

Tapping into Students' Perception of Source Use in Undergraduate Essay Writing Practices in Applied Linguistics

Mina Bikhmohammadi

Writing and Professional Communication Department, East Carolina University, NC, United States

Bikhmohammadim23@students.ecu.edu

Mahsa Alinasab (Corresponding Author)

English Language Department, Faculty of Humanities, Urmia University, Urmia, Iran

m.alinasab@urmia.ac.ir

Abstract

Source use in writing, commonly known as integrated writing, involves drawing insights from listening or reading input to compose a text. Such source-informed writing has gained ground in L2 writing instruction and assessment. However, the extent L2 learners find integrated tasks effective in promoting their writing ability has been rarely touched upon. In addition, research should consider students' needs and perspectives when it comes to the differences between integrated tasks and traditional independent writing practices in satisfying their writing requirements. In this paper, we report on the attitudes of non-Anglophone undergraduate students toward the incorporation of integrated writing tasks as part of essay writing classes and whether they perceive these tasks as effective compared to default independent practices without source use. A researcher-made self-report scale consisting of 44 items on integrated and independent writing tasks was distributed among undergraduate students following their participation in an integrated essay writing program and a regular undergraduate writing course at the university. We interviewed 15 participants to gain further insights into their attitudes toward source use in writing classes. We found that non-Anglophone students significantly favored the inclusion of integrated tasks in their classes. However, they hold fairly positive attitudes toward independent writing tasks, as our interview analysis disclosed. We think that source use could be integrally integrated into L2 writing classes, which seems proportionate to students' needs in non-English settings.

Keywords: Attitudes, Integrated writing, Non-Anglophone, Undergraduate writing

Introduction

Writing instruction has spawned a series of studies over the past few decades. Undoubtedly, independent writing tasks have been adopted in ESL/EFL writing instruction and assessment for so long; however, recently-made progress in the field of writing instruction was the rationale for the emergence of integrated writing tasks, also known as source-based writing tasks that have been attracting increasing attention. In fact, source-based writing necessitates the comprehension, identification, selection, synthetization, organization and expression of written or aural sources (Knoch & Sitajalabhorn, 2013), such as summary writing and paraphrasing (Plakans, 2008; Plakans & Gebril, 2013). On the contrary, an independent writing task is an impromptu task that requires the learners to compose an essay at a specific time according to their own personal experiences and ideas rather than a reference source text (Payant, McDonough, Uludag, & Lindberg, 2019; Plakans, 2008).

Research on writing has a long tradition. Owing to the fact that writing skill requires a good command of English, EFL/ESL learners encounter serious problems in learning this skill. A well-known approach that is widely applied in teaching writing skill is the traditional approach. Su (2007) construed the definition of the traditional approach as the instruction of the four skills of the English language discretely. There is still much controversy regarding the teaching of English language skills in Iranian language institutes since cohesive writing sees text more than a sheer series of grammatical sentences coming successively (Ebrahimi, 2024).

The decline of the traditional product-based approach has been one of the significant methodological changes in academic writing instruction, which led to the dominant practice of process-based approaches; however, Most Iranian instructors are the advocators of conducting writing-only tasks, yet the main problem with the application of such an approach is that it does not take into account the real-life writing tasks which require EFL/ESL learners to take notes while listening to an academic lecture or respond to an Email. To this end, Iranian EFL learners are not successful enough in fulfilling authentic tasks in real life. In addition, most of the highly accredited tests which assess the proficiency level of EFL learners in English require EFL learners to combine their listening and reading skills with writing and producing an essay.

Integrated Writing Tasks

Source-based writing tasks are being used in several standardized tests to measure English language proficiency levels. Previous studies have emphasized the application of integrated composition; several researchers, however, have endeavored to highlight the importance of writing-only tasks in second-language writing classrooms. The employment of independent and integrated writing tasks in EFL classes is the best way to improve the proficiency of L2 learners in academic writing. (Guo et al., 2013; Gebril & Plakans, 2016; Cumming, et al., 2005). Zhang (2015) examined the difference between the impact of integrated tasks and comprehensive written corrective feedback. According to the results, the integrated tasks had a better effect on English language learners when compared to comprehensive written corrective feedback. The utilization of source-based writing tasks has been applied by many well-known second language proficiency assessment tests. Some examples of such tests are the Certificate of Proficiency in English (COPE), Canadian Academic English Language (CAEL), Ontario Test of English as a Second Language (OTESL), and the Internet-based Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL iBT).

Yang and Plakans (2012) suggested that the TOEFL test is the most accepted and well-known language proficiency test in which the writing ability of test-takers is evaluated by integrated and source-based tasks. A study by Feak and Dobson (1996) concluded that since source-based tasks provide the same source for all learners, they increase task fairness. A number of authors have recognized that such tasks also provide a positive washback on teaching and learning due to the fact that they are more like authentic tasks that exist in real life. (Fox, 2004; Cumming, et al., 2004). On the other hand, some researchers believe that source-based writing tasks provide some problems regarding construct validity. (Fox, 2003; Upshur & Turner, 1999).

The literature on integrated tasks has highlighted several aspects. Several researchers, for instance, attempted to investigate the distinctions between source-based and independent writing tasks, including Weigle and Parker (2012), Cumming et al. (2005), Plakans (2008), Gebril (2010). Plakans and Gebril (2012, 2013) examined the roles of the prompt (source text) in the integrated writing task. The findings of some other studies demonstrated that integrated writing tasks employ various strategies and processes, such as particular reading strategies and discourse synthesis processes (Plakans, 2009a, 2009b), test-wiseness and self-regulatory strategies (Yang & Plakans, 2012), and paraphrasing and plagiarism (Li & Casanave, 2012; Hirvella & Du, 2013). Yamada (2002) concluded that writing activities demanding more inference helped authors develop data that was less dependent on the source texts. In other words, students were encouraged to write summaries by the source-based writing assignments, which included a larger level of task inference. This led to an increase in the quantity of information produced by students. Golparvar and Rashidi (2021) investigated the effect of task complexity on integrated writing tasks. According to the findings, grammar and lexicon were influenced by complicated task conditions, and cohesion could not affect accuracy and lexicon.

In light of the above-mentioned studies on source-based writing tasks, the present study is aimed to capture the attitudes EFL learners hold toward the practice of integrated essay writing activities in their composition courses. To our knowledge, no prior studies have examined the attitudes of Iranian EFL learners toward independent and source-based writing tasks. To this end, the objective of this study was to investigate the preference of Iranian EFL learners regarding integrated and independent tasks. The following research questions guided the present study:

1. What are the differences in EFL students' attitudes toward integrated and independent writing tasks?
2. How do they justify those differences?

Method

Context: EFL Writing in Iran

English is currently a major part of Iran's formal education system and mostly in the educational industry because of its status as a global language. The ability to communicate in English is increasingly seen as a sign of both academic and social success. For instance, English is a required area of study in middle school and high school, and all university fields at the Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral levels require students to take English classes as part of their

curriculum. English education begins at a very young age in the private market, and various institutions provide these programs. Writing, while being a vital part of EFL, tends to take a back seat in today's language classrooms as teachers concentrate on other skills. Speaking as an example, on the other hand, attracts a great deal of attention. It is possible to see the emphasis placed on speaking skills by taking a look at the various kinds of speaking-focused classes, such as speaking-oriented English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and English for Professional Purposes (EPP).

With the increasing tendency in order to learn English, researchers and English language instructors have been trying to invent and improve the currently used methods of teaching English to make the instruction and the learning process feasible for students. For instance, integrated tasks were suggested in order to foster students understanding of writing. According to Gebril (2009), source-based tasks have been advocated as an option to or in addition to independent writing activities to address the inadequacies of independent tasks. However, when it comes to the kind of writing activities that are employed in Iran, we discover that independent writing tasks are used the majority of the time. Learners who are exposed to independent activities set themselves up for failure when it comes to coping with writing tasks in real life, such as taking notes or writing a summary of a text as a source.

Design and Participants

This paper aimed to investigate the attitudes and perceptions of Iranian EFL learners toward integrated and independent writing styles. In this study, we followed quantitative and qualitative data collection measures to examine EFL students' perceptions of source use in essay writing practices. To do so, 103 participants took part in a researcher-made 5-point Likert scale questionnaire. The participants were all non-native EFL learners from Iran. Approximately 59.2% of the participants were female (n=61), and 40.8% were male (n=42). The participants' age ranged from 16 to 36. All participants in this study were volunteers. Regarding the participants' educational backgrounds, about 8.7% of them were Ph.D. students (n=9), 25.2% were graduate students (n=26), 43.7% were undergraduate students (n=45), and 22.3% were high school students (n=23). With respect to their proficiency level in English, 56.3% of the participants were advanced EFL learners (n=58), 35.9% were intermediate (n=37), and 7.8% were beginner learners (n=8). 64.1% of the participants have been learning English as a Foreign language for more than 7 years (n=66), 23.3% of them for 4-6 years (n=24), and 12.6% for 1-3 years (n=13). Data were gathered using a web-based online survey at various time points.

Instruments

In order to investigate the attitudes of EFL learners regarding integrated and independent writing tasks, a survey was designated and used as the research instrument. We used a researcher-made questionnaire and a follow-up semi-structured interview to extract students' attitudes toward writing practices.

The Attitude Inventory for Integrated-Independent Writing (AIIW)

To build AIIW, we used a Likert scale development. We first created an item pool for integrated and independent writing based on the literature. The first version of the AIIW questionnaire included 30 items for integrated tasks and 20 items for independent or writing-only tasks. For an initial check, the first draft of the AIIW was administered to twenty-two EFL learners in order to ensure high levels of reliability. The initial reliability analysis of the integrated writing scale indicated a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.67, which was considered to be low. Consequently, 6 items of integrated writing scales (items 6, 14, 23, 32, 35, 42) were eliminated for representing very low levels of reliability. Then, the internal consistency of the remaining 24 items was checked. The analyses showed a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.78 that confirmed the acceptable internal consistency of the integrated writing scale.

Moreover, based on the initial reliability analysis of the independent writing scale, item 22 was eliminated due to presenting negative values and not measuring the independent characteristic of the writing task. The final reliability analysis for the independent writing scale that covered 19 items demonstrated a value of 0.8 for Cronbach's Alpha and an acceptable level of internal consistency. Both reliability values suggest that all items are extremely dependable since the overall reliability values were (0.78) and (0.8).

In addition to reliability analyses of the attitude questionnaire, four academic writing instructors with a good record of teaching experience reviewed the 43 items to confirm the appropriacy of the content. Based on the expert-validation process, further revisions were made with regard to the wording and structure of the questionnaire. Finally, the total number of questions were 43, among which 24 items were devoted to integrated tasks (1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50), and 19 items measured attitudes toward independent tasks (2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 25, 26, 27, 33, 36, 37, 38, 47, 48).

Follow-up Interview Protocol

We employed semi-structured interviews to get a holistic and inclusive picture of EFL students' perspective of integrated and independent ordinations in writing classes. By using semi-structured interviews, we meant to allow the participant to elaborate on the issue in an exploratory manner. The questions of the interview were developed based on the AIIW and a relook at the literature. Before the main study, the researchers had a focus group discussion with four participants to gather further ideas on integrated and independent writing practices. We also used experienced academic writing instructors' as inspiration for our interview categories. We consulted the themes with three EAP teachers to ensure content validity. Our protocol included questions for the two main categories of integrated writing with source use and writing-only tasks.

Procedures and Data Analysis

First, we distributed the AIIW was distributed among 155 learners of five EFL classes in a private language school. We could collect 145 completed questionnaires from the participants. We used frequencies and paired t-tests to account for the difference in attitudes toward integrated and independent writing tasks.

After granting their informed consent, thirty participants agreed to take part in our follow-up interview. We conducted the interviews face-to-face in the same institute. Each interview took almost twenty minutes for each participant. The responses were recorded and then transcribed verbatim and were emailed to students for verification. The transcriptions were content analyzed cyclically to extract the most common responses. The firstly emerged responses were general, and the main ones were expected in the final cycle. We submerged minor themes under inclusive concepts and elaborated on them. This type of coding was adhered to until the end of the interview analysis. Later on, the experts were also asked to code the data, and the inter-coder reliability was found to be .82, denoting a moderate value in reliability analyses. We ensured our participants regarding data confidentiality. They were also informed that there would no value judgments of responses, and that their opinions mattered to us.

Results

Quantitative Findings

In this study, we primarily designed and used a self-report scale to capture non-Anglophone students' attitudes toward integrated and independent tasks. We analyzed and scored students' responses to the scale. Table 1 sketches the initial descriptive analysis.

Table 1

Descriptives of learners' perspectives on integrated and independent writing tasks

		M	5% Trimmed M	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	N
Groups	Independent	58.96	58.69	10.37	35	95	.402	.822	103
	Integrated	96.55	96.41	9.83	74	125	.201	.881	103

According to Table 1, the mean value of the source-based writing tasks is higher than that of the independent tasks. In other words, the participants' preferences are leaning toward integrated writing tasks. However, in order to further examine the significance of the so-called difference, inferential statistics were run. Due to the nature of the research question, independent-samples t-test was used to check the possible differences between learners' tendency for independent and integrated writing tasks. In Table 2, we provide a summary of the t-test findings.

Table 2

Independent samples t-test for learners' perspectives on integrated and independent writing tasks

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Responses	Equal variances assumed	.626	.430	-26.708	204	.000	-37.59223
	Equal variances not assumed			-26.708	203.413	.000	-37.59223

According to Table 3, the equality of variances for the groups is assumed ($F=.626$, $p=.430$), and the independent samples t-test indicates a significant difference between independent ($M=58.96$, $SD=10.36$) and integrated ($M=96.55$, $SD=9.82$) writing tasks in terms of learners' tendency towards either of them. In other words, the learners tend to be more attracted to integrated writing tasks than to independent ones. The magnitude of the differences in the means is found to be very large ($\eta^2 = .77$), which indicates a substantial amount of confidence on the actuality and meaningfulness of the difference between the two groups.

Qualitative Accounts

As a secondary objective, we held focus-group discussions to gain further insights on students' perspectives on integrated and independent tasks. Our qualitative themes analysis confirmed the quantitative findings reported earlier. Students found integrated practices useful compared to traditional writing-only tasks and believed that a hybrid approach consisting of both types could be promising in developing their academic writing abilities. The themes we extracted from the interview included *reading/listening before writing*, *note-taking before writing*, *summarizing/paraphrasing after reading/listening*, and *writing without listening/reading*. Below, we provide extracts for each theme.

Reading/Listening before Writing

Our first theme concerned the importance of listening or reading text before the main writing activity, which is a shining feature of integrated writing tasks. Students referred to this feature as to be effective and nutritious. Extract 1 is a good indication of this finding:

Extract 1

When I start to write, I am usually empty of ideas. Sometime, I feel I have no knowledge of English. Listening before writing is very useful as it shows me the way. I can have the idea pack I need to for starting to write. The reading text is also nourishing because it provides some vocabulary items and even grammar I need. The writing task then becomes as easy as a pie...

Another student believed that listening and reading prompts prepare the scene for future writing activities and are self-motivating:

Extract 2

I found the listening files very helpful. Reading text was also useful. They gave the confidence to write better in my English class which did not have any sources before writing. I feel my knowledge was improved...

Note-taking before Writing

The second theme we extracted from students' comments involved the note-taking idea in integrated writing. In our writing program, students were allowed to take notes based on listening or reading prompts. Our participants found that the note-taking step structured their writing. Extract 3 clarifies this point:

Extract 3

While writing, I am often confused. When I took notes from the listening, I could format my essay better. For example, I knew how to introduce my topic or how many body paragraphs I needed...

An interesting finding was related to the idea maps we used for students' note-taking in the program. The participating students believed that such tasks should be integrated to writing courses, even to those without source-based practices:

Extract 4

I normally don't know how to take good notes. Such maps helped me to structure ideas better. I think we need this practice in all writing activities. For example, in our general English class, we don't listen to read before writing, but still, we can take notes on idea maps to write better...

Summarizing/paraphrasing after reading/listening

Our students also commented on the summarizing or paraphrasing activities in source-based writing tasks. They considered such practices effective and encouraging. Extracts 5 and 6 detail this idea:

Extract 5

I also liked the task where we summarized the points in the listening. I felt like using my English knowledge especially grammar to summarize some ideas...

Extract 6

When you asked us to reproduce the ideas of the reading, I was scared first, but then it became really useful. I could use my pure English to write the text in another way. Later, when you told me my weaknesses in rephrasing, I was assured that I was right. This helped me to write better in future topics where there was no reading, but still I could rephrase my ideas...

Writing without Listening/Reading

The final theme centers on the inadequacy of independent writing-only tasks in academic writing courses. Students noted that traditional writing tasks should be improved by incorporating other skills, such as listening and reading. We think that our participants favored a hybrid approach consisting of integrated and writing-only tasks:

Extract 7

It is getting boring with traditional essay writing classes. We need some variety. In this course, the use of reading and listening texts was very interesting. For sure, I could write better essays as I knew what to write about and how. In traditional essay writing, structure and ideas are missing. I was thinking why not to have both in the class...

Discussion

The discipline of teaching and evaluating writing in ESL and EFL is shifting its focus more and more toward integrated writing activities. It is becoming more important to compare the efficiency of integrated activities to that of the traditional, standalone writing assignments that have been in place for some time. This research analyzes the perspectives of EFL students on the adoption of integrated writing assignments within their EFL writing practices. Based on the results, it was shown that EFL students favored training that included writing activities based on primary sources. Students prefer to be taught via integrated writing activities, with independent writing practice provided as a supplement. This research recommends a more goal-oriented use of integrated activities alongside independent writing tasks in EFL writing instruction in order to better meet the preferences and requirements of learners. Obviously, the usefulness of writing-only activities is not diminished by these results.

This study's findings are consistent with those of other researchers who have argued for the importance of teaching integrated tasks to language learners, such as Gholami and Alinasab (2017), Yang (2009), Weigle (2002), Guo (2011), Cumming et al., (2000), Feak and Dobson (1996), Read (1990). Most of the prior research has implied the introduction of real-world writing practices, such as integrated tasks, into academic writing training rather than focusing on the perspectives of EFL students toward such tasks. The instructional tools learners use to learn and do well in education should allow them to engage in meaningful, integrated activities, as emphasized by Cumming et al. (2005). In reality, students must be trained to write from sources, especially in EFL situations where writing-only activities have been the norm (Weigle & Parker, 2012). In order to help the students write with the aid of outside material and depend less on their own previous experiences, Leki and Carson (1994) also supported the idea that EAP writing programs must include some source-based writing tasks.

There are similarities between the attitudes expressed by EFL learners in this study and those described by Keck (2014), who came to the conclusion that students hold a positive attitude toward integrated tasks such as summarizing and paraphrasing tasks in academic writing instruction. Moreover, our findings accord with those of Ansas and Sukyadi (2019) regarding the importance of integrated tasks, which did not demonstrate the preference of EFL learners for two types of writing tasks and focused on the perceptions of EFL learners on integrated writing in the area of citation. In addition, our research was conducted with a wider range of respondents involved in the questionnaire.

According to Wu's (2013) research, native and non-native writers at various competence levels vary in the lexical items and propositional content they choose from the source reading. That is to say, although there was some variance even within groups, non-native speakers used a wider range of vocabulary words drawn from their sources than did native speakers. This study lends credence to the argument that EFL and ESL authors need more assistance since they lack experience utilizing sources in their writing. Wu did not investigate how authors felt about assignments that need merely writing or those that require referencing other sources. Nonetheless, the goal is to learn how various language users (native and non-native) approach and use information from sources.

In 2010, Howard et al. argued that “students [L1 and L2 writers] are not writing from sources; they are writing from sentences selected from sources.” 18 student research texts of L1 and L2 were analyzed in order to find out if students were successful in comprehending sources. According to their findings, paraphrasing, copying, and patchwriting from specific statements in their sources were more common than the highly praised and advocated the practice of summarizing in academic writing and composition textbooks. Although we argue that L2 writers show a high preference toward source-based tasks, X’s study argues that writers, regardless of their proficiency, do not use sources appropriately since there is a high amount of coping and paraphrased sentences rather than summarized comprehensive statements in students’ writings. This may suggest implementing further source-based activities with a clear objective is warranted. This research, in our opinion, differs from ours in that it does not discriminate between L1 and L2 authors’ utilization of sources or their perceptions of doing so. This study is aimed to explore whether or not sources are utilized effectively.

The students’ consistent practice of academic writing, which include citing and paraphrasing other sources, might account for the findings. In fact, students do better in the kind of writing they may face in real-life tasks. As such, demonstrating advanced academic writing competency requires producing a well-written writing assignment that makes use of the writing of others (Gholami & Alinasab, 2017; Cumming et al., 2005; Crossley, & McNamara, 2013; Gebril & Plakans, 2016; Guo, Crossley, & McNamara, 2013). A different reason is nevertheless plausible. Learners preferred to practice and be exposed to the integrated tasks since their writing ability may be evaluated on many standardized tests, such as the Certificate of Proficiency in English (COPE), the Canadian Academic English Language (CAEL), Internet-based Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL iBT), and the Ontario Test of English as a Second Language (OTESL).

Conclusion

This query set out to investigate the attitudes that EFL learners hold toward integrated and independent writing tasks. The present findings confirm that students held a positive view toward the application of integrated tasks in the teaching of writing without devaluating the merits of writing-only instruction. In other words, integrated or source-based writing tasks are preferred over independent writing tasks among Iranian EFL learners. This finding has important implications for developing the instruction of second and/or foreign language writing skill. Firstly, more integrated writing tasks can be incorporated into the educational systems by syllabus designers and instructors of EFL courses. Moreover, note-taking is not instructed enough in educational settings. Hence, it can be practiced more in academic settings in order to promote the writing competence of the learners in terms of accuracy and fluency. In addition to this, EFL writers can improve their writing if they are instructed on some more writing strategies, such as paraphrasing and summary writing. Finally, instructors may make more learner-centered classes by considering the perceptions which EFL learners hold toward the way EFL writing can be instructed.

It is plausible that a number of limitations may have influenced the results obtained. Firstly, with the pandemic the Coronavirus, which is an infectious disease, we conducted an online survey in order not to put our participants’ lives at risk. At this time, social distancing and quarantine were suggested by the WHO. Moreover, almost all of the classes were held online in Iran. In-person

data collection could have provided more reliable data. Furthermore, no treatment could have been conducted due to the current situation. In addition to this, due to some limitations in the research design, participants were not pretested to ensure the homogeneity or heterogeneity of their writing competence; these results, therefore, need to be interpreted with caution. Moreover, the study only considers 103 cases.

Future research might involve more participants to improve data generalization. Moreover, future research may compare the attitudes of male and female EFL learners toward integrated and independent writing tasks. It is recommended to administer a pretest to ensure the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the participants' writing competence. Besides, future research may conduct EFL learners' attitudes toward two types of writing in another country involving other nationalities. There are still many unanswered questions about the strategies adopted by EFL learners in integrated tasks, such as note-taking, paraphrasing, and summary writing.

References

- Ansas, V. N., & Sukyadi, D. (2019). source-based writing among undergraduate students: perspective and challenges. *International Journal of Education*, 11(2), 152. doi:10.17509/ije.v11i2.14757.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Cumming, A., Grant, L., Mulcahy-Ernt, P., & Powers, D. E. (2004). A teacher-verification study of speaking and writing prototype tasks for a new TOEFL. *Language Testing*, 21(2), 107–145. doi:10.1191/0265532204lt278oa
- Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Baba, K., Erdosy, U., Eouanzoui, K., & James, M. (2005). Differences in written discourse in independent and integrated prototype tasks for next generation TOEFL. *Assessing Writing*, 10(1), 5–43. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2005.02.001
- Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Powers, D., Santos, T., & Taylor, C. (2000). *TOEFL 2000 writing framework*. Educational Testing Service.
- Ebrahimi, S. F., & Mallaki, A. (2024). The Pronoun “this” in Civil Engineering Research Articles. *International Journal of Practical and Pedagogical Issues in English Education*, 2(2), 1-12.
- Feak, C., & Dobson, B. (1996). Building on the Impromptu: A Source-Based Academic Writing Assessment. *College ESL*, 6(1), 73-84.
- Fox, J. (2004). Test decisions over time: tracking validity. *Language Testing*, 21(4), 437–465. doi:10.1191/0265532204lt292oa
- Fox, J. D. (2003). From Products to Process: An Ecological Approach to Bias Detection. *International Journal of Testing*, 3(1), 21–47. doi:10.1207/s15327574ijt0301_2

- Gebril, A. (2009). Score generalizability of academic writing tasks: Does one test method fit it all. *Language Testing*, 26(4), 507–531. doi:10.1177/0265532209340188
- Gebril, A. (2010). Bringing reading-to-write and writing-only assessment tasks together: A generalizability analysis. *Assessing Writing*, 15(2), 100–117. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2010.05.002
- Gebril, A., & Plakans, L. (2016). Source-based tasks in academic writing assessment: Lexical diversity, textual borrowing and proficiency. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 24, 78–88. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2016.10.001
- Gholami, J., & Alinasab, M. (2017). Source-Based Tasks in Writing Independent and Integrated Essays. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(3), 127–142. doi:10.12973/iji.2017.1039a
- Guo, L. (2011). *Product and process in TOEFL iBT independent and integrated writing tasks: A validation study*. A published dissertation. Georgia State University
- Guo, L., Crossley, S. A., & McNamara, D. S. (2013). Predicting human judgments of essay quality in both integrated and independent second language writing samples: A comparison study. *Assessing Writing*, 18(3), 218–238. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2013.05.002
- Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). Why am I paraphrasing?: Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), 87-98. doi: 10.1016/ j. jeap. 2012. 11. 005
- Keck, C. (2014). Copying, paraphrasing, and academic writing development: A re-examination of L1 and L2 summarization practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25, 4–22. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2014.05.005
- Knoch, U., & Sitajalabhorn, W. (2013). A closer look at integrated writing tasks: Towards a more focussed definition for assessment purposes. *Assessing Writing*, 18(4), 300–308. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2013.09.003
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the discipline. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 81-101
- Li, Y., & Casanave, P. C. (2012). Two first year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patch-writing or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 165-180. doi: 10.1016/ j. jslw. 2012. 03. 002
- Payant, C., McDonough, K., Uludag, P., & Lindberg, R. (2019). Predicting integrated writing task performance: Source comprehension, prewriting planning, and individual differences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 40, 87–97. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2019.06.001
- Plakans, L. (2008). Comparing composing processes in writing-only and reading-to-write test tasks. *Assessing Writing*, 13(2), 111–129. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2008.07.001
- Plakans, L. (2009a). The role of reading strategies in integrated L2 writing tasks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8(2), 252-266. doi: 10.1016/ j. jeap. 2009.05. 001

- Plakans, L. (2009b). Discourse synthesis in integrated second language writing assessment. *Language Testing*, 26(11), 561-587. doi: 10.1177/ 0265532209340192
- Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2012). A close investigation into source use in integrated second language writing tasks. *Assessing Writing*, 17(1), 18–34. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2011.09.002
- Plakans, L., & Gebril, A. (2013). Using multiple texts in an integrated writing assessment: Source text use as a predictor of score. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 217–230. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2013.02.003
- Read, J. (1990). Providing relevant content in an EAP writing test. *English for Specific Purposes*, 9(2), 109–121. doi:10.1016/0889-4906(90)90002-t
- Su, Y.-C. (2007). Students' changing views and the integrated-skills approach in taiwan's efl college classes. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(1), 27–40. doi:10.1007/bf03025831
- Upshur, J. A., & Turner, C. E. (1999). Systematic effects in the rating of second-language speaking ability: test method and learner discourse. *Language Testing*, 16(1), 82–111. doi:10.1177/026553229901600105
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Weigle, S. C. (2004). Integrating reading and writing in a competency test for non-native speakers of English. *Assessing Writing*, 9(1), 27–55. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2004.01.002
- Weigle, S. C., & Parker, K. (2012). Source text borrowing in an integrated reading/writing assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 118–133. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.004
- Yang, H. C. (2009). *Exploring the complexity of second language writers' strategy use and performance on an integrated writing test through structural equation modeling and qualitative approaches*. The University of Texas at Austin. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)
- Yang, H.-C., & Plakans, L. (2012). Second Language Writers' Strategy Use and Performance on an Integrated Reading-Listening-Writing Task. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 80–103. doi:10.1002/tesq.6

Appendix A

The Attitude Inventory for Integrated-Independent Writing (AIIW)

Items	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Before writing about a topic, I like to read or hear about that.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I like to write about a topic without any listening or reading activity.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Reading or listening to a passage, improves my writing ability.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I find it helpful to write separately from reading or listening tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I find it useful when the teacher asks me to write after I listen or read.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I find it easier to learn to write when the teacher teaches it by itself (alone).	1	2	3	4	5
7. I like lessons that focus only on teaching writing.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Summary-writing helps me to become a proficient writer.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I like to learn writing by itself.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I can write with more concentration when the teacher practices listening or reading related to the writing task.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Doing writing-only activities is the best way to learn to write purposeful and accurate essays.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I find hard to write after listening or reading activities.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I find it helpful to paraphrase ideas presented in a lecture or a reading passage.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I prefer the lessons in which reading, listening, and writing activities are separate.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I believe my writing quickly develops as I work on writing alone.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I like to rewrite or restate others' ideas in my own words.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Note-taking makes my writing knowledge more upgraded and powerful.	1	2	3	4	5
18. The teacher should begin with integrated writing tasks (with listening or reading) in teaching writing.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I prefer writing-only tasks to be practiced first in the class.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I think my writing ability improves when I'm trying to compare and contrast others' point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Practicing writing by itself improves my creativity and thinking power.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I am able to develop better thesis statements (main ideas) in writing-only tasks.	1	2	3	4	5

23. I enjoy the tasks in which I am the creator and writer of different ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
24. By note taking, I am able to make passive ideas active.	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
25. I find it helpful to cite a speaker or writer's main idea in my own words.	1	2	3	4	5
26. While taking notes on what I read r listen, I can write a well-organized essay.	1	2	3	4	5
27. In the class, I prefer integrated writing tasks (with listening or reading) to be practiced first.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I can organize my essay in to introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion better during writing-only tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I think most real-world writing activities are integrated ones (with listening and reading), so I find them more authentic.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I like doing the tasks in which I only practice writing.	1	2	3	4	5
31. In lessons that focus only on writing, I can write with more concentration.	1	2	3	4	5
32. It is helpful when the teacher asks me to write about a topic based on my own ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Writing makes y listening and reading more attentive and goal-oriented.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I pay more attention to transition words (such as first, however, similarly, thirdly, etc.) in reading and listening passages and use them in my own writing.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Making the summaries of the listening and reading passages increases my writing ability.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I am able to organize my writing into introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion after I listen to or read about a topic.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Paraphrasing others' ideas provides me the chance to improve my writing skill.	1	2	3	4	5

Items	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
38. I believe in academic settings (universities and institutes), writing courses should include a good degree of integrated writing activities.	1	2	3	4	5
39. While listening or reading, my mind pays more attention to the vocabulary and grammar points.	1	2	3	4	5
40. My anxiety and fear about writing decreases after I listen to or read about a topic.	1	2	3	4	5

41. The teacher should begin with teaching writing by itself, then practice writing with listening or writing.	1	2	3	4	5
42. It would be more helpful if the universities and institutes include more writing-only tasks in writing courses.	1	2	3	4	5
43. When I exposed to the language in reading or listening passages, it offers me a good model in writing.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Integrated writing (with listening and reading) is less tiresome.	1	2	3	4	5