop the capacity of using effective words, use appropriate register, distinguish denotative and connotative meaning, use appropriate vocabulary to the topic, use well-formed and complete sentences, distinguish main and subordinate ideas carefully, use appropriate conjunctions, adverbials and relative pronouns.

According to their post test scores, the students in the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and control group who was not exposed pre-writing activities did not show a significance in Mechanics. The reason why they did not show a significant difference in Mechanics might be two-fold :

1. The total time of the tests. Within 45 minutes they only write their compositions and, they might not have had time to check their use of mechanics.
2. In the ESL Composition Profile, the scale for Mechanics is only 5 points. This small scale might not be distinctive enough and might have limited the teachers evaluating the papers in terms of mechanics in detail.

As a conclusion, this study indicates that teaching writing through reading with the help of reading texts produced a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and within the experimental group in the PSC total scores.

And also, there is a significant difference in the Components between the experimental group and the control group in post test. As it is observed from the findings in the Tables, there is a significant difference in Content, Organization, Vocabulary, and Language Use in components while no difference in Mechanics has been observed.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of the study

As it is known, for most students, it is a very difficult task to learn to be productive in writing. If they do not understand the topic and they do not have any idea and do not have enough vocabulary stock about the given topic, writing is very boring for them.

In this study, the idea of reading before writing was taken as a base. The purpose of the study was to see whether reading before writing may help students to write coherent and good compositions.

In the study, there were 20 prep-school students as study subjects from the Faculty of Communication Sciences. Their levels were lower intermediate. 10 of them were in the experimental group and the other 10 were in the control group. During the study, the experimental group was exposed to pre-writing activities

through reading with the help of reading texts. But the control group was not exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts. Each group wrote 4 compositions during the study. The students in the experimental group wrote their compositions with the help of reading texts related with the topic, but the control group was required to write compositions about the given topic without having that help. The final composition was taken as post test. The scores of the post test of the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading and the control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities through reading were evaluated by three writing teachers and the average score of these grades were taken as post test scores of the subjects.

The statistical results which are found in Chapter IV were summarized as follows.

As is seen in Table 1 , the experimental group and the control group had approximately the same scores in total and in the scores of components before the actual study in the PSC.

After the study was completed and the results of the post test were taken, as it is seen that the total scores of the students in the experimental group had an increase.

Also, it is clear from the findings in the tables that the significant difference between the pre-test and the post test which were written during the actual study in total scores is not consistent in the components.

As for the compositions of the students in the experimental group within themselves, group showed significant differences between the PSC and the post test in Content (Table 4), Organization (Table 5), Vocabulary (Table 6), and Language Use (Table 7) except Mechanics (Table 8). Experimental group improved in post test in Content, Organization, Vocabulary, and Language Use

significantly. It also showed some improvement in Mechanics too, but this is statistically non-significant.

The findings showed that there was not a significant differences between the PSC total scores of control group and experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities. It was accepted because of nonexistence of pre-writing activities.

As a significant differences in the post test between control and experimental groups was found. The second hypothesis was rejected.

Similarly, this study found a significant differences in the experimental group before and after the pre-writing activities. The third hypothesis was also rejected.

Hence, the experimental group presented some improvement in Content, Organization and Vocabulary during this study. The forth, fifth and the sixth hypotheses were all rejected.

As for the seventh and eighth hypotheses, relatively Language Use and Mechanics, the findings did not show any significant difference between the two groups. So they were accepted.

This study, therefore, indicated that teaching writing through reading with the help of reading texts produced a significant difference between the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities and control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and within the experimental group in the PSC total scores.

5.2 Implications for Teaching Writing

Since it is very obvious from the findings in this study that teaching writing through reading to low-level students with the help of reading texts would help the student in the EFL context in writing courses. A writing syllabus in the EFL

classes can be designed in the light of the results of this study, so to speak, students write better when they are supported with reading materials.

More reading texts on every topic can be used as a supporting activity to develop the required background knowledge to write on a topic and it can be observed if the number and the text type of the reading texts effect upon the students' written performance.

5.3.Suggestions for Further Studies

This study is limited to low level students. The same techniques and methods used in this study can be applied to different groups of students to find out if the language levels of the students effect the results of the study.

In this study, it is observed that, teaching writing through reading with the help of reading texts produced a significant difference. As a further study, it can be searched if that development really comes from the method used in this study or from the general instruction which the students received in their other English courses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aboderin, Y. (1986). "Integrating Reading and Writing". English Teaching Forum, 22 : 38-39.
- Aplebee, A.N. (1981). "Writing in the Secondary school". Research Report 21, National Council of Teacher of English.
- Arapoff, N. (1978). "Writing: A thinking process", in Alan & Campell (Eds). Teaching English as a Second Language, New Delhi: Tata- McGraw- Hill Company, 199-207.
- Baker, E. (1972). Contemporary English, Pitman Press, Bath G2, Great Britain.
- Belanger, J. (1987). "Theory and Research into reading and writing connections: A critical review." Reading-Canada- Lecture, 5: 10-18.
- Blaunt, N.S. (1973). "Research on teaching literature", M.W Travers (Ed), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: MacNally.
- Braddock, R. (1963). Research in Written Composition, Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Carson, J.E. (1990) "Reading Writing Relationship in First and Second Language", TESOL Quarterly, 24.
- Chastein, K. (1976). Developing Second Language Skills: Theory to Practice, Houghton Mifflin Company, USA.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic Structures. The Hague-Moutan.
- Clifton, L (1986). Composition: An Approach through Reading, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc.
- Comlekci, N. (1988). Deney Tasarimi ve Cozumlemesi. Anadolu Universitesi Basimevi.

- (1989). Temel İstatistik İlke ve Teknikleri, Bilim Teknik Yayınevi.
- Dvorak, T. (1986). "Writing in the Foreign Language", in B.H. Wing (Ed.) Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages: Listening, Reading and Writing: Analysis and Application, USA.
- Eckhoff, B. (1983). "How reading affects childrens' writing". Language Arts, 60: 607-616.
- Finocchiaro, M. (1983). The Functional-Notional Approach, From Theory to Practice, USA: OUP.
- Fowler, M.E. (1965) Teaching: Language Composition and Literature, McGraw Hill Inc., New York, USA.
- Henner-Stancina, C. (1985) "From reading to writing Acts", Discourse and Learning. Essex: Longman
- Hillocks, G. (1984) "What works in Teaching Composition : A meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies.", American Journal of Education, Nov, 133-165.
- Hirsch, E.D. (1977). The Philosophy of Composition. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hughey, J.B, D.R. Wormouth, V.F. Hartfiel, H.L.Jacobs. (1983). Teaching ESL Composition : Principles and Techniques. USA : Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Kecik, I. & J. Laycook. (1993). Devoloping Writing Skills. Eskisehir: Anadolu University Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Pergamon Press.
- (1984). Writing: Research Theory and Applications. Oxford : Pergamon Institute of English.

- Kuhn, T. (1970). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching, OUP : Oxford.
- Lopes, Dalila. (1991). " From Reading to Writing Strategies", English Teaching Forum, XXIX, 4 : 26-29.
- McCrimmon, J.M. (1984). Writing with a Purpose, Houghton Mifflin Company, USA.
- O'dea, P. (1965). " Five Myths in the teaching of composition", English Journal, 54: 328-330.
- Palmer, H. (1964). The Principles of Language -study. London: O.U.P.
- Paulston. C.B. (1976). Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and procedures. Canada: Little, Brown and Company.
- Pincas, A. (1982). Teaching English Writing. The MacMillian Press Limited, UK.
- Raines, A. (1983). Techniques in Teaching Writing, OUP, USA.
- (1987). "Why Write" From Purpose to Pedagogy, English Teaching Forum, XXV, 4 : 36-41.
- Richards, J.C & T.S Rodgers. (1986). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. C.U.P.
- Rivers, M., Mary Tempsley. (1978). A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English, OUP.
- (1968). Teaching Foreign Language Skills. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press.
- Robinson, P. (1987) "Projection into dialogue as Composition Strategy", ELT Journal, 41: 30-36.

- Saporta, S. (1978). "Scientific Grammars and Pedagogical Grammars", Allen & Corder (Eds). Readings for Applied Linguistics, 1: 265-274. Lower & Brydone Printers Limited.
- Shanklin, N.K.L. (1982). Relating reading and writing: Developing a transactional theory of writing process. Bloomington: Indiana University School of Education.
- Shanahan, T. (1984). "Nature of the reading-writing relation: An exploratory multivariate analysis". Journal of Educational Psychology, 76: 466-477.
- Smith, F. (1982). Reading. C.U.P.
- Stratta, L. (1973). Patterns of English. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd. London, GB.
- Stotsky, S. (1983). "Research on Reading and Writing: A synthesis and suggested directions." Language Arts, 60: 627-642.
- Taylor, B. (1976). Teaching Composition to Low-level ESL Students, TESOL Quarterly, 10, pp 309-313.
- (1984). "The effects of text structure instruction on middle-grad students' comprehension and production of expository text." Reading Research Quarterly, 19: 134-136.
- Troyanovich, J. (1974). "How defensible is writing as an Objective in short term Foreign Language Experience", Foreign Language, 7:435-442.
- Valdman, A. (1966). Trends in Language Teaching, McGraw-Hill, Inc, New York, USA.
- Walsh, J.H. (1971). Teaching English, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., London, G.B.
- Walters, L. (1983). "A Theoretical Model for Teaching Students to Write". English Teaching Forum, XXI, 3: 17-18.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). New Starts and Different Kinds of Failure, In A.Freedman, I. Pringle, J. Yalden (Eds.), Learning to Write: First Language, Second Language, London, United Kingdom: Longman.

----- (1978). Teaching Language as Communication. O.U.P.

Wilkinson, A. (1973). Patterns of Language, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., London, G.B.

Willis, J. (1981). Teaching English Through English. London: Longman.

APPENDIX 1

The Reading Text Used in Composition 1 for the Experimental Group

A SOCIETY WITHOUT FACES : Internet

What do you need to form a society? First of all you need people. Then a common culture and a language which they can communicate with. Also you need a place where you can live. Now to form a society is almost impossible because you have to create the conditions above. But, in these days with the help of the developing communication technology a new society is being formed. The society is called "The Internet Communication Society".

To join this society, all you have to do is buy a computer, a modem card and a link to Internet. Then you can communicate with people all over the world. You can play games with them, discuss problems or gather information from different sources. In this society, there are no faces, no particular culture and there is only one language: English. In this society there is no race difference. You can not see the color of anybody and there is peace among the users of Internet. All you see are sentences running on your screen.

Internet is the only communication tool which will exist in the future. No telephones, no fax machines and no post offices.

And because of this simplicity, nowadays millions of people are sitting 24 hours in front of their computers and joining this communication society.

QUESTIONS

1. Related to this passage can you make a brief definition of "society"?
2. What is the difference between the known society and the "communication society"?
3. What does the title "A society without faces" mean?
4. What do you need to join this communication society?

WRITING TOPIC

Choose one of the question below and write a composition

1. Do you think there will always be peace in this society? Why?
2. Do you think that the developments in communication technology will help to create a united society in peace?

APPENDIX 2

The Reading Text Used in Composition 2 for the Experimental Group

YASAR KEMAL

Poul Theroux, a travel writer, is one of the people affected a lot by Yasar Kemal. He first met Yasar Kemal in Istanbul. Theroux was on a conference and there were poets, playwrights, novelists and academics. He states this experience in his travel book like "I was seized by an arm and dragged away in a very powerful hold. The man dragging me was tall and strongly build, bull-necked, with a great jaw. His light shadowed glasses did not quiet hide his right eye, which was dead and looked like a faded grape. He talked rapidly in Turkish as he hustled me into the corner of the room. This was Yashar Kemal, the author of *Mehmet My Hawk*, the only Turkish novel I could ever remember having read. It is thought that before long he will be awarded the Nobel Prize for literature.

Yasar Kemal is one of the greatest writers in Turkey. He was born in Osmaniye (Adana) in 1922. He left school in the forth class of elementary school and worked in many different jobs like guarding rice farms or as a petition-writer. While working in these different jobs he was observing life and trying to experience life. He would later use these experiences as material for his stories and novels. Yasar Kemal came to Istanbul in the year 1951 and began to work in the news department of the newspaper *Cumhuriyet*. In 1955 he got his first award with his interviewes which he collected during his work in Cumhuriyet. He published them under the name of *Seven Days in the World's Biggest Farm*. Again, that year he published his first novel *Mehmet My Hawk* which made him famous and he received the Varlik Novel Award. He became one of the writers of

Turkey whose works have been translated into various languages. In 1977, the French Union of Critics chose his novel *Yer Demir Gök Bakır* as the best foreign novel. His trilogy *The Other Side of the Mountain* was chosen as the best book of the year in France. Again in France, in 1982, he got the international Del Duca Award and in 1984 the Legion d'honneur Award. Yasar Kemal was nominated several times by different institutions for the Nobel Prize for literature.

QUESTIONS

1. When and where was Yasar Kemal born?
2. What is his first job?
3. Where did he first start writing?
4. Which international awards did Yasar Kemal receive for his works?

WRITING TOPICS

1. Write your own autobiography.
2. Write a biography of your favorite artist (writer, singer, actor.....)

APPENDIX 3

The Reading Text Used in Composition 3 (post test) for the Experimental Group

ROCK MUSIC UNDER CONTROL

"Now I am going to tell you a story, a tale of wrong and right. And freedom is the reason, you can not take it without a fight".

These are the first lines of a rock song called "Startin' up a posse" by a group called "Anthrax". The name of the song and the group is not important but what they are singing about in this song is a very important subject among these kind of rock groups: Censorship.

What is censored in these songs? of course the so called "swear words" are censored and the records are labeled as "bad music". There are certain organizations in America which do the job of listening to these records and deciding if they should be censored or not. But what we have to think is what is the criteria for a swear word? Is "pig" a swear word or not? For some people yes and for some people no. Who should decide? These kind of questions are relevant for all kind of censorship in all areas of written and visual materials, for example : literature, music, painting, cinema or TV. We can see all kind of censorship because certain kind of people do not want other people to read or to see some certain things. This sentence could be a definition of censorship.

At the end let's listen to the song's last lines:

"You know you can not censor my feelings. You can not censor my thoughts. Censorship is against everything America stands for".

Yes they can not censor our thoughts and feelings but are they really thoughts and feelings if we can not write and speak about them?

QUESTIONS

1. Should "Swear Words" in songs and movies be censored? Why / Why not?
2. What is your opinion about censorship in all kinds of art? Should it be done in some situations?
3. Who do you think does the censoring? The people, the government or organizations?
4. Is there any censorship in Turkey? If yes, in which areas is this censorship done?

WRITING TOPIC

1. Censorship? YES or NO?

APPENDIX 4

ESL COMPOSITION PROFILE

STUDENT		DATE	TOPIC
SCORE	LEVEL	CRITERIA	COMMENTS
CONTENT	30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic	
	26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail	
	21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic	
	16-13	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate	
ORGANIZATION	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/ supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive	
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing	
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development	
	9-7	VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate	
VOCABULARY	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register	
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage <i>but meaning not obscured</i>	
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
	9-7	VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate	
LANGUAGE USE	25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions	
	21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions <i>but meaning seldom obscured</i>	
	17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
	10-5	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate	
MECHANICS	5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing	
	4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing <i>but meaning not obscured</i>	
	3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>	
	2	VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate	
TOTAL SCORE		READER	COMMENTS

APPENDIX 5

Table 1. The results of the PSC (pre-test) total scores of the students in the Control group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Vocabulary</i>	<i>Language Use</i>	<i>Mechanics</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	20	12	10	9	2	53
2	15	10	10	9	3	47
3	20	13	11	12	2	58
4	19	12	10	9	2	52
5	16	11	10	10	2	49
6	20	14	14	11	3	62
7	19	12	10	11	3	55
8	18	13	10	11	3	55
9	20	13	10	9	2	54
10	20	14	12	11	3	60

Table 2. The results of the PSC (pre-test) total scores of the students in the Experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Vocabulary</i>	<i>Language Use</i>	<i>Mechanics</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	18	13	13	11	3	58
2	19	11	11	12	2	55
3	18	10	10	10	3	51
4	19	13	11	12	2	57
5	18	12	10	9	2	51
6	18	13	14	12	2	49
7	21	13	10	9	2	55
8	20	13	11	12	2	58
9	18	11	10	11	2	52
10	15	11	10	13	3	52

APPENDIX 6

Table 3. The results of the Control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in post test

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Vocabulary</i>	<i>Language Use</i>	<i>Mechanics</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	19	11	12	13	2	57
2	19	11	10	12	3	55
3	18	13	13	13	3	60
4	18	11	11	13	3	56
5	17	12	12	12	2	55
6	19	13	12	12	3	59
7	19	11	11	14	2	57
8	18	12	12	14	2	58
9	20	13	13	13	3	62
10	20	12	11	13	3	59

Table 4. The results of the experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities in post test

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Vocabulary</i>	<i>Language Use</i>	<i>Mechanics</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	22	15	14	12	3	66
2	22	14	15	13	3	67
3	21	13	14	12	3	63
4	23	13	15	13	4	68
5	24	14	14	13	3	68
6	23	13	16	12	2	66
7	24	13	16	14	2	69
8	24	12	15	14	3	68
9	23	15	15	14	3	70
10	23	14	16	13	3	69

APPENDIX 7

Table 1

The Results of t-test showing the Difference between Control group and Experimental group when they are not exposed to pre-writing activities

	N	x	s.d	S.E	d.f	t	level of significance
Control Group	10	54.5					
			5.661	1.887	18	0.371<2.101	0.05
Experimental Group	10	53.8					

Table 2

The results of t-test showing the Difference between Experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities through reading with the help of reading texts and Control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities in post test

	N	x	s.d	S.E	d.f	t	level of significance
Control Group	10	57.8					
			3.018	1.006	18	9.543>2.101	0.05
Experimental Group	10	67.4					

Table 3

The results of the t- test showing the difference between the total scores of the students within experimental group in the PSC (pre-test)and in post test

	N	x	d	s.d	d.f	t	p	level of significance
PSC.	10	53.8						
			13.6	3.502	9	12280	>2.262	0.05
Post test	10	62.1						

Table 4

The Results of the t- test Showing the differences between Control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and Experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities in Content in post test

	N	x	s.d	S.E	d.f	t	level of significance
Control Group	10	18.7					
			1.374	0.458	18	9.170	>2.101 0.05
Experimental Group	10	22.9					

Table 5

The Results of the t-test Showing the differences between Control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and Experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities in Organization in post test

	N	x	s.d	S.E	d.f	t	level of significance
Control Group	10	11.9					
			1.305	0.435	18	3.908	0.05
Experimental Group	10	13.6					

Table 6

The Results of the t-test Showing the differences between Control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and Experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities in Vocabulary in post test

	N	x	s.d	S.E	d.f	t	level of significance
Control Group	10	11.7					
			1.251	0.417	18	7.914	0.05
Experimental Group	10	15					

Table 7

The Results of the t-test Showing the differences between Control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and Experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities in Language Use in post test

	N	x	s.d	S.E	d.f	t	level of significance
Control Group	10	12.9					
			1.101	0.367	18	0.272<2.101	0.05
Experimental Group	10	13					

Table 8

The Results of the t-test Showing the differences between Control group who was not exposed to pre-writing activities and Experimental group who was exposed to pre-writing activities in Mechanics in post test

	N	x	s.d	S.E	d.f	t	level of significance
Control Group	10	2.6					
			0.767	0.256	18	1.172<2.101	0.05
Experimental Group	10	2.9					