Developing an Integrated English Reading and Writing Teaching Model for EFL Learners in China

Yiran Li [1*] , Jilei Han [2]

[1*]Weifang Weiyou Sicheng Education Technology Co., LTD, China

[2]Weifang University, China

*Corresponding author：E-mail: yiranliyiran@qq.com

Abstract: This paper explores the development of an integrated English reading and writing teaching model for EFL learners in Chinese universities. The study is motivated by the widespread difficulty Chinese students face in improving writing proficiency, which is often taught separately from reading and largely assigned as extracurricular homework. Drawing on existing theories of reading models, strategies, and the interrelationship between reading and writing, the research highlights the necessity of integrated instruction to enhance students' overall literacy competence. A mixed-methods design is proposed, involving proficiency tests, questionnaires, interviews, classroom observations, and comparative teaching experiments with both traditional and integrated approaches. By combining quantitative analysis and qualitative feedback from teachers and students, the study aims to identify key instructional elements and evaluate the effectiveness of integrated pedagogy across different proficiency levels. Ultimately, this research contributes to bridging the gap in empirical studies on integrated teaching in China and provides a practical framework to support EFL learners in developing stronger academic writing skills through reading–writing synergy.

Keywords: Integrated Reading and Writing; EFL Teaching Model; Writing Proficiency; Reading Strategies; Chinese University Students

1.Introduction

Nowadays, it is necessary for Chinese university students to have a good English language proficiency to be more competitive in the globalized world as well as to get their graduate certificate, find jobs and continue their further study. In their study, English writing skill plays a decisive role in the language learning and academic research. As EFL learners, students in Chinese universities were likely to be struggled with their English writing ability, while most of the English classes and textbooks in Chinese universities tended to be reading oriented which was concentrated on getting a high score in cloze and reading comprehension tests. Additionally, reading and writing are often taught separately in English classes in many Chinese schools, and usually, practicing writing activities are

treated as homework doing after classes (Yang and Yao 2017, p. 155).

According to the IELTS official research data in 2021, both in academic and general training, test takers whose first language is Chinese show a lower competence in writing than their receptive skills, as listening and reading. (IELTS official website, https://www.ielts.org/research/test-taker-performance) Rather, it has been widely reported that better reading skill has a positive effect on the writing performance (Grabe, 2003), the integration of English reading-writing teaching still seems to be challengeable and inexperienced at many Chinese universities. Liu et al (2019) repeatedly claim that the research on integrated English reading and writing teaching in China has not received sufficient attentions. Based on this, there might be a need of taking the research on a teaching model that focuses on the integrated reading and writing in the Chinese universities to help EFL learners raise their English literacy ability. This paper tries to find, to what extent, the integrated reading and writing in teaching would affect Chinese EFL students to improve their English writing abilities.

2.Research Questions

1.What is the effect of integrated reading and writing teaching to Chinese university students depending on their different English proficiency and majors?

2. For teachers, what are the key elements of integrated reading and writing instruction? For example, related reading materials and teaching points.

3. What are the students' beliefs on the integrated reading and writing teaching method to develop their general writing skills?

3.Literature Review

This chapter gives a brief introduction of some reading issues in the beginning. After analyzing reading skills and reading strategies, it discusses some typical approaches to reading instruction for the development of reading skills. Then, it elicits some issues on writing in EFL study. Finally, it discusses the relationships between reading and writing and gives some information of integrated reading and writing on EFL study.

3.1 The Definition of Reading

Reading as one of the most common daily activities has been described and studied by many researchers for a long time. Early research investigated reading from a more passive and receptive view. Most researchers recognized reading as decoding problems, which mainly focuses on language processing based on letters and words (Carrell, 1988). Meanwhile, the importance of background knowledge and cultural factors has been realized and has been paid increasing attention by more and more people. Rivers (1968, cited in Carrell, 1988) puts forward the argument that non-native readers are inclined in getting a better understanding of the text with the combination of language knowledge and cultural information support. Furthermore, the proposition of "psycholinguistic guessing game" and top-down approach have a bearing on the way in which people realize readers and reading. The former one appears to be more aware of linguistic system and the background knowledge other than graphic information (Samuels & Kamil, 1988) and the later one points to the involvement of readers' background knowledge (Carrell, 1988).

Nowadays, reading has been regarded as a form of an interactive communication between the writer and the reader, which means that the reader not only decodes the print but also

processes information with their background knowledge and cognitive interpretation involved (Anthony et al, 1993; Carrell, 1988; Hudson, 2007; Koda, 2005; Urquhart &Weir, 1988).

Alderson & Urquhart (1984) conducted research on reading from the aspect of text, readers and interaction of the readers and the text. It appears that reading is not a mechanic and silent linear activity. The meaning that the reader could get from the text consists of the meaning in print and the reader's understanding of the potential meaning, which is in Halliday's term (Alderson & Urquhart, 1984) and also mentioned by Wallace (1992). Various factors could influence the interpretation of the text for a reader. Alderson (2000) illustrates two components of reading. One is decoding or word recognition, the other is comprehension, which might be comprised of sentence analyzing, syntactic parsing and semantic proposition. The linguistic knowledge could be the cornerstone of L2 reading, but it is not the only factor for a complete understanding in the hierarchical reading process, because other elements such as background knowledge, reading strategies, reading purposes and social factors could have an impact on the negotiation between readers and writers (Alderson & Urquhart, 1984).

Also, Grabe (2009) agrees that the interactive character exists in the reading process when readers combine a text's potential meaning and their own understanding to have a deeper comprehension, and using various reading strategies and skills which makes the reading progress flexible.

It seems obvious that readers could read in a particular language mainly because they have acquired a certain amount of language knowledge. Grabe & Stoller (2011) point out that linguistic process is essential for reading comprehension, and in turn, the exposure to a language through reading can be beneficial for language acquisition.

On the other hand, it is worth noting that reading also can be seen as the product that focuses on the reading outcomes and the process that emphasis on cognitive activities in which readers get useful information out of the text (Alderson & Urquhart, 1984; Alderson, 2000). Having some insights into the process of reading could be supportive for realizing the nature of reading (Alderson, 2000). Grabe & Stoller (2011) indicate that the reading process synthesizes variables such as reading skills and strategies. Specifically, Grabe (2009) points out that reading could be a rapid, efficient, comprehending, interactive, strategic, flexible, purposeful, evaluative, a learning and linguistic process. He (2009) argues that a rapid and efficient reading process has requirements for reading rate and synthetic application of processing skills containing automatic lexical access, grammatical parsing, inferencing and background knowledge usage.

3.2 Reading Purpose

Reading purposes have a close relationship with reading strategies and skills because readers need to adjust their reading methods depending on their diverse reading purposes (Grabe, 2009). Wallace (1992) generalizes reading purposes briefly into reading for survival, reading for learning and reading for pleasure. Simply put, it tends to be common that reading for survival is everywhere in our life. For example, some signs that give warnings to prevent people going into radiation areas. Reading for learning might be related closely to academic situations such as learning a language or learning some scientific theory, and reading for pleasure tends to account for the reading process that is enjoyable for readers.

Reading for pleasure could happen in the extensive reading. Wallace (1992) mentions that reading for pleasure is a good way for readers to gain fluency in reading. At the same time, Grabe (2009) subdivides reading purposes into aspects such as searching for information, quick understanding, integrating information, and general comprehension.

3.3 Models of Reading

In order to understand the reading process accurately and completely (Hudson, 2007), the exploration of reading models has been developed for quite a long time (Samuels & Kamil, 1988). For example, Emile Javal's paper on eye movements was in the late of nineteenth century (Hudson, 2007). Goodman tries to figure out the macro model in the twentieth century (Samuels & Kamil, 1988). Although Grabe & Stoller (2011) have mentioned some specific models of reading, such as word recognition model and dual-coding model, many researchers prefer to focus on metaphorical models of reading that is the bottom-up, top-down and interactive models.

3.3.1 Bottom-up Model

In line with Gough's (1972, cited in Samuels & Kamil, 1988) model, bottom-up model tends to be linear fashion and data-driven that refers to the decoding of texts word by word and at the lexical level (Grabe & Stoller, 2011; Hedge, 2000; Hudson, 2007). Laberge and Samuels (1974, cited in Samuels & Kamil, 1988) declare that decoding and understanding appear frequently in the reading process and recognize the importance of automaticity. Besides, as more and more researchers realize the contribution of the readers in the reading process, top-down model has been introduced to the L2 reading (Carrell, 1988).

3.3.2 Top-down Model

The top-down processing model considers readers as active and relies on readers' background knowledge and prior experiences to reduce the independence of the text (Hudson, 2007). The top-down model of reading pays more attention to the reader's contribution and it could be useful for fluent readers to lessen the demands of the working memory and to get a deeper level of understanding (Urquhart & Weir, 1998). However, Eskey (1988) argues for limitations of top-down model from point of view of poorer readers who have difficulties in word recognition and grammatical skills.

3.3.3 Interactive Model

The interactive model seems to combine the process of bottom-up and top-down and mix literal meaning and readers' background knowledge (Hudson, 2007). In this way, it seems that reading is a communicative procedure other than a one-way flow of deciphering words or making inference (Grabe, 1988).

3.3.4 Schema Theory

In relation to background knowledge, schema theory has been provided both for reading and listening (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1988). Widdowson (1983, cited in Wallet, 1992) gives an explanation of schema or schemata, which is 'cognitive constructs which allow for the organization of information in long-term memory'. Carrell and Eisterhold (1988) divide the background knowledge into formal schemata, which refers to rhetorical and structure of the text, and content schemata, which refers to the aspect of text content. These views, models and interpretations of reading process could give language learners and teachers a broader insight to language learning and effective ways in which to teach reading.

3.4 Conceptual Building Blocks of Second Language Reading

3.4.1 Reading Skills

The study of reading skills in the first language has been widely discussed.

Some scholars use other expressions such as reading processing and ability (Hudson, 2007). Proctor and Dutta (1995, cited in Hudson, 2007) give the definition of a 'skill' explicitly by underlining its automatic characteristic, which is gained from learning and practice. The classification of reading skills is various and hierarchical. Hudson (2007) divides reading skills into word attack skills, comprehension skills, fluency skills and critical reading skills, while Rosenshine (1980, cited in Hudson, 2007) offers three types of reading skills related to comprehension skills, which are located detail, simple inferential skills and complex inferential skills. Also, Gordon (1982, cited in Hudson, 2007) lists three types of categories and gives a table of their subskills. For example, subskills as predicting outcomes and making inferences belong to one set of competency named reading comprehension development (Hudson, 2007). Specifically, Grellet (2004) gives a helpful overview of the reading sub-skills, which reflects language knowledge from aspects of word attack skill and sentence meaning processing, as well giving attention on text organization and schematic knowledge.

In order to get a better understanding of how we read in the L2 reading literature, there are generally two kinds of skills as well as reading comprehension processes: one is towards low-level processing, the other is relation to higher-level skills (Hudson, 2007; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2011). They could be necessary for readers to read efficiently and effectively, which refers to fluent reading as various reading comprehension processes take place simultaneously and automatically (Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

According to Grabe & Stoller (2011), lower-level processes include word recognition, syntactic parsing and semantic proposition formation, which are essential for fluent reading. Among them, rapid and automatic lexical access is paramount and it needs an amount of time to practice (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Pressley (2006, cited in Grabe & Stoller, 2011) points out that fluent L1 readers are able to recognize four or five words in one second. In addition, many researchers admit that word recognition ability is not only important for L1 reading but also worthwhile for L2 readers to spend time on (Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

Furthermore, it should be noted that syntactic parsing, which refers to word integration and grammatical ability, plays an important part in fluent reading (Grabe, 2009). Grabe & Stoller (2011) emphasize that grammatical analysis such as recognizing phrasal groups and being clear about the relationship between clauses is crucial for comprehending sentences and dealing with ambiguous words, although many L2 learners learn grammar before they become fluent L2 readers. Additionally, semantic proposition formation, which makes use of structural information at a clause level based on extracting word meanings, could help readers make connections with what they have read in the past (Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

Meanwhile, high-level processes refer to the integration of main ideas and supporting opinions by using reading strategies, inferencing, and combining background knowledge on the basis of reading purposes (Grabe & Stoller, 2011). Moreover, lower-level processes and higher-level processes are all related to working memory processes, which make connections between old and new information (Grabe, 2009). It is inevitable that L2 learners need to take some time to make these processes work together rapidly and automatically in order to become a more fluent reader. Besides, Harmer (2017) presents 'scan'

and 'skim' as key issues of the reading skill, which are commonly used in searching specific information and getting the gist of the text. Skimming could help learners know what the text talks about and construct a framework of the text with the main idea and supporting ideas (Grellet, 2004). Scanning can broadly be described as to finding detailed information with purposes (Harmer, 2014). These skills are highlighted because they are essential not only for L2 learning and teaching in academic areas but also for reading in the real life.

3.4.2 Reading Strategy

Apart from reading skills, which is an automatic process, reading strategies are likely to be some selected activities to reach a goal (Paris et al., 1996). In many cases, it is hard to distinguish skills and strategies clearly although many researchers attempt to make a distinction (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2011; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Reading strategies can be considered as ways to deal with problems in the reading process (Grabe, 2009; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Hudson (2007) summarizes strategies in line with pre-reading, while-reading and post-reading. In addition, Grabe (2009) illustrates two levels of strategies, which are cognitive and metacognitive. Cognitive strategy refers to practices of some reading skills that a reader takes such as making inferences, summarizing main ideas and skipping some words (Grabe, 2009), whereas these cognitive activities could be controlled and regulated at a metacognitive level, which means that metacognitive strategy refers to the awareness of planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Hudson, 2007).

3.4.3 Intensive Reading and Extensive Reading

In some ways, reading can be broadly divided into two types: intensive reading, which is inclined to take place in the classroom, and extensive reading, which tends to be an extracurricular activity (Harmer, 2017). Both Hedge (2000) and Nation (2009) give an analysis of these two kinds of reading styles.

Intensive reading usually aims to help students to achieve successful and effective reading through systematic training in reading strategies such as predicting and guessing (Hedge, 2000; Nation, 2009). Hedge (2000) states that the length and genre of texts used for intensive reading are selected in line with the teaching needs. Usually, texts for intensive reading are some extracts, which are not too long such as fiction. Learners would have a close study with these texts from aspects of cohesive devices, text organization, and genre features (Hedge, 2000). Teachers make use of concrete activities, some of which could have a clear focus on necessary language features, to help learners improve their understanding of the text's meaning while avoiding unnecessary language barrier (Nation, 2009).

Extensive reading can be a way for students to practice what they have learned from intensive reading (Hedge, 2000). Compared to intensive reading, learners have more options for texts, which means that they could develop a taste for what they prefer. Hedge (2000) lists some specific features of extensive reading including varied genre, longer text, self-selected material, regular and consistent engaging, and reading for fun. According to Krashen's input view (Krashen, 1982), extensive reading, as an effective approach to get plenty of exposure to English, can support learners to expand their vocabulary, familiarize the use of grammar, enhance reading skills, develop reading fluency and motivate themselves to read more (Hedge, 2000).

3.4.4 First Language Reading and Second Language Reading

Relationships

It should be noted that L2 reading has a close relationship with L1 reading. Grabe (2009) states that L2 reading as a dual-language processing is influenced by L1 transfer to some degree, which can be facilitating or interfering. Some studies advocate for the important role of L1 transfer. Jolly (1978, cited in Alderson, 1984) and Coady (1979, cited in Alderson, 1984) assert that reading skills used in the L2 reading are learned from L1 reading. However, Yorio (1971, cited in Alderson, 1984) argues that L2 reading problems might be caused by L1 interference and deficiency in the target language knowledge.

Grabe & Stoller (2011) sum up three main differences in L1 reading and L2 reading with aspects of linguistic factors, ways of information processing, goals, motivations, texts, and various social cultures. To be specific, the language orthography for Chinese characters is mainly based on syllabic units of speech, which will make first language Chinese readers depend more on visual-processing in reading than English native readers (Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

The situation of L2 reading tends to be not exactly the same as L1 reading. Usually, L2 readers begin to read in another language when they have acquired some language knowledge unlike native speakers who start to read after they have spent plenty of time in using their mother tongue (Grabe, 2009). Hence, Grabe & Stoller (2011) finally conclude that it could be unreasonable to apply L1 reading methods directly to L2 reading instruction.

3.4.5 The Importance of Language knowledge

With regard to L2 reading, many researchers propose the importance of language knowledge as vocabulary, grammar and discourse, although there is controversy about whether language threshold is more important or the reading ability itself (Alderson, 1984; Eskey, 1988; Grabe, 2009; Koda, 2005). Grabe & Stoller (2011) state that language threshold hypothesis requires readers to acquire a certain amount of language knowledge before dealing with the L2 text. Alderson (2000) puts forward the argument that the language threshold hypothesis can be the prerequisite of transfer of L1 reading ability. Alderson (1984) illustrates the correlation between the language proficiency demand and the level of difficulty in texts. In addition, readers are more likely to rely on their L1 reading skills and strategies if they have less language knowledge according to the parallel processing theory (Alderson, 1984). Therefore, it is worthwhile for teachers to balance language knowledge teaching and other teaching content when panning reading lessons.

3.5 Some Principles for English Reading Instruction

Nuttall (2005) argues that there is no formula or fixed procedures for teaching reading. In general, she (2005) introduces some flexible approaches in the English classroom, which are skills-based and text-based. Grabe & Stoller (2011) list nine curricular principles for teaching of English reading. These curricular principles center on helping students to build their reading abilities rather than only mechanically interpreting text.

Teachers usually have their own thoughts on deciding the foci of a class and what kind of activities they might choose to use. In some areas, English reading teaching seems to be viewed as doing comprehensive exercises and correcting answers or grammar and translation training (Macalister, 2011), however, Williams (1986) states that the integration of various skills and knowledge in the reading teaching is one of his 'top ten' principles. Meanwhile,

Nation (2009) and Macalister (2011) agree with the opinion that reading classes should pay attention to transferable skills instead of understanding the meaning of the text, at the same time, it is better for teachers to balance language knowledge, schematic knowledge and reading skills in various reading stages.

3.6 Typical Approaches to English Reading Instruction

Generally, reading classes can be considered as three stages, which are pre-reading, while-reading and post-reading. It could be clear to investigate teaching of English reading through activities that are arranged in each stage (Wallace, 1992).

Pre-reading tends to be a brainstorm that prepares readers before reading the text (Wallace, 1992). Thus, teachers could use different strategies in classes to give developing readers some support. For example, teachers could explain the context and revise some related words in the pre-reading stage (Carrell, 1988). Based on Pearson and Fielding's generative learning, Urquhart & Weir (1998) put forward two strategies in the pre-reading stage, which are previewing and prediction. Currently, the teaching implication of schema theory tends to be more important in the pre-reading stage because it takes effect on activating appropriate background knowledge for readers to interpret the text precisely (Hedge, 2000).

After inviting learners to the text and finishing the schematic preparation, activities as jigsaw reading in the while-reading stage attempt to facilitate readers to be more active as they read (Wallace, 1992). Hedge (2000) states that activities such as making notes makes the reading process more interactive.

Post-reading could not only provide learners with answers for comprehension questions, but also give readers spaces to improve their language proficiency through organizing activities such as creating word banks and finding connecting words (Hedge, 2000). Nuttall (2005) proposes that activities in this stage could be combined with writing or speaking.

3.7 Some Issues of Writing in EFL Study

Unlike other skills in the second language teaching, writing develops relatively late. According to the previous study, writing has not been taken into account as an independent skill and it has been recognized a part of speaking for a while (Matsuda, 2003). Nevertheless, writing in the second language has a wide application and is needed significantly in the daily communication and academic areas.

Contrary to reading, writing not only means the written texts, but also represents the way of expression as same as speaking and signing by encoding the information (Matsuda & Silva 2019). It provides convenience for people to record and transfer their known information or thoughts into written form. Apart from this, the language ability could be reflected by the writing proficiency in some degree. Matsuda & Silva (2019) interpret writing from several aspects with the consideration of its process and its included elements, the reader, the text and the reality (Silva, 1990, cited in Matsuda & Silva, 2019). Accordingly, they analyze writing from relational aspect, strategic aspect and textual aspect (Matsuda & Silva, 2019). The relational aspect of writing focuses on the rhetorical situation, writers' discursive identity, reader and reality (Matsuda & Silva, 2019).

In accordance with the renewed understanding of writing, writing teaching has received more attention by learners as a necessary second language skill to communicate rather than to

practice grammatical accuracy (Reid, 2001). At the same time, the teaching of writing has developed from fully controlled to guide in some degree (Reid, 2001). The pedagogy becomes to be aware of the complex process of writing instead of only chasing the writing product (Reid, 2001).

The focus of writing research developed from product to process in 1970s, according to Mastuda (2003). The change of opinions on writing research may influence the teaching and learning methods of writing, which makes learners have more accesses to improve their writing proficiency. As Hirvela et al. (2016) view L2 writing theory as learning-to-write, writing-to-learn-content, and writing-to-learn-language, on the basis of purposes and contents of learning and teaching L2 writing.

3.8 Relationships between Reading and Writing

Usually, as a kind of silent way to communicate and learn, reading and writing are connected and have some similarities, or they have been recognized as ally. Samway (2006) summarizes some similarities of reading and writing sharing in the way of information process. Before accessing to a piece of meaningful work, there might be prediction and imagination before reading and writing as prereading and prewriting, as well, the way to construct meaning as revising, using schemata, and considering linguistic knowledge, are all common to reading and writing (Samway, 2006). Through these various processes, it can be seen that meaning-making is a vital and crucial element. From the several paralleled processes between reading and writing that Ferris & Hedgcock (2014) provided can see the recursive features of reading and writing. Not only composing is rather a recursive process than a linear one, but also reading (Samway, 2006).

Although there are many similarities between reading and writing, differences exist as present by Samway (2006) with an explicit illustration. For examples, readers can read without writing, while writers need to be exposed to reading. And maybe this is one of the reasons leading to more attention which has paid on reading practices. Besides, feedbacks on writing are not always instant and in time. Additionally, reading and writing may have different influences on people's thinking. To children, Samway (2006) comes up with several emphases that reading and writing have on children's thinking, relating to activity purpose, cognitive behavior, and possible problems. For example, in a same class, the purpose of reading and writing can be irrelevant. Teachers may use reading as background knowledge construction and use writing to practice linguistic knowledge.

3.9 Integrated Teaching of Reading and Writing in EFL Study

As essential elements of literal proficiency, reading and writing play a high value in foreign language learning and teaching. After teaching of writing had received increasing attention, the relationship of reading and writing has been noticed soon, considering they have some similarities belonging to the literal system. The research of reading and writing relationship in L1 contexts has got started from 1980s, which provokes researchers to explore reading and writing relationship in L2 contexts (Grabe 2003, p.249).

To figure out the interplay of reading and writing in foreign language learning, Shanahan & Lomax (1986) summarize three theoretical models which are reading-to-writing model, writing-to-reading model and interactive model, which indicates that the better comprehension of reading and writing relationship could provide more benefits

to the instructional theory and practice. Meanwhile, Ferris & Hedgcock (2014) illustrate some L2 composition instructions with integrated methodologies, reading to write, writing to read, and writing to learn.

Grabe (2003) demonstrates the reading and writing relations in L1 and L2 research separately, even though, a correlation between the reading proficiency and fluent writing has been identified in both L1 and L2 contexts.

Although it is easy to understand that integrated reading and writing teaching would take positive effect on improving English learners' writing skill, there is insufficient empirical research explored the specific instructional application and proved its corresponding outcome. Liu et al (2019) points out that there is limited practical research on reading and writing teaching in the FL context, especially in China. They (2019) do a survey of 82 English language learners whose age are between 25 to 46 in a test preparation program, which has been divided into beginning and intermediate level. Their (2019) research shows that the positive correlation exits between reading comprehension and descriptive writing in spite of the English language ability that learners have. It has been declared that reading comprehension contributes to persuasive writing performance for the beginning level, rather, has a slightly adverse effect for the intermediate level in their persuasive writing performance. According to Liu et al (2019), the inadequate sample and the ambiguous description of two different English levels could be improved in the future research.

4.Research Design and Methodology

I pretend to find around 6 voluntary teachers and 600 students in two or three Chinese universities. Firstly, all the students need to take a test to measure their English writing proficiency, because students with different language ability probably will influence their learning outcomes. Cho & Brutt-Griffler (2015) state that, in some degree, the effect of the integrated reading and writing instruction are various based on students at diverse proficiency groups. The test could be as same as IELTS task two and the assessment norms would be given on the basis of IELTS writing criteria. Correspondingly, the students could be divided into four levels on the basis of their test score in line with the CEFR proficiency scale. In order to have a clear understand of students' weaknesses of their writing ability, a specific analysis is necessary to make instant adjustment for the following instruction. For example, if it is shown that most of the students make a grammatical mistake, the grammar knowledge should be highlighted in the teaching process.

Next step I choose to use questionnaire for students and interview teachers to get information about their opinions of the current English classes and their beliefs as well as suggestions for ways to improve English writing ability. Then I would like to have discussions with teachers to decide the essential teaching points. In order to ensuring the quality of questionnaire and interview, the pilot study should be taken at first. Half of the teachers are responsible for integrated reading and writing teaching, on the contrary, others instruct writing mainly on a traditional way such as only practice writing itself. As well, students are divided into 8 groups including controlled groups, which are A1, A2, B1, B2, a1, a2, b1 and b2. Tests will be taken twice in total. One is in the midterm to make some adjustments in time and the other is in the final providing the effectiveness of learning. During this process, the class

observation should be arranged.

After the final test, I need to collect teachers' reflection of this teaching model by interview, which might contribute on the development of integrated reading and writing teaching in L2 contexts.

This paper will adopt quantitative and qualitative method to collect data. I would like to use questionnaire to have a general understanding of participants' opinions on English language learning and teaching. To have a specific comprehension of their beliefs, interview or audio record is necessary to keep notes of the communication and discussion process. Besides, a certain amount of class observation is needed to collect some specific items of the teaching model. As for the appropriate means to evaluate learners' English language proficiency and assess

classroom, there might be some tests. To get a rational analysis, it seems that SPSS can be considered.

5.Conclusion

The study is trying to help EFL learners who study at Chinese universities to improve their literary competence, by developing a teaching model with integrated reading and writing instruction. It gives an explanation of some reading theories from aspects of definition to practical skills, as well as some writing research, which can be helpful in the teaching application. As reading teaching is the mainstream of English lessons in some Chinese universities, this study of integrated reading and writing teaching should contribute to a more comprehensive and multi-facet English language teaching.

Reference

Alderson, C. J. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge University Press.

Alderson, J. C., (1984). Reading in a Foreign Language: A Reading Problem or A Language Problem? In Alderson, & Urquhart, A. H. (Eds). *Reading in a foreign language*. Longman.

Alderson, & Urquhart, A. H. (1984). *Reading in a foreign language*. Longman.

Anthony, H. M., Pearson, P. D. & Raphael T. E. (1993). In Cleary, L. M. & Linn, M.D. (Eds). *Linguistics for Teachers*. London : McGraw-Hill.

Carrell, Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E. (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge University Press.

Eskey, D. E. (1988). Holding in the Bottom: An Interactive Approach to the Language Problems of Second Language Readers. In Carrell, P. L., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E., (Eds). *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. L. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Harlow: Pearson.

Grellet, F. (2004). *Developing Reading Skills: A Practical Guide to Reading Comprehension exercises*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, J. (2014). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Person Longman.

Harmer, J. (2017). *How to teach English: an introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Person Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirvela, A., Hyland, K., & Manchón. R. M. (2016). Dimensions in L2 writing theory and research: Learning to write and writing to learn. In Manchón, & Matsuda, P.K. (Eds). *Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing*. De Gruyter (pp. 45-63).

Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching Second Language Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huan Liu, Cindy Brantmeier, & Michael Strube. (2019). EFL test preparation in China: The multidimensionality of the reading-writing relationship. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *31*(1), 44–61.

Hyonsuk Cho, & Janina Brutt-Griffler. (2015). Integrated reading and writing: A case of Korean English language learners. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *27*(2), 242–261.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford:Pergamon.

Koda, K. (2005). *Insights to Second Language Reading: A Cross-Linguistic Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge.

Macalister, J. (2011). Today's teaching, tomorrow's text: exploring the teaching of reading. *ELT Journal*, *65*(2), 161–169. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq023

Matsuda, P.K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In Kroll, B. *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge University Press (pp. 15-34).

Matsuda, P. K. & Silva, T. (2020). Writing. In Schmitt, N. & Rodgers, M. P. H. (Eds). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics (3ʳᵈ ed.)*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge.

Nuttall, C. (2005). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A. & Turner, J. C. (1996). The Development of Strategic Readers.*Handbook of reading research*, 2, 609-640.

Reid, J. (2001). Writing. In Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (Eds). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Samuels, S. J. & Kamil, M. L. (1988). Models of the Reading Process. In Carrell, P. L.,Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E. (Eds). *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Samway, K. D. (2006). *When English language learners write: connecting research to practice, K-8*. Heinemann.

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.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Williams, M.J. (1989). A Developmental View of Classroom Observations. *English
 Language Teaching Journal*, *43*(2), 85-91.