

Reading-Writing Habits and Argumentative Writing

Kwak, Su-beom Kookmin University
College of General Education
Assistant Professor

I. Introduction	
II. Reading-Writing Connection and Argumentative Writing	
III. Method	
IV. Finding and Significance	
V. Discussion and Limitations	
VI. Conclusion	

I. Introduction

“Reading and writing a lot” has been considered the fastest and most appropriate and logical means for improving writing skills as Stephen King (2010) gave the same advice to aspiring writers. Ouyang Xiu (1007–1072), a celebrated Chinese writer during the Song dynasty, emphasized the importance of extensive reading and writing. In western and eastern countries, contemporary books on writing skills and habits also stress on this principle (e.g., Goodson, 2016; Hayot, 2014; Silvia, 2018). The belief that reading and writing any type of text can improve writing ability is widely accepted and even repeatedly cited in newspapers (e.g., Parini, 1989; Schaffhauser, 2020). Such social conventions are partially correct, but I remain concerned to a certain extent about other aspects such as individual preference, habits, and types of written texts. The brief idiomatic phrase “reading and writing a lot” leads to a substantial wiggle room. In other words, the phrase can be interpreted or adapted in a different manner. Enjoying reading and writing outside of schools should be encouraged and praised. However, the question of whether both habits are related practically to argumentation ability is a topic that warrants attention.

Thus, the study aims to determine the correlation between daily

reading and writing habits and their influence on argumentative writing. Enjoying and forming a positive attitude toward reading and writing outside of schools through daily experience and out-of-school contexts are undeniably desirable phenomena. As such, support and feedback should be provided to cultivate lifetime readers and writers. Nevertheless, the study views this notion from a different perspective to determine the extent to which the vague promises of daily reading and writing for improving writing abilities correspond to reality, and how such reality differs if various aspects, such as public perception, are considered. Furthermore, the study investigates the relationship between daily reading and writing habits and argumentative writing skills to verify the abovementioned argument despite the obvious answer. The study assumes that speculating that reading and writing habits are proportional to argumentative ability is a natural tendency and perhaps an inference consistent with the above argument, which many scholars have implicitly agreed on as fact for a long time.

The study focuses on argumentative writing, which is a type of text that demonstrates one's ability to construct personal views in a logical manner by analyzing and evaluating various materials. Moreover, argumentative writing pursues the rationality of comprehensively understanding multiple conflicting perspectives. It can, therefore, clearly reveal the recursive process, which is the essence of writing.

II. Reading-Writing Connection and Argumentative Writing

One of aims of literacy education is the integration of reading and writing instructions (Hirvela, 2016). A conventional assumption applies that reading and writing should be integrated theoretically and empirically. Many educators agree that the two areas are not individual components; historically, however, they were predominantly divorced in English language arts classrooms in the United States (Nel-

son & Calfee, 1998). To address this issue, previous studies discussed several methods for integrating reading and writing instructions (e.g., Graham & Harris, 2017), whereas scholars endeavored to investigate the relationship between reading and writing theoretically (Shanahan, 2016; Swanson & Berninger, 1996) and their mutual influences (Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000). The abundant and consistent discussion among scholars regarding teaching methods for integrated reading and writing demonstrates that integrated instruction lacks practice or is realistically difficult to practice in the classroom setting. Conflicting theoretical perspectives surrounding reading and writing can also be evidenced by the many parts whose relationships lack elucidation.

Reading and writing are closely connected each other. Discussions on the relationship between the two areas in the field of literacy education are ongoing since the 1980s (Hirvela, 2016). Other scholars view reading and writing separately. However, recent research indicates the increasingly natural connection between reading and writing (Bloome, 1993; Gee, 2001). Stotsky (1983) is the first study to conduct a meta-analysis to examine the relationship between reading and writing. Stotsky addresses the transition between reading and writing concepts and an extended layer, which reveals a continuous link between reading and writing skills. The study is the starting point for subsequent research on reading–writing connections (Horning & Kraemer, 2013; Tierney, 1992).

The study illustrates the relationship between reading and writing from the cognitive, functional, and rhetorical perspectives. From the cognitive perspective, reading and writing display differences but rely on similar cognitive abilities based on memory, meaning, words, and sentences (Shanahan, 2016). For instance, learners are relying on prior knowledge while writing in the same manner that meta-knowledge is playing a role in understanding an author's intended meaning while reading texts (Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000). Second, many studies propose that although reading and writing could be viewed as independent, individual skills, they should be viewed collectively to solve

problems. This functional view is the basis for the argument that reading and writing should be taught in an integrated manner for effective learning. Furthermore, it is the foundation of cross-curricular writing instruction, which aims to promote understanding of content subject knowledge (Graham & Harris, 2017). Finally, reading and writing display rhetorical proximity in terms of sharing a space for the mutual exchange of opinions to achieve the objective of sharing thoughts and communication (Fitzgerald & Shanahan; 2000; Rubin, 1984).

The abovementioned studies on reading–writing connections suggest an association between reading and writing abilities. Regardless, the current study interprets the findings on the impact of reading on writing and vice versa as provisional. The reason for this notion is that recent studies on reading–writing connections, especially those in the field of reading, primarily adopt cognitive and combined models, thus relatively overlooking the sociocognitive model (Shanahan, 2016). A vast majority of studies on reading–writing connections heavily relies on the results of timed reading tests or prioritizes reading over writing (Shanahan, 2016). Moreover, the variables used in much published research on reading–writing connections are problematic in certain aspects. For example, scores for spelling or vocabulary measurement are frequently interpreted as writing competences. In terms of the impact of writing on reading, studies that explore how interventions for writing can sharpen reading performance are few (Graham & Harris, 2017). To date, research on the effects of the reading abilities of students on writing performance is abundant, whereas a search of the literature reveals that reading–writing connections remain understudied. Several published data on this issue are collected through short-term observations or from a small sample size. Meanwhile, others are relatively passé. Accordingly, a definitive conclusion on reading–writing connections awaits sophisticated enquiries.

In summary, previous studies relatively and actively discuss the theoretical and methodological integration of reading and writing. However, empirical studies on the correlation between the two lack

depth, especially in terms of the diverse factors influencing reading and writing abilities. Therefore, the current study poses the following research questions.

1. Does a correlation exist between the daily reading and writing habits of learners?
2. Does a significant relationship exist between reading and writing habits and two argumentative writing skills, namely, simple argumentative writing and source-based argumentative writing?
3. Should the effects of reading and writing habits on performance in the two types of argumentative writing tasks or the correlation between them be measured at the same level?

III. Method

1. Context of the investigation

This study is part of a large-scale two-year project that aims to evaluate and develop a curricular intervention that fosters students' deep, integrated understanding of writing as a complex cognitive process embedded in a social context (Barton & Papen, 2010; Newell et al., 2015). The study recruited participants from a private high school in Seoul, South Korea, with a reputation for academic excellence and for implementing various after-school programs across a range of content areas. The participants provided informed consent after a briefing of the purpose and ethics of the research. However, three student participants were unable to complete the study because of a one-day absence during writing tests.

2. Data sources and analyses

Quantitative and qualitative data were selected, collected, and an-

alyzed using sequential explanatory mixed methods design (Bowen et al., 2017; Creswell & Clark, 2018) to understand the complexity of reading and writing practices that students experience in and out of school contexts.

The early writing skills of the participants were measured using the Test of Argumentative Writing (TAW) (Newell et al., 2015), which is a respected, tested, and norm-referenced assessment tool with established validity and reliability for measuring argumentative writing abilities at the high school level. To more fully capture student writing abilities, the TAW is grounded in present research on argumentative writing abilities that are subdivided into two subsets: simple writing and source-based argumentative writing. Student argumentative writing abilities were measured through four different writing tasks: two simple and two source-based writing tasks. The completed texts were scored using a six-point scale on a rubric of seven compositional items, such as appropriate use of evidence and claims. The writing tasks were as follows:

[Simple writing task 1] Discuss whether a competitive atmosphere is conducive for studying or working.

[Simple writing task 2] Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of co-educational and single-sex schools.

[Source-based writing task 1] Explain the point of both [A] and [B] respectively in relation to [C] and criticize an opposing opinion from your perspective among the arguments for and against as reflected in [C].

[Source-based writing task 2] Text (A) presents the argument that the application of scientific research results must be controlled, whereas text (B) contends that people should continue to develop new knowledge without fearing its consequences. On the

basis of these positions, answer the following questions. (1) Develop the points of the two texts and, if you link them together, reconstitute what answers are possible about whether scientists should be socially responsible for the negative consequences of their research. (2) Examining the validity of your reconstituted answer, and state your opinion on whether scientific research should undergo social or legal regulations or control processes.

The broad corpus of data used in the study comprised classroom observations taken during the school year together with field notes, teacher debriefings, student interviews, student work, and related documents. To make the corpus of data manageable, several episodes of instructional conversations and interviews representative of key moments were selected (Mitchell, 1984).

Two scorers who performed a comprehensive evaluation based on TAW (Newell et al., 2015) were high school Korean language arts teachers who had respectively six and ten years of teaching experience. The total score per student participant was calculated by summing two scores from the scorers. Student texts with different scores of over five points between the two scorers were scored once more and adjusted by discussing the scoring criteria (Johnson et al., 2001). The discussion to coordinate adaptation and interpret rubrics was based on Toulmin's (1958/2003) argumentation model and Gallagher's (2006) scoring criteria.

IV. Finding and Significance

During the first lesson on argumentative writing, students were asked to reflect on their past reading and writing experiences, and based on this prior experience, write down the relationship between the two. The teacher then proposed that students share their experiences with classmates. After a brief sharing period wherein the stu-

dents described their experiences, the teachers asked students to express their views regarding reading and writing. The instructional conversation below was originally communicated in Korean and was later translated into English by a field researcher.

Teacher: Do you see any connections between reading and writing?

What was your experience learning about these subjects?

Student 1: Both were taught separately. What connections?

Students: (laughter)

Student 2: They seemed connected... in some ways, but I have no idea.

Student 3: Well, they would have a positive influence on one another.

Better readers should be better writers vice versa.

Teacher: Sure. How and why, then, are they connected?

Student 1: Reading is just reading. (quietly)

Teacher: Yes, reading is just reading sometimes. Does everyone agree with her? How about we consider the connection between reading and argumentation and argumentative writing? What do you guys think?

Student 2: I think some of the ideas and logic are used in both, and better readers are likely to become better writers because reading a lot makes people more familiar with expressions, like sentences and paragraphs.

Teacher: Okay. So you mean to say that spending time reading books and writing would lead to a better understanding of sentences, paragraphs, and ideas.

In this segment of instructional conversation, the teacher and students focus on two issues: (1) whether reading and writing are connected; and (2) how and what aspects of reading and writing could influence on argumentation and argumentative writing. This illustrates certain conceptual ideas students had regarding reading and writing, as well as their ideas about argumentative writing. The conversations regarding prior learning experiences and concepts helped students to share their feelings and views toward the relationship between read-

ing and writing, as well as how daily reading and writing could make an impact on argumentative writing. Although the teacher did not speak this point out loud explicitly, the instructional conversation implies the underlying assumption that daily reading and writing would affect argumentative writing abilities.

In this section, aside from participants' understanding and concepts about reading and writing and their influence on argumentative writing, the results of argumentative writing tasks and daily reading and writing habits were illustrated in response to the first research question. Equivalent form reliability was verified for the results obtained from performing four writing tasks. First, following a Pearson's correlation analysis of simple argumentative writing tasks 1 and 2, simple writing task 1 scores revealed a significant positive correlation with simple writing task 2 ($r = .533, p < .001$). The source-based argumentative writing tasks 1 and 2 scores also exhibited a significant positive correlation ($r = .478, p < .001$). Finally, cross validating the two simple and two source-based argumentative writing tasks confirmed that simple argumentative writing task 1 was statistically significantly positive correlated to the source-based argumentative writing tasks 1 ($r = .864, p < .001$) and 2 ($r = .438, p < .001$). Likewise, simple argumentative writing task 2 also revealed significantly positively correlated to source-based argumentative writing tasks 1 ($r = .499, p < .001$) and 2 ($r = .834, p < .001$). These test results can be interpreted as relatively stable, suitably reliable, considering they are more likely to result in being less reliable than the other reliability tests. This is because the equivalent form reliability test usually includes the errors caught by the test-retest and caused by the item design.

Table 1. Correlation analysis between writing tasks

Variable	1	2	3	4
Simple 1	1			
Simple 2	.533***	1		

Source-based 1	.864***	.499***	1	
Source-based 2	.438***	.834***	.478***	1

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Subsequently, it was verified whether understanding the level of writing ability by averaging or summing each writing result was acceptable. In the reliability statistics results, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .828, which demonstrated that the reliability of the writing ability evaluation tool was excellent because of high internal consistency.

1. Reading and writing habits

Daily reading and writing habits, including the text types and frequency of reading and writing outside of school contexts, were measured through questionnaires. Some of the questionnaire items are displayed in Figure 1. The whole questionnaire, which comprises 15 pages, was adapted from the survey instrument that was originally developed, tested, and verified by Newell et al. (2015). Pearson's correlation analysis was conducted using the collected data to determine the correlation between daily reading and writing habits outside of school contexts and answer the first question of this study. The finding of this analysis demonstrates that reading habits show a statistically significant positive correlation with writing habits ($r = .411, p < .001$). Concerning the significance level, the r value has a variance of 16.8%, indicating that reading and writing habits outside of school are moderately positively correlated.

What types of writing do you do outside school for personal purposes? (Please mark all that apply.)

☐ Email
☐ Diary/journal/personal blog
☐ Twitter/Facebook/Instagram
☐ Texting
☐ Other type(s) (Please write in):

☐ Poem
☐ Story
☐ Report
☐ Argument/Critique
☐ Don't do any writing

What do you read outside school for personal purposes? (Please check all that apply.)

☐ Novels
☐ Personal blogs
☐ News
☐ Commentaries
☐ Don't do any reading
☐ Other type(s) (please write in):

☐ Magazines
☐ Journals
☐ Comic books
☐ Graphic novels

Figure 1. Daily reading and writing habits questionnaire

2. Reading-writing habits and writing abilities

Pearson's correlation analysis was conducted to see how reading and writing habits outside of school correlate with argumentative writing ability. The results are shown below in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation between reading-writing habits and argumentative writing skills

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
Reading habit	1					
Writing habit	.411***	1				
Simple task 1	-.042	.201**	1			
Simple task 2	.101	.161*	.533***	1		
Source-based task 1	-.095	.150*	.864***	.499***	1	
Source-based task 2	.023	.100	.438***	.834***	.478***	1

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The second question of this study examined whether there is a meaningful relationship between reading-writing habits outside of school and argumentative writing ability. Looking at the results of the correlation, writing habits outside of school do not show any significant correlation with writing performance regardless of the types of writing tasks, except for reading habits ($r = .411, p < .001$). On the other hand, reading habits showed a significant positive correlation with simple argumentative writing task 1 ($r = .201, p < .01$), the simple argumentative writing task 2 ($r = .161, p < .05$), and the first source-based argumentative writing task ($r = .150, p < .05$). There is no significant correlation between reading habits and the second source-based argumentative writing task.

Next, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to verify the influence of reading and writing habits outside of school on argumentative writing ability. The number of participants in this paper satisfies the recommended requirements set out by Tabachnick and Fidell's (2019) method for calculating sample sizes for generalization of multiple regression model results. As the last question of this study explores the differing influences of reading and writing habits according to the type of argumentative writing task, multiple regression analysis was used, dividing the analysis according to the dependent variables of simple argumentative writing and source-based argumentative writing (Refer to Table 3 and 4 below).

Table 3. The influence of reading-writing habits on simple argumentative writing ability

Dependent variable	Independent variable	B	S.E.	β	t	p	VIF
Simple Argumentative Writing	(Constant)	4.344	.532		8.160***	< .001	
	Writing	.051	.085	.042	.598	.551	1.203
	Reading	.131	.064	.144	2.049*	.042	1.203

$F = 3.346 (p < .05), R^2 = .027, \text{adj}R^2 = .019, D-W = 1.267$

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to verify the effect of out-of-school reading and writing habits on argumentative writing, especially simple argumentative writing task performance. The regression model was statistically significant ($F = 3.346$, $p < .05$), and the explanatory power of the regression model was approximately 2.7% (adjusted R squared 1.9%) ($R^2 = .027$, $_{adj}R^2 = .019$). The Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.267, and it was evaluated that there was no problem of violation in the assumption of independence of the residuals. The tolerance was .831 and the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were all less than 10. As such, it can be judged that there was no multicollinearity problem. Following the verification of the regression coefficient significance, it was found that daily reading habits outside of school ($\beta = .144$, $p = .042$) had a significant positive effect on simple argumentative writing performance, but daily writing habits outside of school ($\beta = .042$, $p = .551$) did not appear to be statistically significantly related.

Table 4. The influence of reading-writing habits on source-based argumentative writing ability

Dependent variable	Independent variable	B	S.E.	β	t	p	VIF
Source-Based Argumentative Writing	(Constant)	6.745	.959		7.034***	< .001	
	Writing	-.047	.154	-.022	-.308	.758	1.203
	Reading	.176	.115	.109	1.532	.127	1.203

$F = 1.236$ ($p = .292$), $R^2 = .010$, $_{adj}R^2 = .002$, D-W = 1.253

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to verify the effect of daily reading and writing habits outside of school contexts on the ability to perform source-based argumentative writing tasks. As a result, it is possible to interpret that the explanatory power of the regression model is insufficient because the variance of the dependent variable by groups in the ANOVA of this regression model is not large

enough to produce significant results ($F = 1.236$, $p = .292$). In other words, reading and writing habits outside of school are less accurate in estimating data presentation-type argumentative writing performance, which means that daily reading and writing habits hardly affect argumentative writing skills.

V. Discussion and Limitations

In this paper, I examined the correlation between reading and writing habits outside of school, and considering this correlation, I tried to investigate the influence of daily reading-writing habits on argumentative writing ability and relationship between them. The argumentative writing task was divided into a simple and a source-based argumentative writing task. The equivalent form reliability was verified in order for disciplined calculation of the writing ability indicators.

1. Extensive reading and writing outside the school: A weak relationship

The result of correlation and regression analyses confirmed that reading and writing habits outside the school context were strongly correlated. It can be interpreted that learners who enjoy reading in their daily lives generally write a lot. What does a statistically verified correlation mean? Certainly, there is a correlation between writing and reading habits outside of school contexts. In other words, likewise, learners who enjoy writing outside of school are more likely to enjoy reading. To put it the other way, learners who enjoy reading outside of school are more likely to enjoy writing. However, it is inappropriate to infer causality from the results of the correlation analysis between reading and writing habits conducted in this study.

I was interested in whether reading and writing habits outside of school had the same effect on the ability to perform two different types of tasks, namely, simple argumentative writing and source-based argumentative writing task which is a more complicated writing task requiring students to analyze multiple reading materials. Correlation and multiple regression analysis were carried out to grasp the relations and effects among reading-writing habits outside of school and argumentative writing abilities. The analysis results indicate that daily writing habits did not show statistically significant correlations with the two types of argumentative writing task performance, but reading habits had an effect on simple argumentative writing task performance. This result suggests that writing habits outside of school had little or no effect on the ability to perform argumentative writing tasks regardless of the type, and on the contrary, reading habits outside of school had a certain effect on simple argumentative writing task among the two types. However, considering the explanatory power of the regression model, approximately 2.7% and the adjusted R squared is 1.9%, further studies using larger randomized controlled research design could provide more definitive evidence. This is because the explanatory power of the same size seen in the regression model for explaining large-scale economic indicators is generally considered to be very ample reliability, but discussions on the magnitude of explanatory power in the fields of reading and writing research have not yet been elaborated.

2. Best practice for teaching argumentative writing

Reading and writing habits outside of school had no influence on the ability to perform the source-based argumentative writing task in the results of multiple regression analysis. These results must be interpreted with caution because it is not insisted that daily reading and writing habits outside school are meaningless. It can be judged that the effect on the writing ability to form the only one type of writing—

an argumentative writing—among the various types of writing such as narrative, persuasive, descriptive, expository, is imperceptible. Argumentative writing could also be divided into several types of writing tasks and contexts including a research paper. In this study, we focused on impromptu argumentative writing in the form of recalling reasons and evidence within a limited time of about 30 minutes and source-based argumentative writing requiring analyzing given data and expressing one's opinion regarding them. This is also the reason why it should not be jumped to hasty conclusions, on the basis of the results of this paper's investigation, about the influence of reading and writing habits outside of school on other types of argumentative writing ability or other types of texts.

This finding has important implications that reading-writing habits outside of school do not have much impact on the performance of argumentative writing tasks, if conscious writing practice is not supported. This outcome is contrary to the tacit, pervasive assumption that the more books you read, the better you will naturally write, or extensive reading will be a key not only to essay writing tests but also personal difficulties in their lives. If this is the case, so, is it pointless to form the habit of writing and reading outside of school? Of course not. In addition to reading and writing for literacy assessment, cultivating reading and writing habits is a pathway that make people know how to interact with texts and enjoy writing in everyday life, which furthermore lead them to lifelong readers and writers, and this ultimately is one of the goals of literacy education.

An issue that emerges from the findings is that areas for improvement will persist and will not be remedied by simple repetition, as evidenced by hobbies or activities in other areas. Take a game of tennis with a friend, for example. If one were to take a small spin and hit the ball toward the left side of the friend at chest level, then the friend will experience difficulty in hitting the ball properly. The friend would be aware of this phenomenon, whether such a thought is expressed verbally or not. However, it is not an occupational problem and it

rarely occurs. As a consequence, consciously exerting effort to solve the problem or devising a plan to cope with it may be unnecessary.

Such problems tend to display similar patterns in any technology or situation. Students learn basic concepts through the instructors' guidance or books, and practice the acquired knowledge individually. Although their abilities reach certain levels over time, the majority undergo a stagnant phase. At this point, many people believe that taking a lot of practice will lead to improvement. Public awareness of this perception was reinforced by prior research on the thesis that a certain amount of practice should be accumulated until a threshold is exceeded (Ericsson, 2009; Shenk, 2010).

Notably, the opposite is true. Following the abovementioned logic, a doctor, a teacher, or a driver with 15 years of experience is expected to display more professionalism, greater expertise in teaching, or better driving skills, respectively, than those with three years of experience. However, many cases demonstrate that people with more than 20 years of experience exhibit performance skills similar to those with less years of experience in the same field. Others may even show a decline in proficiency (Ericsson, 2014). The reason underlying this notion is that the ability to achieve certain levels through practice ceases or regresses with simple repetition.

Thus, the study emphasizes the importance of education on systematic writing and the role of teachers in designing instructional plans and conducting lessons in writing. Brief writing activities conducted three to four times per week is sufficient for basic learning objectives, such as forming a good habit of writing a diary, writing simple emails, and breaking down psychological barriers that lead to writer's block. However, the current study proposes that argumentative writing, which includes analyses of various data, evaluation of resources, and enhancement of one's logic through the synthesis of various perspectives, can be improved only through the process of practicing "differently" rather than "more" (Newell et al., 2015). For example, a teacher should set clear learning goals, divide them into

multiple stages, and design a detailed plan for each stage. What are the elements that constitute a compelling argument? Using reliable evidence to reinforce the argument is crucial. This goal is relatively specific but requires classification into a series of steps and stages. How can one identify reliable evidence among multiple sources? Teachers should determine how learners frequently search for evidence and link the findings to claims and warrants.

Lastly, teachers should provide feedback. Usually, in any field, we need feedback help us realize exactly where we need to pay more attention and our weakness. Such feedback should be detailed enough to deliberately provide additional assignment for the next step, instead of just pointing out defects or providing scores. Additional assignments should also be a little beyond the student's current ability (Byrnes & Wasik, 2019). Whether they discover their own mistakes based on their metacognitive ability or are pointed out by outside observers, they cannot recognize their positions without feedback. Likewise, the improvement of writing ability, especially for the argumentative writing ability, can progress only by knowing learners are writing in the right way or where they are doing wrong and how to make progress, rather than accumulating writing experience by simple repetition. Most learners have a hard time figuring out mistakes in their writings without someone who can see the logical development and point out weaknesses, mistakes, leap of logics. The usefulness of simple repetition lies in removing the psychological barriers to writing by making it easy and comfortable to perform a certain level of writing, but the danger of simple repetition is that it is difficult to try to write to reach a level that exceeds the familiar and comfortable writing. It is difficult for learners to voluntarily devote the effort and maintain concentration to write for a better level of writing, and the bigger problem is that the process of pushing themselves is not fun and not easy to motivate.

Suggestions for further research are as follows. If daily reading and writing habits outside of school do not have a significant impact

on the ability to perform a certain type of argumentative writing tasks, it is also necessary to examine whether the correlation and explanatory power with other types of writing—descriptive, expository, narrative, persuasive—are similar or if different, how they differ.

A specific criterion for literacy teachers, educators, researchers to measure learners' ability to perform argumentative writing is also necessary. Of course, there are several instruments and rubrics for evaluating persuasive writing, but more detailed analytical scoring criteria specialized for argumentative writing are required. In addition, this criterion becomes the basis for meaningful diagnosis and feedback only when it is subdivided in detail by every single factors. If it remains at the simplified, "one size fits all" level, there would be no difference from the existing scoring criteria. It's a natural request. If there is no consensus on what level of good writing skills are, if there is no specific standard for judging which changes can be considered as improved skills, and if the concept of writing improvement is ambiguous, then the slogan itself are meaninglessly remained that writing skills are needed to be improved. This is because we cannot develop concrete ways to achieve our goals to design instructional plans or create interventions for student writing improvement only with slogan.

Reading and writing are complex, multidimensional, and intertwined practices. In other words, the questionnaire items and writing test tools that were adopted and adapted for this study may not address learners' daily reading and writing habits as well as writing abilities appropriately, although those tools were developed, tested, and validated by prior studies. For instance, the principal weakness of this study was an uncertainty about the different results between simple and source-based writing tasks. Thus, a natural progression of this work should be to refine the survey and writing test tools.

A further study with more focus on instructional plans consisting of multiple stages with various activities and tasks is therefore suggested. If it is possible to measure the writing ability, instead of

presenting the next task by rule of thumb, it should be possible to provide tasks that exceed the learner's level in a specialized form. It also differs in that instead of listing the knowledge of argumentation in the classroom and the learner memorizing the characteristics of good writing, they should focus on the experience of actual writing and how to improve it. In many classrooms, there are still very few opportunities to write, or there is a tendency to leave it entirely to the learner to actually try it and experience trial and error after displaying information on what the text as a final product should be look like (Applebee & Langer, 2013). Delivering and remembering descriptive knowledge about writing within writing classroom is like trying to improve marathon skills by watching a YouTube video or by reading an article in a magazine. The question of 'knowing what' is, of course, important, but fixed descriptive knowledge cannot serve as an end in itself. Ultimately, the most important thing for leis "what can I do" after writing classes.

VI. Conclusion

The present study was designed to investigate the correlation between reading and writing habits, and then between read and writing habits and argumentative writing abilities. In this investigation, the second aim of this study was to grasp the effect of reading-writing habits on argumentative writing abilities. The results indicated that the correlation between daily reading and writing habits is positive. In terms of argumentative writing, participants took four different argumentative writing tasks for reliability and validity: two simple and two source-based argumentative writing tasks. The results revealed an observed difference between simple and source-based argumentative writing, in relation to reading and writing habits outside the school contexts. Analysis of instructional conversations and interviews with

students revealed that teachers and students consider daily reading and writing habits a good approach for learning how to write regardless of genre (i.e., narrative, expository, or argumentative). However, the results of the statistical model indicate a relatively weak relationship between reading and writing habits and argumentative writing abilities, specifically, source-based argumentative writing.

Over the last several decades, many effective writing approaches have been designed, developed, and discussed (e.g., Ferretti & Graham, 2019; Kiuahara et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020; Newell et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2012). In the meanwhile, in recent decades, scholars and teachers have criticized instruction and assessment that separated reading and writing by challenging the underlying assumption that each reading and writing practice is an isolated individual act. However, classroom instruction and scholarly discussion regarding the teaching of writing often ignore the possibility that any measured writing abilities are influenced by individual habits, cultures, and other media outside school (Barton & Hamilton, 2012; Brayko, 2013; Hull & Schultz, 2002; Lee, 2007; Moje, 2008). Accordingly, many researchers, educators, and teachers alike over the last 30 years have raised a call for a thorough examination of learners' specific influences and texts because "they are situated within specific personal and cultural contexts" (Applebee, 1993, p. 116).

The key argument of the study is that daily reading habits outside school are deemed to exert a positive impact on argumentative writing performance, especially independent writing tasks that do not require understanding, analysis, and evaluation of multiple sources provided to students. However, contrary to expectations, the study found an extremely weak relationship between daily writing habits and argumentative writing performance. Furthermore, detailed analysis suggests that performance in source-based argumentative writing is statistically uncorrelated with daily reading and writing habits.

A possible explanation for the relatively contradictory results may be the experience of writing "practice" (Ericsson & Pool, 2016). Ac-

cording to argument schema theory (Reznitskaya & Anderson, 2002), argumentative writing encapsulates not only rhetorical production with argumentative knowledge regarding the functions and forms of an argumentative component but also the realization of conflicting perspectives and counter-arguments. Thus, the study suggests that a teacher's role is vital in orchestrating a series of activities that students can practice with purpose instead of simply accumulating a volume of repeated practice to produce text.

To teach and learn argumentation, the study proffers the importance of developing experience in writing “practice” (Ericsson & Pool, 2016) in a correct and diligent manner. The study presents fundamental differences in predominant assumptions, teacher and student roles, and significant factors related to writing practice and argumentation instead of focusing on a simplified persuasive writing task, which frequently produces a five-paragraph theme (Johnson et al., 2003). Correct and diligent “Practice” (Ericsson & Pool, 2016) refers to sophisticated, effective, and purposeful practice for steady improvement that relies on research-based modes of learning. This form of practice differs from naïve, ignorant, practice that focuses on the amount of repetition.

* Submitted 2021.11.09.
First revision recieved 2021.11.23.
Accepted 2021.12.15.

REFERENCES

- Applebee, A. N. (1993). *Literature in the Secondary School: Studies of Curriculum and Instruction in the United States*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Applebee, A., & Langer, J. (2013). *Writing Instruction that Works*. Teachers College Press.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2012). *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*. Routledge.
- Barton, D., & Papen, U. (2010). *The Anthropology of Writing: Understanding Textually Mediated Worlds*. Continuum.
- Bloome, D. (1993). Necessary indeterminacy and the microethnographic study of reading as a social process. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 16(2), 98-111.
- Bowen, P., Rose, R., & Pilkington, A. (2017). Mixed methods -theory and practice. Sequential, explanatory approach. *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, 5(2), 10 – 27.
- Brayko, K. (2013). Community-based placements as contexts for disciplinary learning: A study of literacy teacher education outside of school. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(1), 47-59.
- Byrnes, J., & Wasik, B. (2019). *Language and Literacy Development*. Guilford Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2018). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Ericsson, K. (2009). *Development of Professional Expertise*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. (2014). *The Road to Excellence*. Psychology Press.
- Ericsson, A., & Pool, R. (2016). *Peak: Secrets from the New Science of Expertise*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Ferretti, R. P., & Graham, S. (2019). Argumentative writing: Theory, assessment, and instruction. *Reading and Writing*, 32(6), 1345-1357.
- Fitzgerald, J. & Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(10), 39-50.
- Gallagher, K. (2006). *Teaching Adolescent Writers*. Stenhouse Publishers.
- Gee, J. (2001). Reading as situated language: A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(8), 714-725.
- Goodson, P. (2016). *Becoming an Academic Writer*. Sage.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2017). Reading and writing connections: How writing can build better readers (and vice versa). In C. Ng., & B. Bartlett (Eds.), *Improving*

- Reading and Reading Engagement in the 21st Century* (pp. 333-350). Springer.
- Hayot, E. (2014). *The Elements of Academic Style*. Columbia University Press.
- Hirvela, A. (2016). *Connecting Reading & Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Horning, A. S., & Kraemer, E. W. (2013). Reconnecting reading and writing: Introduction and overview. In A. S. Horning, & E. W. Kraemer (Eds.), *Reconnecting Reading and Writing* (pp. 5-25). Parlor Press.
- Hull, G. A., & Schultz, K. (2002). *School's Out: Bridging Out-of-School Literacies with Classroom Practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Johnson, E., Kimball, K., Brown, S., & Anderson, D. (2001). A statewide review of the use of accommodations in large-scale, high-stakes assessments. *Exceptional Children*, 67(2), 251-264.
- Johnson, T. S., Thompson, L., Smagorinsky, P., & Fry, P. G. (2003). Learning to teach the five-paragraph theme. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(2), 136-176.
- King, S. (2010). *On Writing*. Scribner.
- Kiuhara, S. A., Gillespie Rouse, A., Dai, T., Witzel, B. S., Morphy, P., & Unker, B. (2020). Constructing written arguments to develop fraction knowledge. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(3), 584-607.
- Lee, C.D. (2007). *Culture, Literacy, and Learning: Blooming in the Midst of the Whirlwind*. Teachers College Press.
- Lin, T. J., Nagpal, M., VanDerHeide, J., Ha, S. Y., & Newell, G. (2020). Instructional patterns for the teaching and learning of argumentative writing in high school English language arts classrooms. *Reading and Writing*, 33, 2549-2575.
- Mitchell, J. C. (1984). Typicality and the case study. In R. F. Ellen (Ed.), *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct* (pp. 238-241). Academic Press.
- Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96-107.
- Nelson, N., & Calfee, R. C. (1998). The Reading-Writing Connection Viewed Historically. In N. Nelson, & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *The Reading - Writing Connection: 97th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1-52). National Society for the Study of Education.
- Newell, G. E., Bloome, D., & Hirvela, A. (2015). *Teaching and Learning Argumentative Writing in High School English Language Arts Classrooms*. Routledge.
- Parini, J. (1989, July). The more they write, the more they write. *The New York Times*, Section 7, Page 1.
- Reznitskaya, A., & Anderson, R. C. (2002). The argument schema and learning to reason. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension Instruction:*

- Research-Based Best Practices* (pp. 319-334). Guilford Press.
- Rubin, D. (1984). Social cognition and written communication. *Written Communication, 1*, 211-246.
- Schaffhauser, D. (2020, August). Research: Students Need to Spend More Time Writing. *The Journal*. Retrived from <https://thejournal.com/articles/2020/08/25/students-need-to-spend-more-time-writing.aspx>
- Shanahan, T. (2016). Relationships between reading and writing development. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald, (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research* (pp. 194-207). Guilford Press.
- Shenk, D. (2010). *The Genius in All of Us*. Doubleday.
- Smith, M. W., Wilhelm, J. D., & Fredricksen, J. E. (2012). *Ob, Yeab?!: Putting Argument to Work Both in School and Out*. Heinemann.
- Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. *Language Arts, 60*, 627-642.
- Swanson, H. L., & Berninger, V. (1996). Individual differences in children's writing: A function of working memory or reading or both processes? *Reading and Writing, 8*, 357-383.
- Sylvia, P. (2018). *How to Write a Lot: A Practice Guide to Productive Academic Writing* (2nd ed.). APA LifeTools.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Tierney, R. J. (1992). Ongoing research and new directions. In J. W. Irwin & M. A. Doyle (Eds.), *Reading/Writing Connections: Learning from Research* (pp. 246-259). International Reading Association.
- Toulmin, S. (1958/2003). *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge University Press.

Reading-Writing Habits and Argumentative Writing

Kwak, Subeom

The decades following 1980 were as important to the United States as South Korea for the introduction of concepts like reading-writing connection and reading and writing outside of the school habits to improve literacy practices for students. Ironically, this also was a period when theoretical discussions were largely dominant while few empirical studies investigated the relationships and effects of reading and writing habits on writing abilities. This study aims to investigate the correlation between reading and writing habits outside of the school context, and examine how such habits influence argumentative writing ability. A total of 240 high school students participated. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed within this study relying on sequential explanatory mixed methods design in order to capture a complexity of literacy practices. Questionnaires were used to measure reading and writing habits, whereas writing ability was assessed through four argumentative writing tasks. For in-depth analysis, writing tasks were divided into two types: a direct question and a source-based writing task. Semi-structured interviews and classroom observations based on ethnographic approaches were also conducted for one academic year. Accordingly, differences in argumentation ability according to task type were observed. The study identified a complicated set of results. Out of school reading and writing habits are strongly correlated each other. Such reading and writing habits outside of school effects significantly impact direct question type argumentative writing task, although not for source-based writing task. This study is meaningful because it not only examines the relationship between reading and writing habits outside of the school setting and argumentative writing ability, it also lays the foundation for follow-up stud-

ies. Such research may target reading, writing, and argumentative writing abilities given this study's support for the necessity of teacher-designed structured process writing instruction and a set of activities for learning to write more meticulous argumentative essays.

KEYWORDS Writing, Argumentative Writing, Reading, Reading Habit, Writing Habit