

Teaching Activities and Students' Preferences in Integrated College English Reading and Writing Classes

Eun-Hee Nam and Myeong-Hee Seong*

Nam, Eun-Hee, & Seong, Myeong-Hee. (2020). Teaching activities and students' preferences in integrated college English reading and writing classes. *English Teaching*, 75(2), 69-91.

This study was designed to explore effective techniques to be used in IERW (Integrated English Reading and Writing) classes for college students. The study last for 15 weeks and included 457 students and 11 instructors at E University. The participants were freshmen who were taking a compulsory English reading and writing class, and the instructors were seven native English speakers and four Koreans. To ensure the effectiveness of IERW classes, it is important to identify what teaching activities are being used and which activities students prefer. To address these issues, the instructors were interviewed regarding their teaching activities in IERW classes. From the interview results, a survey was made that asked students which class activities they consider useful. The results show that most students responded positively to the activities that the instructors were using, with a preference of around 70 percent. Notably, pair or group activities were rated as less favorable than other activities, with a score of under 50 percent. Some implications of the findings and suggestions for teaching activities for IERW classes are provided.

Key words: competency-based English teaching, reading activities, writing activities, integrated English reading and writing class, teaching activities

*First Author: Eun-Hee Nam, Instructor, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Eulji University
Corresponding Author: Myeong-Hee Seong, Professor, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Eulji University; 553, Sanseongdaero, Sujeong-gu, Seongnam-si, Gyeonggi-do, 13135, Korea; seong@eulji.ac.kr
Received 15 March 2020; Reviewed 12 May 2020; Accepted 2 June 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

General English education at Korean universities is changing according to the demands of the times and government policies. Traditional professor-centered reading classes and grammar-translation classes have been transformed into practical general English programs centered on learners based on the dissemination of communication teaching methods (Kim & Lee, 2010). As speaking-oriented communication skills have been emphasized since 1990, speaking-oriented English courses at universities has also emerged as critical to the improvement of English education. Later, the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development (2007) encouraged integrated education of four functions: listening, speaking, reading, and writing to improve students' ability to understand written language and express spoken language in foreign language courses. However, despite starting English study from elementary school, students who graduate from university have always been criticized for their poor English ability. Furthermore, the constant criticism that college graduation does not lead to a successful life in the future has given universities the task of creating talented people with practical skills based on competency.

In this recent era of globalization, English ability has become an important part of national and individual competence, and university liberal arts and English education are also expected to enhance competency. In respect to students' competency, Yoon (2013) stresses that English education should also change so that students can develop their core competencies by adjusting and changing the educational content and methods appropriate to the needs of society. In an education-based society, emphasis on human resources development, building a lifelong learning society, and strengthening the responsibilities of university education, key competences are the basic and universal skills required by learners which must be nurtured through education (Kim & Seong, 2017).

English skills have been taught separately in many universities in Korea, with designated courses for each language skill (e.g., a course for listening speaking, reading, writing and English grammar). This has been a convenient way to organize instruction (Scott & Piazza, 1987) or curriculum design. However, in the effective aspect of education, there are many arguments that it is better to integrate English literacy skills in a single course. The reason why integrated literacy education draws attention in relation to strengthening the core competence of general English is that integrated literacy education enhances the authenticities of the task and enables meaningful learning (Feak & Dobson, 1996) and may make reading and writing learning more successful. Although literacy is to be emphasized as an essential language function to accept information from various fields and to present one's views logically through written language (Kwon & Kim, 2015), reading and writing skills pose a challenge and can cause some difficulties for Korean students since reading and writing in a foreign language requires a complex process

(Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). To lessen these difficulties and make reading and writing successful, it is necessary to apply the method of integrating reading and writing for them. Integrated English reading and writing (IERW) classes can increase students' motivation by enhancing writing through improving reading (Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). Furthermore, English language instructors also need to search for new ways to make their IERW classes productive. In fact, English instructors use a variety of activities in their classes to give learners language input opportunities in their classes, and these teaching activities are supposed to serve as a medium for students to improve their English skills. Instructors are charged with adapting their instruction and contributing to the implementation of English courses. Their engagement and input are vital to the improvement and success of the class. Under the circumstances, it is important to identify what teaching activities are being offered and finding out the students' preference towards them to promote effective and productive IERW classes. For this, two research questions were raised:

1. What teaching activities are used by instructors in IERW classes?
2. What are the students' preferences for these teaching activities?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Competency-Based Curriculum and English Reading and Writing Classes in College

After the importance of competency-based education in college education was highlighted by the University Education Competence Enhancement Program implemented in 2008 and the University-Based Education Advancement Program implemented in 2010, universities began to explore ways to generate talent with practical skills even after college graduation by conducting training based on competency (Yoon, 2013). Competency-based curriculum refers to education that enhances the personal, social, and suitability of the curriculum and places learners' capacity building at the core of the curriculum (Park, 2008). Interest and investment in liberal arts education, which can adapt to make people creative rather than knowledgeable in a field and develop universal basic skills, is continuously increasing. In an academic setting, student success in learning is dependent on their ability to interact with a text. Activities such as summarizing can prepare students for academic tasks in which they will be asked to analyze and work with ideas and information from readings (Reid, 1993). This view is related to the perspective that English reading makes university students prepare for their area of specialization and higher education (Kim, Oh, & Yang,

2009). At a time when job competency is especially important, English education has a role as a tool to prepare for their area of specialization, but at the same time it also has a role as a subject that strengthens employment capacity (Yoon, 2013). Moreover, regarding employment capacity, given the globalized business environment, one of the most necessary English skills in the business world is writing. Therefore, more weight should be given to writing in university liberal arts English classes (Shin, 2018).

However, since 1990, with communication-oriented practical English, especially speaking ability, the importance of literacy in universities has also been reduced. Milkulecky and Jeffries (1986) assert that English reading skill development in a foreign language absent from a natural speaking environment, such as in Korea, is the most accessible language material, and a language function in which we can acquire comprehensive knowledge of words and grammar. In addition, learning to read is an important educational goal, and the ability to read English makes our students productive members of the modern society (Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). Busbee (2001) mentioned the importance of English reading and its connection with Koreans, which is especially important in relation to English education. He stressed that the importance of English text as a source of information is expanding, and Koreans in such areas as economics, technology, and medicine, particularly those who are specialists, rely a great deal on printed English from abroad to stay abreast of changes. The quantity of English that Koreans are expected to read will continue to grow, and this quantity will require faster reading.

On the other hand, writing is a more difficult skill than reading because students have to balance between the content, organization, vocabulary and spelling. The ability to write well is not a naturally acquired skill; it is usually learned or culturally transmitted as a set of practices in formal instructional settings or other environments. As Pysarchyk and Yamshynska (2015) state, the writing experience in foreign language learning is a complex process that requires learner's skills and ability to successfully combine different components of language. Writing skills must be practiced and learned through experience (Johanne, 2002). For instructors, English writing classes are difficult to evaluate, cause difficulty in creating interest and maintaining concentration among learners, and, above all, place a burden on cutting-edge guidance, making it a reality that most university general English classes are not taught in earnest (Tak, 2012). However, considering that one of the most required English skills in globalized business environments and other practical employment settings is writing, a much greater proportion of the English language classes at universities in Korea should be dedicated to writing education (Shin, 2018). Writing is recognized as the most important and effective language function in learning or learning a language (Harklau, 2002; Weissberg, 2000). As Kwon and Kim (2015) present, literacy is to be emphasized as an essential language function to accept information from various

fields or to present one's views logically through written language, as online communication becomes common.

2.2. Integrated English Reading and Writing (IERW) Classes

Integrating skills in EFL learning improves and enhances all basic skills and sub-skills. It is worthwhile to note that integrating skills contributes to the mastery of foreign language during the whole study and develops the ability to express ideas freely (Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). There are two types of language skills: receptive and productive skills. The receptive skills are listening and reading. Because learners do not need to produce language to do these, they receive and understand it. They can be contrasted with the productive skills of speaking and writing. The relationship between receptive and productive skills is a complex one, with one set of skills naturally supporting another. For example, building reading skills can contribute to the development of writing (British Council, 2020). Saikey and Cagney (1987) stated that since a mutually supportive relationship exists between reading and writing, students benefit from the combined use of these two skills. In fact, numerous studies show that reading and writing are interrelated processes, and current research in reading and writing increasingly recognizes the importance of the interrelationships of these two skills (Squire, 1983). Research and pedagogy on integrating reading and writing suggest that the facilitating effects of reading practice upon writing practice, and of writing practice upon reading skills (Applebee, 1977). Recent thinking about the nature of reading and writing views the two skills as interdependent and transactive (Carson, 1993; Spack 1998).

It is argued that it is effective to integrate reading and writing (Carson, 2000; Leki, 1993), and to teach them through enhancing their mutual abilities (Grabe, 2003; Shanahan & Lomax, 1986), which shows the relevance of reading and writing in English education and implies the positive effects of integrated education. These two skills have remarkably similar interrelationships between them in the process of creating meaning (Anderson, Spiro, & Montague, 1977; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). Reading and writing, since they are so intricately linked, mutually reinforce each other and, therefore, promote learning when they are integrated in classroom activities. Students become better readers, writers and thinkers when they learn reading and writing together (Carson, 1993).

Considering the ways in which reading and writing complement each other as disciplines offers instructors opportunities for creativity in terms of selection for reading content and subsequent writing assignments (DuBrowa, 2011). DuBrowa (2011) comments that integrating reading and writing is more a logistical challenge than an academic problem. Indeed, engaging reading selections has been used for exploratory ways to involve students in the writing process. Without the benefit of reading, students cannot

become effective writers. They need to see and experience how the written language works. While reading gives students exposure to vocabulary, sentence structure, and rhetorical structures of English writing, writing activities give students practice in using them. Students can use readings as a model for their writing, or they can write about readings (Reid, 1993). Integrating skills in EFL learning improves and enhances all basic skills and sub-skills in common. It is worthwhile to note that integrating skills contributes to the mastery of foreign language during the whole study, develops an ability to express ideas freely (Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015), and integrated reading and writing activities help students cope in university courses (Grabe, 1991; Reid, 1993; Spack, 1993; Zamel, 1992).

Teaching of reading and writing cannot be torn apart, nor can they be arranged in linear order so that one necessarily precedes the other (Zamel, 1992). While the development of listening and speaking is simple and quick, the development of reading and writing skills requires persistent and continual study (Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). From a pedagogical perspective, the proposal by William Grave and Robert Kaplan (1996) are worth noting. They suggest that L2 reading would help improve L2 writing at the beginning level and the advanced level, and they believed that the integration of writing and reading is applicable at all proficiency levels.

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

The study involved 11 instructors who taught *English Reading and Writing 2* at E university, and 457 students who took *English Reading and Writing 2* classes. E University has English reading and writing classes by level, the bottom 25 percent of students take *English Reading and Writing 1* and the top 25 percent of students take *English Reading and Writing 2* in the spring semester. The other 50 percent of students take *English Reading and Writing 2* in the fall semester. In the study, the students taking English reading and writing classes during the fall semester of 2019 participated.

The instructors who participated in the study consisted of seven native speakers of English and four Koreans. Among the English native instructors, two were in a PhD program, and the others had obtained a Master's degree in various fields of study. They were full-time faculty members at E University with 6–10 years of university teaching experience with students of all skill levels. The native English instructors came from multiple countries, including: two American instructors, one Canadian, one Irish, and one British. All four Korean instructors had PhD degrees, one majoring in English_literature and the others majoring in English education. The number of years that they have been

teaching at universities ranged from 7 to 19 years. They all had been teaching *English Reading and Writing 2* at the time of data collection.

3.2. Setting of The Study

English Reading and Writing 2 is designed as an IERW course. The course meets for two consecutive 50 minute sessions per week. As the course is part of the common core curriculum, the same teaching material and the same syllabus are applied to all classes. The textbook was developed by instructors at E University to suit the characteristics and the level of E university students. It consists of Vocabulary Preview, Reading, Reading Comprehension Exercises, Grammar Builder, and Follow-Up Activity.

Vocabulary Preview covers the definition and use of words and phrases for the main reading. Reading was compiled from TED Talks with appropriate edited text by selecting a lecture that was helpful to the students. In Reading Comprehension Exercises, students are supposed to summarize the text to check how well they understood it. The next step is Grammar Builder, which is the grammar learning stage for English reading and writing. After finishing Grammar Builder, students are supposed to write through a Follow-up Activity. In this step, all the contents learned in each unit are put together to create a sentence so that writing ability can be developed. In detail, students re-engaged in activities to write a given sentence in English, taking into account appropriate (or applicable) words and grammatical elements. Table 1 summarizes the common core of the IERW course according to the textbook.

TABLE 1
IERW (Integrated English Reading and Writing) Course Design

Step	Content of the Textbook	Teaching/Learning Activities
Before Reading	Vocabulary Preview	Vocabulary Previewing
While Reading	Text Reading	Interpretation of the Text Vocabulary Learning and Usages Grammar Syntax Analysis Reading Comprehension
After Reading	Reading Comprehension Exercises	Checking Understanding of the Text Summary of the text
	Grammar Builder	Learning of English Grammar and Grammar Usages
	Follow-Up Activity	Creating Sentences Using Learned Grammar
	Writing Tasks	Writing a Passage in Relation to Learned Unit

As seen in Table 1, the IERW course started with previewing vocabulary in the text. In the while-reading stage, students interpreted the text and grasp the meaning of the text. In this process, they learned vocabulary usage, grammar, and recognized syntax with the classroom activities. In the after-reading stage, they checked how well they understood the text through reading comprehension exercises and summarized the text. Then, they learned English grammar presented in each unit and formed sentences using learned grammar. Finally, they wrote a passage in relation to learned content from each unit. Two writing assignments were given during the semester, which was presented in the syllabus so that students could plan submissions from the beginning of the semester. The topics of the writing assignments were decided by students or given by the instructor at his/her discretion, but they were intended to be selected from the textbook. Each instructor notified students of the length and form of the writing assignments. When students prepared and submitted their first draft for the first writing assignment, instructors reviewed and returned it with notes on the parts to be revised. The students were then required to draw up a final draft by revising the first one, and to submit the first and final draft together to be evaluated for completion.

3.3. Instruments

3.3.1. Interviews

The study was designed to explore various teaching activities conducted in IERW classes by university instructors and to find out students' preferences for those activities. For this, an interview and a survey were used in the study. First, instructors were interviewed about the teaching activities they were using in their actual classes and what their reading and writing teaching tips were. Then, based on the results of the interview, a survey was organized to ask students about their preference for the activities.

The interviews covered all 11 instructors who gave lectures on IERW classes during the fall semester in 2019 and were conducted over two weeks before the end of the semester, with appropriate time coordinated with instructors. The interview time averaged 10 to 15 minutes per instructor. The interviews were conducted by one of the researchers in a semi-structured approach to expand further if necessary. The interviewees were informed that the interview would be used for academic purposes only, and that the interviews would be recorded. The personal information of the interviewees was encoded into English capital letters so that only the interviewer could know about the details of the interviewees.

3.3.2. Survey

A survey for students was developed by the researchers for students' preferences to the activities in their IERW classes, based on results from the instructors' interviews. Survey items were extracted from the interviews and were designed to identify students' preferences. The survey included three questions about students' personal background, followed by items about their preference for teaching activities in IERW classes from 1 to 20.

Statements in the survey were organized without specific categorization, and were later analyzed separately as activities for pre-reading, while-reading, and post-reading: six activities for pre-reading, six activities for while-reading, and eight activities for after-reading exercises including grammar and writing. Students were asked to indicate their degree of preference with 20 activities in IERW classes using a 5-point scale. In detail, on 20 items, the Likert scale, ranging from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree' was used to collect responses. A preference survey was also collected on the same day after completion of the final exams.

Reliability analysis was performed to verify that the survey used in this study was reliable as a measurement tool. Survey reliability measurements used Cronbach's Alpha, which is a relatively high confidence factor with a confidence factor of 0.888 throughout the 20 items, all of which are considered reliable as measurement tools.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Results of the Interviews

Eleven instructors teaching IERW classes were asked three questions. The first question was the procedure of their classes. Almost all the instructors answered that they proceeded in the order of the table of contents of the textbook, such as Vocabulary Preview, Reading, Reading Comprehension, Grammar Builder, and Follow-up Activities. The IERW classes were carried out according to the common course plan, but classes could be run freely according to individual instructors' intention. In this environment, it was important to listen to the instructors' individual class procedure. From one of the instructors, the specific and personal sequence of class progress was shown as follows.

In the preliminary weeks (2-4) I have spent around an hour teaching writing structure, beginning with components of the paragraph (topic/supporting/concluding sentences), before moving onto the short 3 or 4 paragraph essay (introduction, hook, background, & thesis; body paragraphs; concluding paragraph) and rounding up with a look at one or two different types of

essay. Throughout, I tend to give writing exercises as homework to develop the techniques learned in class, as well as top-up 1 hour sessions within the class to work on concepts such as unity, coherence and descriptive writing. While the opening weeks are somewhat lecture-heavy, I do feel that it helps ground students in terms of expectations for the writing project, future writing homework. (Instructor J)

In addition to text, there have been several references to showing TED Talk videos related to the reading since the text was made from TED Talks videos. It is believed that the instructors shared the belief that showing a video will help students understand the text, but the timing of the video differed before or after reading the text. What one of the instructors said showed a clearer idea of why they are showing the video. One mentioned:

I start each class with a “TED Talk Summary”. I liked doing this as a way to start the lesson, and to give them a little time to process the topic for each unit. I told them not to worry if they had a hard time understanding the video since we would be reading the same material together later in class. I think hearing the reading from the book in the speaker's voice was beneficial for them and helped them understand their emotion in the text. We watch the video as a class, and then I give them a few minutes to write a brief summary of the video. The summary only needs to be around two or three sentences. I collect these papers at break and then bring them again to the following class. (Instructor F)

On the other hand, some of the instructors said they were using videos after reading the text. An instructor using TED Talk videos after reading commented as follows:

I assign a task to read the text in advance. For vocabulary learning, after giving each person time to solve a word problem for learning words, I allow students to access online dictionaries on the spot and check their own. Before reading the text, I ask a question about the text. The difficult parts are presented by sentences using PPT slides to interpret sentences. After reading the text, students watch the relevant TED video to help organize the whole story. (Instructor A)

Besides the class procedure, the instructors' personal beliefs, opinions, or specific goals about the IERW classes were also explored from the second question of the interview. They talked about their overall views of the class, the goal or difficulties of the class, and

what aspects of the class were focused on. As follows, instructors reveal their own beliefs for the successful classes:

My teaching focus is grammar application and embedding grammar into writing. For this, I pick an essential grammar skill from each unit's reading and explain to students the rules and usages of the grammar in the text. After I explain, I provide activities where students can practice the learned grammar. Finally, I give students opportunities where they can produce writings using the grammar. (Instructor C)

Generally, I try to get students to communicate as far as possible within class, which admittedly suits some students and not others, but of course a great deal of quality writing is produced by students who prefer to listen, so I find it works relatively well. Also, class size reduction would obviously benefit quieter students in this regard. (Instructor J)

Through interviews, some of the instructors explicitly stated their goals of the class, that is, what they intended to accomplish personally through the class. One said:

My goal of this class is to make my students write simple correct sentences rather than generate wrong complex sentences. So, in my reading and writing class, I not only focus on the development of students' reading skills but also implement various teaching methodologies to improve their writing skills. What I generally do for the writing lesson is that I start off by paying attention to the grammar point of each unit from the textbook. (Instructor C)

As seen above, there was an instructor who focused more on writing in IERW classes, and this would benefit students who studied English with a focus on reading in high school. Below, a tip on how to proceed with the class under special circumstances is presented. An instructor suggested:

One of my goals is to get students away from the temptation to feel sleepy or tired while reading an article, especially on a Monday. In this case, besides the content of the textbook, a variety of teaching activities are required that allow students to focus on their classes with interest. In that sense, sometimes I divide the class into groups and assign each group a

paragraph of the text. Then I carry out the teaching-learning activities related to what I will learn on that day. (Instructor I)

Meanwhile, there was an instructor who talked about the difficulties of the class. Even if the IERW course was conducted according to students' English levels, his words indicated difficulties caused by the inevitable differences in English abilities among students in a class. As he advised below, it would require an adjustment of the number of students per class and curriculum management solutions. The following statements are worth noting as a reminder of the problems that may arise in a common core course. One revealed the difficulties:

Most Reading and Writing Classes are oversized and are mixed ability. In certain areas (grammar, writing), I've found that peer learning and paired or group work are effective methods of getting around this problem. However, in large mixed ability classes, assigning large 'reading texts' for in-class work is quite difficult. Faster students finish quickly while weaker students can feel like they're being left behind or are not being given enough time to complete the work on their own. (Instructor B)

The last question of the interview was about teaching activities the instructors were using in the IERW classes. This question was intended to find out how the actual common course classes are conducted in a variety of ways. It was revealed that all the instructors were using their own activities for their IERW classes through the interview. They presented various tips for effective teaching learning activities that could be done in actual classes. The following are some of the useful activities they suggested:

I assign the reading comprehension as homework. The reasons I do this are as follows: It introduces the topic for the next class in advance, thus allowing the student time to think about it and gives the weaker students the time to work at a slower pace. In addition, weaker, and even stronger, students are able to check new vocabulary on their dictionary before the class day. Also, it frees up more time to do other activities in the classroom. For the reasons mentioned above, I feel that by assigning the 'reading comprehension' as homework it allows everyone the opportunity and time to work at their own pace. (Instructor B)

One exercise I've been using recently is called Synonym/Antonym Slap. While the class and I read the text together, I'll sometimes slap my hand on

the desk once. If I do that, they need to tell me the antonym of the last word that was read. At other times, I'll slap my hand on the desk twice and they'll need to tell me the synonym of the last word that was read. I feel that this exercise helps them to recall their vocabulary knowledge, as well as enlarging it. (Instructor D)

I'm not sure if this is exactly the sort of teaching technique we are looking for, but I tend to elicit answers to the opening questions/ice-breakers in the book and then ask students to write their own ideas. I ask students to do the vocabulary for homework in order to quickly review it in class and cover any questions/confusing terms. We tend to read the main reading aloud altogether, students volunteer to read passages, and depending on the difficulty I might or might not ask them to complete reading comprehension. We usually read for meaning and as a launching point for wider discussion/writing homework as the reading comprehension questions tend not to be very challenging. I teach the grammar point as simply/efficiently as possible setting the follow-up for those with a desire to practice. (Instructor J)

My teaching tip is paragraph drawings. I put the class into groups and assign each group a paragraph from the text. Each group has to design a picture that explains that paragraph, then they have to draw the picture on the board. I use this as a way to create interest in the text, students can ask questions about the picture to the team that drew the picture on the board. After discussion, we read the original paragraph. I like this technique, as it creates a visual picture of the text in students' minds and it gets us discussing the text in a fun way. We use a die to form questions about the text, where each side of the die is a W word (who, what, why, when or where) or the H word (How). Those questions are used in discussion. (Instructor I)

There were other instructors who suggested tips for writing. In addition to short writing exercises in the textbook, this IERW course got students to create longer paragraphs and complete their own writing tasks. The teaching activities they used are considered useful and worthy of consideration for effective writing classes. The following interview excerpts show their tips on writing:

I think context clues and writing outlines are effective. Context clues are for reading skills and they help my students figure out words they don't know. On the other hand, writing outlines will benefit their writing skill because it helps them organize their thoughts. (Instructor E)

My teaching point is providing them with necessary grammar points for writing. The Reading and Writing curriculum consists of essential grammar points, reading and writing skills, and techniques aimed at expanding students' communication toolkit: writing, in particular. As our RW project is writing an essay, word and phrase-level grammar points such as articles, pronouns, conjunctions, and relative clauses are useful, and can be expanded upon in subsequent, speaking-focused classes. Skills like essay structure, thesis sentences, skimming/scanning, and supporting an argument or opinion are useful in writing, and in later speaking courses as well. (Instructor G)

As seen above, various teaching activities were employed in IERW classes. The activities allow integrating vocabulary, reading, grammar, and writing. They reflected instructors' views and beliefs for the classes and could increase students' motivation and enhance writing through improving reading.

4.2. Results of Students Preferences

Based on the interview results, a survey was developed and implemented to capture their preferences towards the IERW teaching activities. The instructors' teaching activities were analyzed into three categories according to three stages in class: pre-reading, while-reading, and after-reading stages. The results of preferences by three categories are as follows.

4.2.1. Teaching activities for the before-reading stage

For the results of pre-reading teaching activities, six items were analyzed according to the degree of student preference. Students expressed their preferences to the following six items about learning vocabulary or watching videos corresponding to the main reading. The findings indicate that students relatively highly valued the teaching activities implemented. For four out of the six items, the respondents assigned about 60–70 percent of the positive answers (agree and strongly agree). The results of students' preferences for teaching activities by each item are shown in Table 2. Although 457 participants

participated in the study, there were some missing responses for several items. Therefore, the total response varies by item.

TABLE 2
Preference of Teaching Activities for the Before-Reading Stage

Items	①	②	③	④	⑤
	n (%)				
(1) Reading the text in advance helps students learn words.	7 (1.5)	20 (4.4)	134 (29.3)	210 (46.0)	86 (18.8)
(4) Watching a Ted Talk video and thinking about its contents before reading the text is helpful for understanding the text.	10 (2.2)	33 (7.2)	143 (31.3)	168 (36.8)	101 (22.1)
(6) Drawing the relevant pictures and having the group activity before reading the text is helpful for understanding the text.	19 (4.2)	78 (17.1)	168 (36.8)	125 (27.4)	67 (14.7)
(9) Learning the vocabulary of each unit in advance and taking the vocabulary test before class helps understand the content.	9 (2.0)	24 (5.3)	127 (27.8)	195 (42.7)	102 (22.3)
(11) Having students access online dictionaries in class and check for themselves after individual vocabulary exercise is helpful for reading comprehension.	6 (1.3)	25 (5.5)	105 (23.0)	217 (47.5)	103 (22.5)
(12) Presenting key contents in PPT before reading the text is helpful for comprehending the text.	5 (1.1)	18 (3.9)	15 (31.7)	198 (43.3)	90 (19.7)

Note. ① = strongly disagree, ② = disagree, ③ = unsure, ④ = agree, ⑤ = strongly agree

As seen in Table 2, respondents perceived most of the pre-reading teaching activities as helpful. Especially, 70% of respondents strongly agree or agree with item 11. The result could be attributed to changes in the environment in which all students have cell phones, which can be used as a learning tool in the classroom. For today's digital generation, it seems necessary for instructors to come up with ways of using digital device applications in a simple but practical English teaching method. Besides, item 1 and item 9 also were given stronger preference (64.8%, 65.0% respectively) from the respondents. Both items have something in common that students were supposed to study or read the text by themselves before class. Generally, students prefer not to be given assignments; however, this result shows that students think that assignments are helpful to their studies.

While students responded relatively strong preferences for most pre-reading teaching activities, there were some students (42.1%) who expressed unfavourable responses (strongly disagree or disagree) to item 6. What is noteworthy here could be the term pictures and group activity. An instructor suggested that this tip made students create a visual picture of the text in their minds and it got them discussing the text in an

entertaining way. However, only a little over one-fifth of the students (21.4%) said they preferred the activity. This may be due to the unfamiliar teaching techniques of drawing pictures in an English classroom and group activities. In this respect, the weak preference of the teaching activities can be interpreted in conjunction with the above-mentioned items 1 and 11. It is possible to think that students prefer studying individually rather than learning together as a group. For item 4, more than half of the students (58.9%) agreed that is helpful. The reason why the preference for the activity is not very high can be considered that students do not understand the content well before they learn it.

4.2.2. Teaching activities for the while-reading stage

The next category from the survey analysis is teaching activities for the while-reading stage. Six items in this category concern various activities that could help students understand the main reading. Students responded preferably to four activities (63-70%) in the IERW classes, and the other two items (item 7 and 10) received relatively low preference scores (43.1% and 46.2%, respectively). Table 3 shows the results of preferences for activities that were used for the main reading.

TABLE 3
Preference of Teaching Activities for the While-Reading Stage

Items	①	②	③	④	⑤
	n (%)				
(7) Asking the Wh-questions and discussing after reading the text is helpful for understanding text.	12 (2.6)	54 (11.8)	194 (42.5)	131 (28.7)	66 (14.4)
(10) Having a volunteer read the text aloud in class and the whole class read it altogether is helpful for reading comprehension exercises.	27 (5.9)	72 (15.8)	146 (31.9)	142 (31.1)	69 (15.1)
(13) Watching the corresponding TED Talk Video after reading the text helps to understand the whole story.	7 (1.5)	26 (5.7)	135 (29.5)	176 (38.5)	112 (24.5)
(15) Testing the important words and expressions from the text after reading the text helps students confirm what they learned.	8 (1.7)	20 (4.4)	140 (30.6)	195 (42.7)	193 (20.4)
(17) Presenting the entire text with word and grammatical descriptions on one slide by using PPT helps students understand the text.	6 (1.3)	13 (2.8)	114 (24.9)	215 (47.0)	107 (23.4)
(18) For complex sentences, presenting syntax analysis and interpretation in PPT is helpful.	5 (1.1)	8 (1.6)	135 (29.5)	204 (44.6)	105 (23.0)

Note. ① = strongly disagree, ② = disagree, ③ = unsure, ④ = agree, ⑤ = strongly agree

Among six while-reading teaching activities, students expressed stronger preferences for items 13 and 17 compared to others. With item 13, students were asked whether they

thought watching the corresponding TED Talk video after reading the text was helpful. 70.0% of the students answered with agree or strongly agree. This result is higher than the results of watching the TED Talk video before reading a text (58.9%). The response could be understood that because the video is in English, it is easier for students to understand it and more useful after reading than before reading. Moreover, students preferred using PPT slides explaining words and phrases or grammar needed to interpret the text. For item 17, students showed the strongest preference (70.4%) for this method of explaining the material while they are reading in class.

On the contrary, some teaching activities were not even favored by half of the students. For item 7, while 43.1% of the respondents agreed that the activity is useful, more than half of the respondents did not seem to like to be asked wh-questions and discuss after reading for meaning. This could be attributed to the burden of creating questions and preparing answers and a debate about the reading. Another disfavored activity is item 10, in which a volunteer reads the text aloud in class and then the whole class reads it for completing the reading comprehension exercise. For the activity, less than half of the respondents (46.2%) expressed their preference. This may be attributed to the characteristics of Korean students that they do not want to be a volunteer or read the text altogether in class so much. For testing, students reported that testing the important words and expressions in the text helped them to learn the unit (63.1%). With this, it turned out that students are not reluctant to take all exams, but they prefer them if they are helpful.

4.2.3. Teaching activities for the after-reading stage

The last category from the survey analysis is about preferences for teaching activities used in the after-reading stage in IERW classes. Eight items asking the preferences for teaching activities regarding English grammar and writing were included in this category. In terms of after-reading activities, respondents rated the teaching activities favorably in general. Table 4 shows the preference results for after-reading activities.

As seen in Table 4, the respondents showed more preference for items 2, 3, 16, and 19 than for items 5, 4, and 20. Among them, item 3 gained the strongest preference; 74.4% of students responded in agreement (agree and strongly agree) to presenting the full outline of word descriptions before writing helps improve writing skills. Item 19, which gained preference for 71.1% of students, was the second preferred. This showed their preference to explanations of the grammar elements presented in each unit through PPTs or handouts. These two results show that students prefer classes providing additional materials to study compared to classes using the textbook only.

TABLE 4
Preference of Teaching Activities for the After-Reading Stage

Items	①	②	③	④	⑤
	<i>n</i> (%)				
(2) Explaining grammar and how to apply it in writing is helpful for a writing task.	4 (0.9)	16 (3.5)	128 (28.0)	216 (47.3)	93 (20.4)
(3) Presenting the full outline of word descriptions before writing helps for improving writing skills.	3 (0.7)	8 (1.6)	106 (23.2)	222 (48.6)	118 (25.8)
(5) Writing about students' college life such as making friends, joining clubs and social activities is helpful for improving writing skills.	8 (1.6)	50 (10.9)	157 (34.4)	162 (35.4)	79 (17.4)
(8) Explaining how to write in class before introducing techniques for a writing task is helpful for writing.	6 (1.3)	14 (3.1)	131 (28.7)	213 (46.6)	91 (19.9)
(14) Checking with pairs or working in groups for consulting each other about what they do not know is helpful during the writing activity.	21 (4.6)	41 (9.0)	142 (31.1)	167 (36.5)	86 (18.8)
(16) Starting with arranging words to represent the meaning and gradually increasing the level of difficulty is helpful for writing.	6 (1.3)	11 (2.4)	138 (30.2)	209 (45.7)	91 (19.9)
(19) Additional explanations of grammar through PPTs or handouts are helpful for creating sentences.	4 (0.9)	5 (1.1)	123 (26.9)	215 (47.0)	110 (24.1)
(20) After grammar explanation, working in groups for reading comprehension or sentence-making exercises is more helpful than working individually.	11 (2.4)	48 (10.5)	164 (35.9)	151 (33.0)	83 (18.2)

Note. ① = strongly disagree, ② = disagree, ③ = unsure, ④ = agree, ⑤ = strongly agree

For items 5, 14 and 20, on the other hand, a little over half of the students agreed that these activities are helpful, earning relatively weaker preference. Item 5, which was writing under the theme of dealing with current contexts that reflects students' college life, such as making friends, joining clubs and social activities, was preferred by 52.8% of students. Similarly, 55.3% of students expressed their preference for item 14 (checking with pairs or group work and teaching a fellow struggling student). As stated above, unlike the instructors' ideas, it turned out that preferences for writing subjects related to students' lives and pair work or group activities were relatively weaker in writing class. Similar results were found for item 20 (working together as a group in reading comprehension exercises or in a sentence-making exercise), which was favored by 51.2% of the respondents. From these results, while professors thought group work is needed for effective IERW classes, only half of the students agreed that those are more useful than individual studies for grammar and writing.

The other after-reading activities gained somewhat high preference. Item 2 (including explanation of grammar and writing processes through application of grammar), item 8 (providing how to write in class and use the techniques for a writing task) and item 16 (starting with the word arrangement and gradually increasing the level of difficulty in writing) were preferred by 67.7%, 66.5%, and 65.5%, respectively.

5. CONCLUSION

The present study investigated instructors' teaching activities and students' preferences in an integrated college English reading and writing course by using instructor interviews and student preference survey methods. The results from the interviews showed that the instructors used various teaching activities according to each step of the lesson—pre-reading, while-reading, and after-reading activities—so that their students can integrate reading and writing skills.

The teaching activities employed in the pre-reading stage were the ones that helped students understand the reading text by predicting its content and learning the vocabulary and background knowledge relevant to the text. Various teaching activities were also used in the while-reading stage: watching a TED Talk video related to a main text, using PPTs for describing words and grammar or analysing complex sentence structures, and testing the key words and expressions in the reading. These activities were employed to facilitate and guide students' understanding of the main reading text and to improve their reading skills. The instructors used teaching activities for the after-reading stage to check how much students understood the text and to help them apply the grammar they learned to their writing. These activities were supposed to give students the opportunities to organize and review what they learned in each unit, thereby creating a learning effect. These results indicated how the instructors well understood and fulfilled the purpose of the IERW course by choosing appropriate activities in classes.

Based on the results from the instructors' interviews, a questionnaire was created to measure students' preferences for teaching activities. Most teaching activities were preferred by students, especially five activities with preference over 70% each. Most of all, students expressed strong preferences to accessing online dictionaries in class and checking vocabulary individually. Other preferable teaching activities had something in common: providing additional learning materials. For example, they preferred using PPT presentations for grammar explanation or the entire text on a slide for analyzing sentence structures or using additional handouts for grammar learning than only using the textbook. Besides, most students showed their stronger preferences for presenting the full outline of word descriptions, agreeing that the activities helped improve their writing skills. These results imply that students prefer visualized materials and that they may need their own pace and time in reading and writing activities in multi-level classes.

On the contrary, some of the teaching activities showed relatively lower preferences. The least preferred teaching activities by students (at 40 percent) was pair or group work in the class. While instructors implemented group work over individual work, only under half of the students agreed that these teaching activities are useful. Regarding using TED Talk videos corresponding with the main reading, some instructors used them before reading

while others after reading. The results showed that students found it more effective to watch TED Talk videos after reading the text than before reading it. These results imply that the instructors should develop strategies to design pair or group work where effective learning is guaranteed on the one hand while they should carefully consider the students' different learning styles and preferences for activities especially in multi-level classes on the other hand.

The results from the students' survey could provide instructors with a practical way of integrating instruction in writing and in reading, and students' preference for the activities would make IERW classes more effective. However, the information from the results may offer a starting point for instructors who teach in the context of the IERW classes. Those who teach reading and writing know, and have known, that the acquisition of academic literacy is a slow, protracted process (Goen & Helen, 2003).

To produce competent members of society where communication matters more than ever, college English education needs to put more effort on not only speaking skills but also on reading and writing skills. Among four language skills, writing is the most complicated but absolutely as important one as other skills (Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). It is particularly difficult for foreign language learners because writing requires all skills and experiences that they have acquired during language learning processes (Pysarchyk & Yamshynska, 2015). This requires instructors to consider some teaching activities that integrate writing skills with reading skills more effectively. For instance, when reading activities are used for providing input or frames for writing tasks and when writing exercises are used specifically to enhance reading comprehension, significant gains will be achieved (Stotsky, 1983). At the same time, as shown in the results from the survey, the integrated course should include individualized learning activities as well as pair or group work, and the instructors should be more sensitive to the individual students' needs. Given this, the integrated reading and writing classes will benefit EFL college students who need to develop, but have troubles developing, their writing skills as well as reading skills.

Applicable levels: Tertiary

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. C., Spiro, R. J., & Motague, W. E. (1977). *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Applebee, A. (1977). Writing and reading. *Journal of Reading*, 20(6), 534-537.
- British Council. (2020). *Receptive skills*. Retrieved on December 23, 2019, from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/receptive-skills>
- Busbee, E. (2001). Computer training to improve word recognition and reading speed. *English Teaching*, 56(2), 143-165.
- Carson, J. (1993). Reading for writing: Cognitive perspectives. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom* (pp. 299-314). New York: Newbury House.
- Carson, J. (2000). Reading and writing for academic purposes. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching: Developing academic skills in ESL/EFL writing classes* (pp. 19-34). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- DuBrowa, M. (2011). Integrating reading and writing: One professor's story. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education*, 28(1), 30-33.
- Feak, C., & Dobson, B. (1996). Building on the impromptu: Source-based academic writing assessment. *College ESL*, 6(1), 73-84.
- Goen, S., & Gillotte-Tropp, H. (2003). Integrating reading and writing: A response to the basic writing crisis. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 22(2), 90-113.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 375-405.
- Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(4), 329-350.
- Johanne, M. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ The Electronic Journal for as a Second Language*, 6, 1-10. Retrieved on January 2, 2020, from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej22/a1.html>
- Kim, E.-J., Oh, K.-M., & Yang, J. (2009). Textbook evaluation for college reading classes. *The Journal Linguistic Science*, 49, 23-48.

- Kim, E.-J., & Seong, M.-H. (2017). Educational needs of industry in core competencies and general education at universities: Focused on the health care industry. *Korean Journal of General Education*, 11(2), 121-145.
- Kim, H.-O., & Lee, H.-K. (2010). Implementing a level-specific general English program at a tertiary level. *English Language Teaching*, 22(4), 75-101.
- Kwon, M.-J., & Kim, E.-J. (2015). A study on the effect of the integrative reading and writing practice in improving college students' English literacy ability. *The Journal of Linguistic Science*, 73, 1-24.
- Leki, I. (1993). Reciprocal themes in ESL reading and writing. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 9-32). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Milkulecky, B. S., & Jeffries, L. (1986). *Reading power*. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (2007). *2007 revised national curriculum of foreign languages (I)*. Seoul: Author.
- Park, M.-J. (2008). A new approach to curriculum development in higher education: Competence-based curriculum. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 24(4), 173-197.
- Pysarchyk, O. L., & Yamshynska, N. V. (2015). The importance of integrating reading and writing for EFL teaching. *Advanced Education*, 3, 77-83. Retrieved on December 23, 2019, from <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.44298>
- Reid, J. (1993). Historical perspectives on writing and reading in the ESL classroom. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 33-60). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Saikey, E. H., & Cagney, M. A. (1987). Integrating reading and writing: The DRWA. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 27(4), 1-10. Retrieved on January 4, 2020, from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol27iss4/2
- Scott, D., & Piazza, C. L. (1987). Integrating reading and writing lessons. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 28(1), 1-10.
- Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. G. (1986). An analysis and comparison of theoretical models of the reading-writing relationship. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(2), 116-123.
- Shin, Younghun. (2018). A study on how to teach English writing in college English class. *Korean Journal of General Education*, 12(4), 37-65.
- Spack, R. (1993). Student meets text, text meets student: Finding a way into academic discourse. In J. G. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 183-196). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Spack, R. (1998). Initiating students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(1), 29-51.

- Squire, R. (1983) Composing and comprehending: Two sides of the same basic process. *Language Arts*, 60(5), 581-587.
- Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. *Language Arts*, 60(5), 627-642.
- Tak, J-Y. (2012). Research on university learners' satisfaction with writing-oriented mandatory English classes and their opinions toward writing: Comparison between English native and Korean non-native instructors. *Studies in British and American Language and Literature*, 105, 323-349.
- Tierney, R., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, D. Pearson, B. Mosenthal, & L. Kamil (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 246-280). New York: Longman.
- Yoon, Hey-Gyeong. (2013). The role of general English education as key competencies: Based on the case of Kyungnam University. *Korean Journal of General Education*, 12(7), 429-458.
- Weissberg, B. (2000). Developmental relationships in the acquisition of English syntax: Writing vs. speech. *Learning and Instruction*, 10(1), 37-53.
- Zamel, V. (1992). Writing one's way into reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(3), 463-485.