

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG WRITING AND READING AS A RESPOND TO CRITICAL JOURNAL REVIEW

Dita Grace

Email: greezsy2nd@gmail.com

Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

Abstract. The integrating of reading and reading in L2 is not the new area; However, only a few studies in reading and writing receive enough attention and are implemented in the L1 and L2 teaching. This study is aimed to reveal relationships among reading and writing through critical journal review. Thus, the participants show the ability of L2 learners on reading which confesses through writing. In another occasion, the participants show judgment which representative error is written after reading. This research is going to certain fault writing L2 as judgmental on reading a review on journal.

Keywords: Reading, Writing, L2 Judgmental

INTRODUCTION

The L2 writing performance of learners seems an interesting area. Before writing, the learners initially build their performance from reading. Researchers have found that phonemic awareness and knowledge of symbol relationships are critical factors for learning to read and strong phonemic awareness has been found to be crucial for efficient word decoding, especially reading a lot in L1 (Sparks, et.al, 2011). The implication of enjoyment in reading will be likely to read more often and over time, so later it is exposed to the printed word and more frequently (Sparks, et. al 2011, Cunningham & Stanovich,1991). From reading more, the students will acquire early success in learning to read and subsequent development of language-related skills. Surprisingly, the exposure to L1 reading is similar to acquiring L2 reading. The L2 reading factors involve language – related skills such as vocabulary, spelling, grammar, and general knowledge.

The contribution of reading reflects on writing. Actually, the writing performance happens if the learners' mental representation of writing would give any contribution (Zarei, et.al 2016). From its contribution, the writing model actually has shown a process-based, multi-dimensional and integrated activity inducing self-direction and organization.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Reading as a strategy

There are several hypotheses showing reading and reading–related skills(Sparks,et.al 2011 and Stanovich, 1997). The cognitive efficiency hypothesis has differences in vocabulary, general knowledge, and general language skills caused by

variation in differences of the cognitive mechanisms for gaining meaning from texts. The environmental opportunity hypothesis have differences in language skills that result in the differential opportunities for word learning. From these hypotheses, we may conclude that reading activity is a measurement of print exposure (reading volume) which students engaged. The learners sometimes meet differences in reading– related skills which are associated with the efficiency of the cognitive mechanism related to reading.

Writing after reading

Writing in L2 has several implications such as cohesion device and writing quality. Several studies found that the greater cohesion is indicated by perfectly linking between paragraphs (Crossley, et.al, 2016). Cohesion is used to give judgments to investigate the writing.

A number of studies show positive relations between L2 writing quality and the production of local and text cohesive devices. The implications may happen if the L2 learners use his L1 knowledge of reading to produce L2 writing. The essay quality will reveal the learners' cognition and the production result after the transfer.

Recent studies show that the quality of writing after reading depends on pedagogical aspect because the available sources of reading have also linked to writer's previous knowledge and lead to other interpretation in writing. Li (2014) has studied reading summary and writing as the integrated task. Sixty-four participants were assigned to criticize a textbook and write the summary by their own styles. The result reveals that several reading strategies—identifying and skipping unknown words; reprocessing information to clarify meaning; and rereading clarification—are focused on word and sentence level comprehension. In writing, the participants create the content from the source read. It proves that reading-writing is integrated skills.

In presenting the L2 writing, it is found some errors. Conducting this judgments of writing, there are some composition variables for analysis the error on writing (CLRC writing center), such as verb tense errors, sentence structure errors, and word choice errors.

RESEARCH METHODS

Source of Data and Participants

This research reveals the learners' writing based on the critical review on applied linguistics. In their critical review, they made conclusions after summarizing the article. The conclusion represented their knowledge of reading and the learners' assumptions as their cognition to writing. Some errors were found in their critical review such as verb tense errors, incorrect items, sentence structure and word structure. Those criteria were used as the data source. The samples were taken from five participants. They are students of The State University of Malang in the class of Applied Linguistics at 2016.

Data Analysis

There are some results of implications to judge L2 writing such as verb tense errors, incorrect items (conjunction use), sentence structure errors, and word choice errors. Those categories most commonly happened in L2 writing.

Verb tense errors

2nd writer: The researchers *reveals* the reality that the Jakarta Post actually has its standpoints.

The correction : The researchers *have revealed* the reality that

4th writer : This article broadens my knowledge about how language taboo not only *can* make a judgment to someone's personality and intelligence but also *they can* be used in literature, drama or movies and how they influence the audiences or readers.

The correction : This article broadens my knowledge about how language taboo not only *can* make a judgment to someone's personality and intelligence but also *can* be used in literature, drama or movies and how they influence the audiences or readers.

Incorrect items (conjunction use)

There are some mistakes in using conjunction explained as follows.

1st writer : Besides, it does not have a single grammatical error *nor* misspelling.

The correction : Besides, it does not have *any* single grammatical error *or* misspelling.

3th writer : Not only learning general English, *but* varieties of English must be learnt *also*.

The correction: Not only learning general English, *but also* the varieties of English must be learnt.

Sentence structure errors

This is example of overuse on sentence, so it becomes jumbled sentence.

3rd writer : Conducting research communication in aviation, the point of view of a linguist a certainly contributes to a deeper understanding of the issues involved.

The correction : Conducting research *on* communication in aviation *from* the point of view of a linguist certainly contributes to a deeper understanding of the issues involved.

Word choice errors

5th writer : *In case* of the results and discussions of the research, *not enough explanations* are given and there is problem in reporting the data.

The correction : *Concerning* the results and discussions of the research, the explanations does not give *additional information*, *besides* there is still problem in reporting the data.

FINDING

This explanation of data analysis which interprets the participants' reading and writing judgment errors has been raised. In terms of verb tense error, the 2nd writer did not realize that the activity was done and the writer used present tense instead of present perfect or simple past tense. In addition, the 5th writer, s/he did not realize adding subject

for 2nd clause, but 1st clause does not have the subject. However, this may be connected to writer's mental cognition. Moreover, the 1st writer is also supposed to give special attention. The use of *nor* is matching with *neither*, but the sentence does not support for adding *neither*. Next for the 3rd writer, it is odd to put *but* separately away from *also*. The writer tried to make variation in the sentence but failed. When the 3rd writer used the prepositions for several times, the sentence produced repetitions. In sentence structure, the sentence from writer seems haphazardly constructed, so it does not give a good interpretation for many prepositions used. From word choice errors, it can be seen that the 5th writer tried to make it short, but it may bewilder the readers. The word choice or diction of the writer has to be reformed to avoid misinterpretation.

This research leads to several interpretations on the participants' writing. Considering L1, it is not possible that the participants did not deepen enough on their L1 reading. Lightbown and Spada (2006) already revealed that certain misunderstanding in acquiring L2 happened also with the participants' L1 background in that whether they were good or bad at L1 skill impacted to acquiring L2.

CONCLUSION

Reading plays important role in writing. The writers much more improved to reuse the article reading. Contrast to the results, the writing seems still challenging to writers. The L2 writing error may disappear gradually. The implication of this research, the writers have to read a certain good passage, and then try to make a review writing afterwards.

REFERENCES

- Kim, K.J. (2011). Reading Motivation in Two Languages : an Examination of EFL College Students in Korea. *Reading and Writing*, 24:861-881. doi: 10.1007/s11145-010-9229-z
- Li, J. (2014). The Role of Reading and Writing in Summarization as an Integrated Task. *Language Testing Asia* 4(3), 1-9. doi:10.1186/2229-0443-4-3
- Lightbown, P. Spada, M. (2006). *How Languages are Learned*. Birmingham : Oxford University Press
- Sparks, R.L., Patton, J., Leonore, L., Humbach, N., (2011). Relationships among L1 Print Exposure and Early L1 Literacy Skills, L2 Aptitude and L2 Proficiency. *Reading and Writing Journal* (25), 1599-1634. doi 10/107/s11145-011-9335-6
- Zarei, G R., Pourghasemian, H., Jalali, H. (2016). Language Learners' Writing Task Representation and Its Effect on Written Performance in an EFL Context. *Journal Psycholinguistics Research*. doi:10.1007/s10936-016-9452-0