

From Reading to Writing Argumentative Texts: Strategies as a Bridge

Maha Dallagi

Lecturer of Applied Linguistics, University of Tunis, Tunisia

Corresponding Author: Maha Dallagi, E-mail: maha_dallagi@yahoo.co.uk

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: September 05, 2020

Accepted: October 07, 2020

Volume: 2

Issue: 4

DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2020.2.4.4

KEYWORDS

Reading, Writing, Conversion, Connection, Argumentative text, Strategies, University Level

ABSTRACT

Reading and Writing differ in accordance with the position of the learner and depend on the process of retrieving ideas from the text or formulating ideas into a written text. Reading process becomes a writing process when it turns from a receptive skill into a productive one. Wittrock (1989, p. 347) explains that "These well-known differences are summarized best by the commonly accepted belief that writing is the process of putting meaning on written pages, whereas reading is the process of getting meaning from the written pages". Nevertheless, and despite the different aspects of the two skills, a large and growing body of the literature has investigated and highlighted the existence of common points and the conversion from Reading to Writing. This paper investigated the conversion of Receptive strategies into productive strategies in the writing of argumentative essays by 147 Tunisian University students. Results revealed the strong connection of the two sets of strategies and recommends teachers to raise students' awareness of the latter to enhance their proficiency level. The aim of this study was to assess the relationship and connection between Reading and Writing in English as a Foreign Language context, and more particularly in the Tunisian University Setting. This study argues in favor of focusing on that connection while teaching Reading and Writing argumentative texts to non-native speakers.

1. Introduction

In the Tunisian context, various variables and factors seem to impact students' strategies in acquiring English, which is an additional language, learnt after French. At the tertiary level, a significant place is given to Reading and Writing, since a good command of these skills is necessary for students who intend to do research, especially that most of the academic sources are in English. This study aims to investigate the conversion of strategies from Reading to Writing. Much research has examined the connection between reading and writing, but very few studies have determined the specific aspects that characterize this relationship, especially from a discourse and cognitive angle (Parodi, 2006). De Rycker and Ponnudurai (2011) claim that reading texts are used as a means to achieve better writing. On the basis of these claims, it would be interesting to study these points in a Tunisian academic context with participants of different profiles. This study seeks to investigate the impact of reading strategies on writing strategies, and to what degree reading proficiency level predicts writing adeptness. In order to collect data, a triangulated approach was adopted, and it was necessary to use multiple instruments permitting to reach valid and reliable results: Document Survey, Proficiency level Tests, Survey of Reading Strategies (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002), Survey of Writing Strategies (Dallagi, 2020). Quantitative and Qualitative analyses have been undertaken to analyze the super ordinate and subordinate categories of reading and writing strategies. The main limitation is related to students' L1 (Arabic) and L2 (French) Reading and Writing proficiency levels. The researcher did not measure to which extent students' L1 and L2 reading and writing strategies affect their choice of Reading and Writing strategies in English, especially in an academic context.

2. Literature Review

For several years great effort has been devoted to the study of Reading and Writing skills. From the late '30s, scholars have managed to study the reading -writing connection (Stotsky, 1983). A great amount of research investigated the different linguistic aspects of Reading and Writing (Stotsky, 1983; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991; Parodi, 2006; Allen et al, 2014).

In a review of the literature, Stotsky (1983) summarized all the studies that focused on reading and writing skills. According to Stotsky (ibid), most of the investigations were correlational and attempted to establish a relationship between reading achievement and writing ability. Most of the studies proceeded by selecting one variable from reading and one variable from writing and combined these statistically to discern the pattern, especially in the field of syntax, vocabulary knowledge or the accuracy of spelling. Though, Reading and Writing unveiled some common features, they also differed in other measures (Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). Studies on Reading and Writing varied and attempted to investigate common aspects to the skills by comparing either products or performances. The main objective of these investigations was to identify common processes and address the psychological similarity existing between the two skills. Loban (1963, p. 75, cited in Stotsky, 1983) investigated upper-elementary students, and found a high correlation between reading scores and writing scores, and reached the conclusion that "those who read well; also write well; those who read poorly also write poorly."

Equally, Lazdowski (1976, cited in Stotsky, 1983) attempted to predict the readability level from writing level. Based on readability formula, the analysis indicated that the overall progression of the readability level in writing corresponded to the overall progression in reading. Lazdowski (1976, p. 81) reached the conclusion that "proficiency in writing ability reflected a corresponding degree of proficiency in reading".

In spite of the great amount of studies that have investigated the different linguistic levels in Reading and Writing, no conclusive results have been reached, as all findings resulted in moderate correlations that ranged between .20 and .50. These findings directed scholars to consider other research perspectives.

In a longitudinal study, Shanahan (1980) investigated Reading and Writing changes at different developmental stages. Since then great effort has been done to investigate Reading and Writing more intensely, attempting to analyze the different facets of the two skills. The last two decades have witnessed a rising interest in the analysis of the connection between the two processes. This relationship has been motivated by students' difficulty in performing in these two skills, and while moving from the receptive level to the productive level.

Different studies (Shanahan & Lomax, 1986; Clarke, 1988; Santa & Høien, 1999, cited in Fitzgerald and Shanahan, 2000) support the finding that learners tend to transfer knowledge from one process to another. Owing to similarities, the two skills "provide cognitive support for learning the other process" (Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000, p. 42). Fitzgerald and Shanahan (2000) claim that reading and writing are closely interrelated and share similar developmental knowledge, despite their different objectives and points of departure, since in the former the student is a receiver whereas in the latter, he is a producer.

Research investigated the reading-writing connection and analyzed it from three important perspectives: rhetorical relations, procedural connections and shared knowledge (Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). In the light of various preceding studies, Fitzgerald and Shanahan (2000) developed a model which recapitulates the development of shared knowledge existing in the two skills. Reading and Writing skills vary and develop according to the learner's educational maturity.

Parodi (2006) investigated 439 eighth graders on argumentative reading and written texts. He aimed to determine the connection between reading and writing processes at different levels (local vs global coherence and superstructural organization). The results permitted to discover systematically and analytically a significant and overall positive correlation between discourse comprehension and production (especially at the level of cohesion and microstructure). Parodi (2006, p. 236) explains that as far as argumentative texts are concerned "there must be a set of strategies in common, that is procedural knowledge constituting the support of the textual comprehension and production mechanisms".

In another research, Baba (2009) discovered that it is reading comprehension, rather than lexical proficiency that affects summarizing performance. Conversely, Delaney (2008) refuted the claim and reported a weak relationship between reading-for comprehension and ability in the production of essays and summaries. She maintains (2008, p. 147) that "Being a good reader contributes to being a good reader/ writer, but it is not a sufficient condition to be one" as it is necessary to take into

consideration other external factors, such as language proficiency and educational level, especially when tasks are “cognitively demanding”.

In a more recent investigation, Allen et al. (2014) attempted to identify how cognitive processes common to the two skills are related and to what extent reading comprehension ability impacted student writing proficiency. The main objective of the study was to determine the extent to which “cognitive skills that are associated with the construction of meaning contribute to both reading and writing performance” (p. 673). In other words, they tried to investigate the relationship of Reading and Writing with Higher (access of prior knowledge from long-term memory, making inferences based on information in the text, the ability to recall new information from memory, etc.) and Lower cognitive abilities such as, working memory.

108 University students in their first or second year of college participated in the survey. Findings revealed a strong correlation between reading comprehension scores and essay scores ($r=.57$, $p<.001$), in addition to the dependence of the two skills on vocabulary knowledge. Low achievers with a limited word knowledge revealed high difficulties in developing “quality essays”. Though Reading strongly correlated with vocabulary knowledge and higher cognitive skills, the statistical relationship between Writing and the latter variables was moderate, unveiling a dependence on other factors and processes (Allen et al., 2014, p. 685). Additionally, linear regression analyses demonstrated that word knowledge and high cognitive skills (making inference about the text, ability to access prior knowledge about given topics) are predictive of reading proficiency, while writing proficiency is mainly predicted by vocabulary knowledge (Allen et al., 2014, pp. 681-682). To sum up, Reading and Writing were shown to be linked to each other but are also predicted by common cognitive abilities mainly text memory, text inferencing, knowledge access and knowledge integration. Yet, vocabulary knowledge seems to be the greatest factor to impact performances in the two skills and vital to both understanding and writing a text.

In the light of these investigations, the following study aims to explore reading and writing connection at rhetorical and cognitive levels. As most of the literature in the field focused on one linguistic aspect, the current study is interested in investigating a set of reading strategies and writing strategies that are used in the production of an argumentative essay. Results may have pedagogical implication in the development of more efficient curricula.

Despite their relationship, no benefit is drawn from the connection existing between Reading and Writing, and these two skills are often taught separately in Tunisian teaching context. This fact results in a pedagogical separation of the two skills, engaging instructors in developing different curricula and instructional materials and enhancing the gap between Reading and Writing. Due to time constraints, Reading is often more developed at the expense of writing skills. Nonetheless at the end of each term learners are evaluated on a writing task and often need to develop an argumentative essay.

3. Methodology

Echoing previous studies this paper aims to account for the link between Reading and Writing in an EFL context, and more precisely in an Arab environment. In addition, it is important to explore the relationship between strategy use and success in the development of reading and writing skills.

Previous research investigated reading and writing separately; however, the last two decades have witnessed a major concern in investigating reading-writing relation from the same discourse and cognitive perspectives (Parodi, 2006). Since, it is often claimed that good readers are good writers and poor readers are poor writers (Loban, 1967), the current study is interested in verifying this hypothesis. The study compares data and tries to find out if such relationship holds for reading comprehension and essay writing. The results of the investigation might be of significant help in showing the importance of teaching reading and writing strategies and in improving ESP teaching at the university level.

3.1. Population

The study investigated the use of reading and writing strategies by 147 Tunisian University students majoring in four different disciplines (Soft Sciences: English and French, Hard Sciences: Medicine and Engineering).

3.2. Instruments

The Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) and the Survey of Writing Strategies (SOWS) were the main instruments used to gather quantitative data. Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS) was designed by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002, p. 2) as “a simple, yet effective tool for enabling students to develop a better awareness of their reading strategies, for helping teachers

assess such awareness, and for assisting students in becoming constructively responsive readers.” SORS aims at determining and evaluating learners’ reading strategies, “mental plans, techniques and action” adopted once they read academic texts. Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) argue that raising students’ metacognitive awareness facilitates the development and progress of reading comprehension skills. Very few studies (Spivey, 1990, 1997; Sadoski & Paivio, 2001) adopted instruments that analyzed simultaneously reading and writing strategies. Parodi (2006, p. 228) points out that “The standards used to correlate reading and writing were not necessarily comparable and did not share a common ground of similarity.” On the basis of this evidence, the investigator felt the need to design a questionnaire relative to writing strategies and which would focus on strategies common to Reading ones: the Survey of Writing Strategies (SOWS) (Dallagi, 2020). Because of the dearth of instruments that evaluate reading and writing strategies, the fieldworker focused on documentation that dealt with the argumentative essay writing (guidelines and techniques) in order to identify strategies shared in the two skills. These documents were of significant help to select the 30 most frequent writing strategies that shared common characteristics with reading strategies and that permitted to get a reliable statistical comparison.

The SORS and SOWS categorize reading and writing strategies into 3 parts, according to Mokhtari and Sheorey’s (2002) taxonomy: Global Strategies, Problem Solving Strategies and Support Strategies (Appendix A). Each questionnaire consists of 30 items, each of which is on a 5 point- likert scale ranging from 1 (“I never or almost never do this”) to 5 (“I always or almost always do this”). The overall score average indicates how often students believe they use the strategies when reading academic materials. Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002) explain that the average, for each subscale in the inventory, shows the mean frequency with which students use a given category of strategies when reading academic material. The results obtained will help in this study to a) identify the frequency of the different strategies, b) determine relationships between proficiency and strategies use. All answers had been recorded on an Excel Table and analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

The Cronbach reliability tests indicated that the alpha coefficient for SORS and SOWS are respectively .89 and .822. These coefficients suggest that the 30 items of the two questionnaires have relatively high internal consistency.

Before completing the surveys, the participants had to read a text, answer comprehension questions, and write an argumentative essay. The objective of this task was to assess informants’ awareness of the different strategies they use in the receptive and productive skills, and not getting influenced by the strategies mentioned in the surveys, which could have affected the validity of the results. The Reading and writing tasks were evaluated in order to identify the participants’ proficiency level. Students’ writing proficiency was determined through a holistic scoring. Holistic scoring is the evaluation technique most often recommended for assessing the overall proficiency level of a writing sample (Omaggio, 1993) by one or more raters. Holistic scoring guide for Persuasive Writing designed by Knudson (1992), permitted to identify students’ writing adeptness. An inter-rater reliability was undertaken to avoid any subjective behaviour that might impact the scoring of the papers. The results of the inter-reliability checks revealed little difference among the raters and a high agreement. A total mean was determined which equaled a percent agreement of 82.5%. An agreement coefficient is considered to be acceptable if it ranges between 75 % and 90% (Loewen & Plonsky, 2016).

4. Analysis

4.1 Impact of Reading on Writing

In this section, I will attempt to confirm statistically the relationship between reading and writing and the impact that reading strategies have on writing strategies. Some studies (Stotsky, 1983; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991; Parodi, 2006; Allen et al., 2014) have investigated the relationship between the two skills. Though a great deal of research confirmed the relationship between these two skills at different levels, the objective of this study is to verify that claim in the Tunisian tertiary level context, and more precisely in relation to the argumentative text type. The current investigation inspired by previous research on the reading-writing connection intends to identify how reading strategies map onto writing strategies, and confirms the relation between the different sub-strategies. “Linear Regression analysis” was adopted. Riazi (2016) defines Linear regression as “The statistical procedure that is used to predict the values of a dependent variable from the known values of independent variables” (p. 173). A standard linear regression was calculated to predict Writing Strategies (Dependent variable) based on Reading Strategies (Predictor Variable). In other words, the analysis permitted to determine the degree to which Reading strategies predict Writing Strategies. I undertook four calculations in order to analyze how well READING STRATEGIES (Overall, GLOB, PROB and SUP) impact WRITING STRATEGIES. By Overall strategies the fieldworker refers to the 30 strategies altogether without taking the sub-classification into consideration.

4.2 Impact of Overall Reading Strategies on Overall Writing Strategies

This part of the study explores the impact of Overall Reading Strategies (overall_Rea) on Overall Writing strategies (Overall_Wr_Av) to identify the strength effect of the former variables on the latter ones.

Table 1: A Standard Linear Regression: Reading Strategies vs Writing Strategies

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,703 ^a	,494	,491	,41216

a. Predictors: (Constant), overall_Rea

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	24,088	1	24,088	141,796	,000 ^b
	Residual	24,632	145	,170		
	Total	48,719	146			

a. Dependent Variable: Overall_Wr_Av

b. Predictors: (Constant), overall_Rea

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,622	,237		2,624	,010
	overall_Rea	,842	,071	,703	11,908	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Overall_Wr_Av

A simple linear regression analysis was calculated to investigate the degree to which Overall Reading strategies predict Overall Writing strategies. Table 1 shows a significant regression equation ($F(1,145) = 141.796, p < .000$), with an R^2 of .494. Predicted progress in writing strategies is equal to $.622 + .842$ (Reading strategies). In other words, the impact of Overall Reading strategies is evaluated at 0.842 or at 84.2%.

4.3 GLOB Reading Strategies and GLOB Writing Strategies

As Overall reading strategies show a strong effect of 84.2 % on writing strategies, it would be appropriate to find out if this strong effect is also valid in the sub-strategies. The same test was adopted to investigate the degree to which Global (GLOB) Reading strategies predict Global (GLOB) writing strategies.

Table 2: A Standard Linear Regression: GLOB Reading Strategies vs GLOB Writing Strategies

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,790 ^a	,623	,621	,96004

a. Predictors: (Constant), GLOB_ReaAv

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	221,258	1	221,258	240,060	,000 ^b
	Residual	133,643	145	,922		
	Total	354,901	146			

a. Dependent Variable: GLOB_Wr_Av

b. Predictors: (Constant), GLOB_ReaAv

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,743	,153		4,844	,000
	GLOB_ReaAv	,806	,052	,790	15,494	,000

a. Dependent Variable: GLOB_Wr_Av

Table 2 reveals a significant regression equation ($F(1,145) = 246.060, p < .000$), with an R^2 of .623. Predicted progress in writing strategies is equal to $.743 + .806$ (Reading strategies). In other words, the impact of GLOB Reading strategies is evaluated at 0.806 or at 80.6%.

4.4 PROB Reading Strategies and PROB Writing Strategies

In the same way that GLOB strategies were analyzed, a simple linear regression investigated the degree to which Problem-Solving Reading strategies (PROB_ReaAv) predict Problem solving Writing strategies (PROB_Wr_Av).

Table 3: A Standard Linear Regression: PROB Reading Strategies vs PROB Writing Strategies

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,759 ^a	,577	,574	1,16073

a. Predictors: (Constant), PROB_ReaAv

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	265,969	1	265,969	197,411	,000 ^b
	Residual	195,356	145	1,347		
	Total	461,325	146			

a. Dependent Variable: PROB_Wr_Av

b. Predictors: (Constant), PROB_ReaAv

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,638	,197		3,247	,001
	PROB_ReaAv	,807	,057	,759	14,050	,000

a. Dependent Variable: PROB_Wr_Av

Table 3 shows a significant regression equation ($F(1,145) = 197,411, p < .000$), with an R^2 of .577. Predicted progress in writing strategies is equal to $.638 + .807$. In other words, it demonstrates that the impact of PROB Reading strategies is evaluated at 0.807 or at 80.7%.

4.5 Support Reading Strategies and Support Writing Strategies

A final test was carried out to find out to what extent Support reading strategies (SUP_ReaAv) impact Support-Writing Strategies (SUP_Wr_Av).

Table 4: A standard Linear Regression: SUP Reading Strategies and SUP Writing Strategies

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,798 ^a	,637	,635	,84938

a. Predictors: (Constant), SUP_ReaAV

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	183,792	1	183,792	254,756	,000 ^b
	Residual	104,609	145	,721		
	Total	288,401	146			

a. Dependent Variable: SUP_Wr_Av

b. Predictors: (Constant), SUP_ReaAV

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	,664	,134		4,946	,000
	SUP_ReaAV	,785	,049	,798	15,961	,000

a. Dependent Variable: SUP_Wr_Av

Table 4 indicates a significant linear regression equation ($F(1,145) = 254,756, p < .000$), with an R^2 of .637. Predicted progress in writing strategies is equal to $.664 + .785$, and that indicates the impact of SUP Reading strategies on SUP Writing Strategies is evaluated at 0.785 or at 78.5%.

4.6 Impact of Proficiency in Reading on Proficiency in Writing

Linear regression tests confirm that Reading strategies and Writing strategies are closely related with an impact of the different Reading strategies on Writing strategies. The four results demonstrate to what extent Reading strategies affect Writing strategies, and reveal an impact that varies from 84.2 % to 70.5%, and R^2 that ranges between .494 and .637 (Tables: 1,2,3,4). These findings reveal, according to Cohen’s (1992) classification, that Reading strategies have a large size effect ($R^2 > .25$) on Writing strategies. Based on these results, it seems logical to analyze if READING PROFICIENCY has an effect on WRITING PROFICIENCY and if these two variables are related. A statistical explanation permits to assert the claim that “The more students read the better they write”. A Spearman’s rank order correlation test (Table 5) was run, revealing a positive relationship between Prof_Rea (Proficiency in Reading) and Prof_in_Wr (Proficiency in Writing).

Table 5: Spearman's correlation matrix between Reading and Writing proficiency levels

		Correlations		
			Prof_Rea	Prof_in_Wr
Spearman's rho	Prof_Rea	Correlation Coefficient	1,000	,487**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	,000
		N	147	147
	Prof_in_Wr	Correlation Coefficient	,487**	1,000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	.
		N	147	147

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Results indicate a statistically significant relationship between the two variables ($r_s(147) = .487, p = .000$); that reveals the constructive impact of Reading Proficiency on Writing Proficiency. The positive correlation between the two variables comes to enhance previous conclusions that the better the learner's performance is in reading, the better performance it is in writing as well.

The different analyses aimed to identify whether there is an impact of reading strategies on writing strategies. Linear regression analyses (Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4) permitted to confirm the strong predictive impact that the different Reading strategies have on writing strategies. This conclusion is affirmed by the positive correlation which exists between READING PROFICIENCY (Prof_Rea) and WRITING PROFICIENCY (Prof_inWr) (Table 5).

5. Discussion

Reading –Writing Conversion

The current study attempted to identify connections between Reading strategies and Writing Strategies. It also asked if Reading proficiency level impacted students' Writing proficiency level. The findings showed no correlation between SPECIALTY and WRITING STRATEGIES. Nevertheless, there is a relationship between PROFICIENCY and SUB-STRATEGIES in Reading (PROB) and Writing (GLOB and PROB). Alike previous studies that investigated Reading and Writing connection, the present study attempted to enhance that field of research and confirm the hypothesis that Reading strategies and Writing Strategies are connected. Relationship of the two skills may have an impact on students' production level.

Results of the linear regression analysis, which was run at the different levels of strategies (Overall, GLOB, PROB and SUP), revealed an independent power of the explanatory variable READING STRATEGIES (overall_Rea) on the response variable: WRITING STRATEGIES (Overall_Wr_Av). In other words, the impact of OVERALL READING STRATEGIES (overall_Rea) is evaluated at 0.842 or at 84.2%. Similarly, the impact of GLOB READING STRATEGIES (GLOB_ReaAv) is evaluated at 80.6%, while the prediction of PROB READING STRATEGIES (PROB_ReaAv) on PROB WRITING STRATEGIES (PROB_Wr_Av) is estimated at 80.7%. The impact of SUP Reading strategies (Sup_ReaAv) on SUP Writing Strategies (SUP_Wr_Av) can be considered as high since it is evaluated at 0.785, though it is slightly below the other results. The different results explain that the variation ranges between 78% and 84%. This outcome signifies that the various reading strategies largely contribute to the variance of writing strategies. The findings of the linear regression test predict a relevant impact of Reading (independent variable) on Writing (response variable) as the relation between the two variables explains a good deal of variation.

On the basis of these results, a Spearman' rho correlation was conducted to identify the relationship between READING PROFICIENCY and WRITING PROFICIENCY; which resulted in a statistical significant relationship between the two scores ($r_s(147) = .487, p = .000$). This result falls in line with Fitzgerald and Shanahan's (2000) and Allen et al. (2014). They found that Reading comprehension scores correlated with writing scores and ranged between $r = .20$ and $r = .57, p < .001$, concluding then that the two processes share some degree of similarity.

The findings can only confirm that Tunisian students do not differ from other ESL and EFL learners. Results come to support the hypothesis that Reading and Writing share common knowledge sources and same processing strategies at the level of reception and production. This means that the better the learners' performance is in reading, the better their performance is in writing. These findings can serve as evidence for the constructive impact of Reading Proficiency on Writing Proficiency.

These findings are in line with the conclusions that were reached by Tierney and Shanahan (1991) and Parodi (2006), who reported a progressive relationship between strategies in the two skills. These conclusions also confirm the results reached by Ryan (1985), who identified six strategies common to reading comprehension and writing (paragraphing, hypothesizing, contextualizing, structuring, monitoring and revising), and Langer (1986) who determined common strategies and cognitive processes such as reasoning and constructing meaning.

Data permitted as well to identify a positive correlation between READING PROFICIENCY and WRITING PROFICIENCY. It is suggestive that the strategies used by students while perceiving the message in their reading of an argumentative text are the same adopted at the productive level, which will probably impact their proficiency level. Loban (1967, cited in Allen et al., 2014) reached the conclusion that poor readers are also poor writers, while good readers are good writers. As explained by Parodi (2006, p. 236), this positive correlation between Reading and Writing Strategies indicates the presence of common strategies "at the procedural knowledge that constitute the support of the textual comprehension and production mechanisms".

Overall, the findings of the study strengthen the evidence that Reading and Writing skills are closely interrelated. The evidence is that Reading-Writing conversion is not restricted to simple language knowledge, and findings provide insights that cognitive skills are closely tied. The results of the current study fall in line with previous research which investigated overlapping strategies employed by students in both reading comprehension and writing tasks. As Allen et al. (2014, p. 667) have mentioned, these findings permit to raise instructors' awareness on the relevant connection of the two skills in order to effectively develop an integrated pedagogy for reading comprehension and writing, and do not teach the latter separately.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The main purpose of this study was to verify the impact of reading strategies on writing strategies in the perception and production of argumentative texts. The aim was to assess the relationship and connection between the two skills. The relationship between Reading and Writing was evidenced by previous research; however, the issue still raises some questions. One of the purposes of this study was to investigate that connection in an EFL context among Tunisian University Students

Linear regression analyses of the super ordinate and subordinate categories of strategies revealed a strong impact of Reading strategies on writing strategies. In the same line, the most obvious finding to emerge from this study is the connection between READING PROFICIENCY and WRITING PROFICIENCY. The positive correlation between the two variables is in good agreement with other studies (Fitzgerald & Shanahan's, 2000; Allen et al., 2014) which confirmed that the two processes share some degree of similarity.

Findings also revealed that University Tunisian students do not differ from other EFL learners in their receptive and productive processes. The results serve an evidence of the constructive impact of Reading Proficiency on Writing Proficiency and complement those of earlier studies (Tierney & Shanahan, 1991; Parodi, 2006) which reported the progressive relationship existing between the strategies in the two skills. Additionally, the findings of the current research come to highlight that the connection between Reading and Writing skills is not only limited to simple knowledge but also to strategies.

Due to the similar *constructive* and *meaning-making* nature of both reading and writing, investigation on their strategies among Tunisian tertiary level students hopes to have pedagogical implications. Thanks to the interaction existing between reading and writing, it is strongly recommended to relate the two skills in order to achieve better and more efficient learning (Allen et al.2003, Parodi, 2006). Given that one of the most important goals of teaching reading and writing is to help university students grow as strategic and independent readers and writers, instructors need to be aware of the common characteristics of the two processes and the necessity of not dissociating the teaching of the two skills. The findings of this study provide insights that reading strategies are closely related to writing strategies. As the two skills support each other's' processes, it is highly recommended to promote reading strategies to enhance writing strategies. This procedure will permit instructors to tailor their instructions and enhance their pedagogy by focusing on strategies that will improve learners' proficiency level.

References

- [1] Allen, L.K., Snow, E.L., Crossley, S.A., Jackson, G.T., & McNamara, D.S. (2014). Reading comprehension components and their relation to writing. *Topics in Cognitive Psychology*, 114, 663-691.
- [2] Baba, K. (2009). Aspects of lexical proficiency in writing summaries in a foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(3), 191-208.
- [3] Dallagi, M. (2020). Writing Strategies across four disciplines in a Tunisian Context. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 2(3), 119-140. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v2i3.284>
- [4] Delaney, Y. A. (2008). Investigating the reading-to-write construct. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(3), 140-150.
- [5] De Rycker, A., & Ponnudurai, P. (2011). The effect of online reading on argumentative essay writing quality. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 11(3), 147- 149.
- [6] Fitzgerald, J. and Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and Writing Relations and Their Development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 39-50.
- [7] Knudson, E. (1992). Analysis of argumentative writing at two grade levels. *The Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 85 (3), pp.169-179.
- [8] Langer J. A. (1986). *Children reading and writing: Structures and strategies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- [9] Lazdowski, W. (1976). *Determining reading Grade Levels from Analysis of Written Compositions*. Doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University.
- [10] Loban, W. (1963). *The Language of Elementary School Children*. Research Report N°1. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- [11] Loewen, S. & Plonsky, L. (2016). An A-Z of Applied Linguistics Research Methods. PALGRAVE.
- [12] <https://books.google.tn/books?id=UCYpCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA93&lpg=PA93&dq=intra+rater+reliability+in+applied+linguistics&source=bl&ots=WuW4IVo4t3&sig=mlxYQotpgPsdIJJBjOhM-GW6ug&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewjM6f2Yxs3ZAhXGuxQKHYKLDiYQ6AEIPTAC#v=onepage&q=intra%20rater%20reliability%20in%20aplied%20linguistics&f=false>
- [13] Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25, 2-10.
- [14] Omaggio, A. (1993). *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- [15] Parodi, G. (2007). Reading–writing connections: Discourse-oriented research. *Reading and writing*, 20(3), 225-250.
- [16] https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Giovanni_Parodi/publication/225843642_Reading-writing_connections_Discourseoriented_research/links/54b79cc60cf24eb34f6ec090/Reading-writing-connections-Discourse-oriented-research.pdf
- [17] Riazi, A. M. (2016). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of research methods in Applied Linguistics*. Routledge.
- [18] Ryan S. M. (1985). An examination of reading and writing strategies of selected fifth grade students. In J. Niles & R. Lalik (Eds.), *Issues in literacy: A research perspective* (Thirty-fourth yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 386-390), Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- [19] Sadoski, M., & Paivio, A. (2001). *Imagery and text: A dual coding theory of reading and writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [20] Santa, C. M., & Høien, T. (1999). An assessment of early steps: A program for early intervention of reading problems. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(1), 54-79.
- [21] Shanahan, T. (1980). The impact of writing instruction on learning to read. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 19(4), 357-368.
- [22] Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. G. (1986). An analysis and comparison of theoretical models of the reading–writing relationship. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(2), 116.
- [23] Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. *Language arts*, 60(5), 627-642.
- [24] Tierney, R., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp.246-280). Vol.II Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [25] Wittrock, M. C. (1989). Generative Processes of Comprehension, *Educational Psychologist*, 24:4, 345-376, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2404_2

Appendix A

Common strategies in Reading and Writing

Survey of Reading Strategies by Mokhtari and Sheorey (2002)	Survey of Writing Strategies by Dallagi (2002)
<p style="text-align: center;">GLOBAL READING STRATEGIES</p> <p>1- I review the text first by noting its length and organization 2- I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it. 3- I have a purpose in mind when I read. 6- I try to guess what the content of the text is about when I read. 7- When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore. 8- I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose. 15- I think about what I know to help me understand what I read. 19- I check my understanding when I come across new information. 20- I use context clues to help me better understand what I am reading. 23- I use tables, figures, and pictures in the text to increase my understanding. 26- I pay attention to typographical features like bold face and <i>italics</i> or use different colours to identify key information. 27- I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text. 28- I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">GLOBAL WRITING STRATEGIES</p> <p>2- I use tables or diagrams when I brainstorm. 3- Before writing I critically analyze the topic. 4- I have a purpose in mind when I write. 7- I think about what I know to define what I should write 9- Before writing an argumentative essay I prepare a plan. 10- Before writing I identify the position I am going to defend. 11- The first step I do is to write down ideas that I will directly develop in a final draft. 12- I write a first draft, before a final one. 13- After writing the first draft I select, what to keep and what to suppress. 24- I use typographical features like bold faces, <i>italics</i>, <u>underlying</u>, or different colours when I want to focus on key ideas. 25- While writing I keep in mind that I try to persuade the reader. 27- In an argumentative essay, I make sure I formulate my opinion. 29- After writing I critically evaluate what I wrote.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">PROBLEM-SOLVING READING STRATEGIES</p> <p>4- I read slowly and carefully to make sure I understand what I am reading. 5- I adjust my reading speed according to what I am reading. 9- When the text becomes difficult; I pay closer attention to what I am reading. 11- I stop from time to time and think about what I am reading. 13- I try to get back on track when I lose concentration. 16- When I read, I guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases. 25- I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read. 30- When text becomes difficult, I re-read it to increase my understanding.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PROBLEM -SOLVING WRITING STRATEGIES</p> <p>15- When I meet difficulties while writing, I reread what I wrote in order to re-boost my argumentative process / my way of thinking. 16- I stop from time to time and reread what I wrote. 17- I get back to the topic to make sure what I am writing is coherent. 19- I resort to my experience and background knowledge to illustrate my argumentation. 28- I read slowly and carefully to make sure I achieved cohesion. 30- I reread the final draft to correct the grammar and vocabulary mistakes.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">SUPPORT READING STRATEGIES</p> <p>10- When the text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help myself understand what I read.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SUPPORT WRITING STRATEGIES</p> <p>1- I underline or circle the key words of the topic to clarify the purpose of the essay.</p>

<p>12- I go back and forth in the text to find out relationships among ideas in it.</p> <p>14- When reading, I think about the information I have developed from the text in both English and my mother tongue.</p> <p>17- When reading, I translate from English into my native language.</p> <p>18- I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.</p> <p>21- I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.</p> <p>22- I underline or circle information in the text to help myself remember it.</p> <p>24- I use reference materials (e.g., a dictionary) to help me understand what I read.</p> <p>29- I ask myself questions I like to have answers in the text.</p>	<p>5- Before writing, I reformulate the topic into questions that I try to answer.</p> <p>6- I think about the content of the topic, in both English and my mother tongue.</p> <p>8- I take notes while reading the topic to help me identify what I should write.</p> <p>14- I think aloud when I have difficulties in expressing an idea.</p> <p>18- I go back and forth in my passage to check the relationship among ideas.</p> <p>20- I reinforce my arguments with quotations.</p> <p>21- When I write, I use vocabulary seen previously during previous English courses.</p> <p>22- While writing, I formulate ideas in my mother tongue and translate them into English.</p> <p>23- I use reference materials (eg. Dictionary) to help me use the adequate vocabulary and adopt the correct structures.</p> <p>26- I use persuasive words.</p>
---	--