

Effects of Teaching Writing through Integrated Skills on Students Writing Perception: at Sekela Secondary School Grade Eleven in Focus

Fantahun Kitila¹, Sherif Ali¹, Ebissa Bekele¹

¹Department of English Language and Literature, Wollege Unversity Institute of Languages study and Journalism

Correspondence author: **Fantahun Kitila: email: fantahunkitila44@gmail.com**

Abstract

The main purpose for using teaching writing through integrated skills as the focal issue to conduct this research was activated from the established use of integrated skills way to salivate students' dissatisfaction of writing skills in a class. Thus, this study was to see the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills on students' writing perception. Experimental design was used in order to examine the cause-effect relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. Pre-and post-study parts of the questionnaire were used to collect data to see the effect of using teaching writing through integrated skills on students' writing perception. Data on experimental group students' reflection to their involvement in the intervention of teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing perception was gathered by a questionnaire that was employed before and after the study. The data gathered through this instrument was analyzed quantitatively. Comprehensive sampling was used to get data from the subjects of experimental and control group. Pre-questionnaire parts were administered immediately after sorting students in control and experimental groups. The results of pre-experiment parts of the questionnaire revealed that there was no significant change in the writing perception between the control and experimental groups prior to the intervention. However, the results of the post-study parts of the questionnaire demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference between the control and experimental groups. From the entire findings, it was concluded that teaching writing through integrated skills resulted on favorable perception of students' writing skills. The significant improvement of the experimental group students' writing performance due to teaching writing through integrated skills proved the value of the intervention. It is understood that teaching writing through conventional needed be replaced by teaching writing through integrated skills to enhance students writing perception.

Keywords: integrated skills, students writing perception, the cause-effect relationship, independent variable and dependent variable, before and after the study, the control and experimental groups

1. Introduction

The background of conducting this research on the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing perception was raised from observable facts. For instance, paradigm shifts and recent trends of using integrated skills teaching and learning are the major attempt to promote students language skills (Harmer, 2007). After the launch of contemporary era in the language pedagogy, integrated skills trends have been observed with the paradigm shifts that occurred in delivering foreign language lessons (Brown, 2001). With this tremendous shift, learning teaching needs to follow integrated approach which in turn improves students' writing skills (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The issues arose this research as a result of students' deteriorating behind on the English writing performance. Even though different type of research on teaching and learning in integrated skills trends have been observed, whether teaching writing through integrated skills change students perception or not is not studied in the context of Ethiopia in general and the study area in particular. This research relies on the context where teaching writing through integrated skills has taken the ground and position of teaching-learning process at the classroom. A crucial problem especially related to changing students' perception towards writing for real purpose teaching writing through integrated skills has not yet been investigated. Besides, the effects of teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing perception has not been studied in our context. Thus, the main focus of this research is to investigate the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing perception.

2. Literature Review

When we relate the issue of perception with teaching writing through integrated skills, the way students are taught influences their positive or negative perceptions towards the students' skills. The point is that teaching influences learners' sensing and meaning; their sensing in turn improves/deteriorates learning and their performance. Sometimes there would be misunderstanding between the teacher and the learners. What the teacher thinks about the progress of students in their writing, for example, can be positive but students may perceive it as negative and the vice-versa. This thinking gap can affect the interaction between the teacher and the students in writing lesson (Brewer, 1999).

The other point that has to be underscored in relation to the role of perception is that learners' perception about their ability can influence the improvement of their writing. The other worth mentioning point is that the way integrated skills and feedback is provided to the written work of students can also affect the writing performance of students. In sum, in order to make writing instruction successful changing the perceptions of writing students about traditional way of teaching is one of the focal areas of the writing pedagogy. Oxford, R., Lee, D., Snow, M. A., & Scarcella, R. (1996) note that the changes that so far have been made on the teaching writing through integrated skills of writing skills need mainly attributed to the changes made on the perceptions of writing students.

3. Objectives

This study aimed to address the following objectives:

1. To see significant differences between the students' perception in the experimental and control group due to treatment.
2. To find out the extent of teachings writing through integrated skills improves students writing perception after intervention in favor of experimental group.
3. To find out the students perception difference between the content, organization, language use, mechanics and style before and after the intervention of the experimental group students.

Research hypotheses:

Based on the research questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated to be checked in this study

HO1 There is no statistically significant differences between the control group and the experimental group in the students' writing perception.

HO2 There is not statistically significant differences between students' writing perception in pre and post questionnaire of the experimental group.

HO3 There is no statistically significant difference between students writing perception between experimental group in line of content, organization, language use, mechanics and style before and after intervention.

4Materials and Methods

4.1Design

This study was intended to investigate the effects of teaching writing through integrated skills on students' writing perception. The study employed a quasi-experimental pre-posttest research design to examine perception change in the students' writing skills as a result of teaching writing through integrated skills. A quasi-experimental research design was chosen because this design allowed the researchers to use preferably intact classroom setting in which random assignment of participants of study to different conditions was not mandatory (Cress well, 2009). Hence this study applied an intact classroom by taking section of grade eleven (N=70) students to look into whether or not the EFL teacher teaching writing through integrated skills improves students' writing perception.

4.2. Participants

The two groups were actually two sections assigned to one teacher who was teaching English grade eleven of Sekela secondary school. The teacher was selected for this instructional job in this study only to avoid teacher related variables. If two different teachers were employed for teaching according to this approach in the experimental class, teachers related variables might be there.

4.3. Instruments of Data Collection

Relevant data was collected using questionnaire. In the study, pre-questionnaire and post questionnaire were administered at the beginning and also at the end of the program. The pre and post questionnaires were distributed to 35 students. Alpha reliability test showed that the questionnaire distributed as the pre and post study was highly reliable since the pre-questionnaire has cronbach's alpha value of .944 and the post questionnaire has cronbach's alpha co-efficiency of .946. Items in questionnaire were developed in line with the related literature and were later checked by experts of TEFL for validity purposes.

4.5. Procedures

The procedure started with a selection of the respondents for the study then administered of pre-questionnaire then after, post-questionnaire were provided. During the process, an attempt was made to encourage the respondents to ask questions in case there was any ambiguity with regard to the content, language and ways of dealing with the test. After collecting the data, the researcher put the data into categories and arranged them for interpretation. Finally, the interpretation was made and generalized to draw out of the data analysis.

5. Results

5.1. Estimating the Reliability

According to Creswell (2003), the pretest and the posttest of their writing skills administered to calculate the inter-raters reliability of pre-and posttest of writing result range from a low to -94 to high of .97.

5.2. The Normality Test

The assumption of normality was examined through both the graphic of the histogram and also some numerical ways as recommended by Creswell (2011). Regarding the numerical methods of assessing normality, two measures were considered: 1 the values of Skewness and Kurtosis statistics, which must be within +/-1, based on Dorneyei(2007), and 2 the outcomes of the ratio of Skewedness and Kurtosis over their respective standard errors, which must fall within the ranges of +/-1.96, based on Creswell (2003). In this study, all the tests provide to be normally distributed.

Table 1: The pre-questionnaire result of the experimental and the control group Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std.Error mean
Content Cont	35	2.207970	.6332521	.1075555
Exp	35	2.217697	.6403903	.0930588
Organization Cont	35	2.287879	.5488668	.0845343
Exp	35	2.288998	.5434616	.0830588
Language use Cont	35	2.227273	.5675296	.0945845
Exp	35	2.248393	.5910483	.1002280
Mechanics Cont	35	2.628788	.6427718	.1025411
Exp	35	2.748689	.6702071	.1073170
Style Cont	35	2.295455	.5407734	.1033044
Exp	35	2.394847	.2434423	.2400000

As can be grasped from table 1 above, the mean score of the experimental group and the control group on each rubric was nearly similar on both the control and experimental group correspondingly. However, we cannot say that there was a significant difference between the language performances of the two groups by simply looking at their mean scores of the statistics. To know whether this difference is significant or not and to determine the homogeneity of the control and the experimental group students, an independent samples t-test should be used. Table 2 below shows the results.

Table2: Independent Sample Pre-questionnaire

	Levene's test for equality Of variance		T_test for equality of means						
	F	Sig	T	df	Sig(2tailed)	Mean difference	Std Deviation	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
Content Equal variances assumed	1.057	.20	.88	34	.217	.33585	.33877	-35721	1.251
Equal variances not assumed			1.53	1.41	.123	.35858	.16148	-1.23314	1.127

Organization Equal variances assumed	1.56 2	.10	1.20	34	.118	.80176	.28312	.11071	1.613
Equal variances not assumed			4.70	32	.77	.80176	.14622	.34765	1.376
Language use Equal variances assumed	.481	.38	1.10	34	.127 .166	.36616	.28564	-.32992	1.174
Equal variances not assumed			1.11	31		.36616	.15657	-1.49571	2.340
Mechanics Equal variances assume	1.17 5	.17	-14	34	.687	.12121	.36021	-1.06708	.7355
Equal variance not assume			-33	32	.605	.12121	.16351	-1.83755	1.505
Style Equal variances assume	1.30 0	.15	1.15	34	.142	.434343 .43434	.35778	-.40742	1.388
Equal variances not assume			1.97	31. 35	.120		.16336	-1.18512	2.166

As presented in table-2, the P- value (level of significance) of Levene’s test for equality of variances is greater than 0.05. This infers that we consider the above row for analysis. At the same time, if the value of t calculated is greater or equal to the value of the t-table with a given degree of freedom (df), it is said that there is a significant difference between the performance of the groups being compared. Moreover, if the t-calculated is less than the value of the t-table, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the performances of the groups. Similarly if the p-value is less than 0.05 (the standard limits of significance), it can be said there is significant difference between the average scores of the groups. However, if the p-value is greater than 0.05, the difference is insignificant.

On the basis of this assumption, the t-calculated of the pretest was found less than the value of t-table with 34 degree of freedom (content, t-calculated = .88, df = 34, P=.217 mean difference=.335858, Organization, t-calculated=1.10, df=34, P=.118, mean difference=.801767, Language use, t-calculated=1.10, df=34, P= .127, mean difference=.366161, Mechanics, t-calculated=-14, df=34, P= .687, mean difference= -121211, Style, t-calculated=1.15, df=34, P=.142, mean difference=.434343). Thus, we can determine that there was no significant difference between the language performance level of the experimental group and the control group. Therefore, the null hypothesis (HO1) was accepted.

Also, the following table shows the comparison of post-test results of the experimental and control groups after intervention.

Table 3: Independent sample Descriptive group statistics of the post questionnaire score

Scope	Group	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std.Error mean Sig value
Content	Exp	35	2.131746	.50162	.10160
	Cont	35	2.111318	.47948	.09786
Organization	Exp	35	3.111328560	2.1213	.09004
	Cont	35	2.175614275	1.1856	.10458
Language use	Exp	35	3.074613175	2.076	.0804
	Cont	35	2.174613176	1.161	.0736
Mechanics	Exp	35	2.8460318	1.8461	.14034
	Cont	35	2.4674603	1.4675	.10773
Style	Exp	35	2.14	2.1400	.10060
	Cont	35	1.18	1.1818	.09113
Sum	Exp	35	13.3037195		
	Cont	35	10.1090058		

As shown in table 3 above, the experimental group test result is greater than the control group test result in the total mean scores of the post-test between the experimental and control groups. The mean of the post-test in the experimental group reached (13.3037195), whereas the mean of the control group was (10.1090058). However, we cannot say that there was significant difference between the writing performances of the two groups by simply looking at their mean scores of the statistics. To know whether this difference is significant or not, an independent sample t-test is required.

Table4: Independent sample Post questionnaire

	Levene's test for equality of variances		t-test for equality of means						
	F	Sig	T	df	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean diff	Std.erro diff	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
Content	1.360	.055	12.060	34	.011	-1.12122	.07842	-1.28224	-.95847
Organization	1.106	.106	-5.404	34	.004	-.93550	.12150	-1.18407	-.68522
Language use	1.350	.060	-7.457	34	.007	-.91408	.09425	-1.10513	-.72120
Mechanics	3.652	.110	-1.151	34	.012	-.37836	.15935	-.70163	-.05310
Style	.530	.055	-9.526	34	.000	-.95703	.52660	-1.13700	-.77506

It is visibly shown in table-4 that the value of t-calculated was found greater than the value of t-table with 34 degree of freedom (content, t-calculated = 12.060, df = 34, P=.011 mean difference=-1.12122, Organization, t-calculated=-5.404, df=34, P=.004, mean difference=-.93550, Language use, t-calculated=-7.457, df=34, P= .007, mean difference=-.91408, Mechanics, t-calculated=-1.151, df=34, P= .012, mean difference= -.37836, Style, t-calculated=-9.526, df=34, P=.000, mean difference=-.95703). Accordingly, we can conclude that there was a significant difference between the language performance level of the experimental group and the control group. Therefore, the null hypothesis (HO1) was rejected.

All these statistical data of the posttest results confirmed there is a statistically significant difference between the post treatment performances of the two groups. Accordingly, the experimental group, which was taught writing through integrated skills, performed significantly higher than the control group. This result indicates that teaching writing through integrated skills is more effective than the conventional way of teaching to improve students' performance.

Table 5: Experimental group pre-questionnaire and post questionnaire Paired Sample Statistics

	Grand Mean	N	Std Deviation	Std. Error mean
Pair1 exp pre Pre-writing stage	3.1636616	34	1.703	.147
Exp post	4.714512	34	2.415	.150
Pair2 exp pre While writing stage	6.10307670	34	1.310	.103
Exp post	8.96923055	34	1.234	.250
Pair3 exp pre Post writing stage	2.206	34	1.106	.167
Exp post	3.303	34	1.652	.201
Total grand mean Exp pre	11.4727383	34	4.119	0.417
Exp post	16.9867426	34	6.068	0.601

The analysis result indicated that EFL teachers' teaching writing through integrated skills was raised from pre- to post intervention questionnaire. Besides, the result indicated that teaching writing by integrated skills increased students' writing performance. Table 5 depict that there were grand mean increases in post-intervention questionnaires in each stage of the writing process experimental group such as the mean score of Pre-writing stage per and post questionnaire(3.1636616& 4.714512) respectively, While writing stage per and post questionnaire(6.10307670 & 8.96923055) and Post writing stage per &post questionnaire(2.206 & 3.303) . The total grand mean from pre-to post questionnaire increased from 11.4727383 to 16.9867426. To examine the significant difference between the two groups paired sample t-test was computed. The intellectual question here is what is a possible reason for this difference in the mean scores to happen? Are these differences significant or not? The following paired sample t-test examines these (table 6).

Table 6: Experimental pre-post questionnaire intervention Paired Samples T-test

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of difference				
				lower	upper			
Pair1 Prewriting stage Exp Pre-post	-1.44	2.613	.216	-1.74	-1.34	18.437	34	.002
Pair2 While writing stage Exp pre-post	-1.75	1.801	.910	-1.98	-1.72	3.220	34	0.06
Pair3 Post writing stage Exp pre-post	-1.01	3.115	0.501	-1.22	-.980	6.480	34	.0007

A paired sample t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the intervention. There was a statistically significant increase in grand mean scores for pre writing stage from pre-intervention questionnaire score (M=3.16366, SD=1.703) to Post intervention questionnaire score (M=4.71451, SD=2.415), $t(34)=18.437$, $P=0.002$, $P<0.05$ (two-tailed). With a 95% confidence interval limit from -1.74 to -1.34. Similarly, While stage writing stage from pre-intervention questionnaire score (M=6.10307, SD=1.310) to post intervention questionnaire score (M=8.96923, SD=1.234), $t(34)=3.220$, $P=0.06$, $P<0.05$ (two-tailed) With 95% confidence interval limit from -1.98 to -1.72. The same way, Post writing stage from pre-intervention questionnaire score (M=2.206, SD=1.106) to post-intervention questionnaire score (M=3.303, SD=1.652), $t(34)=6.480$, $P=0.007$, $P<0.05$ with 95% confidence interval limit from -1.22 to -.98. In all writing stages (Pre-writing stage, while-writing stage and post-writing stage) the mean scores on the post intervention questionnaire were greater the pre-intervention questionnaire, all the result of the results being $P<0.05$ (2-tailed). Therefore the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.

This implies that it can be concluded that the intervention brought improvement (was successful). This means practicing writing through integrated skills improves students writing perception. Of the qualitative data, the interview result substantiates the above results.

To see a significant difference between the content, organization, language use, mechanics and style before and after the intervention, experimental group pre-posttest Paired Sample Statistics and experimental group pre-post t-test was computed respectively. The results are presented in the tables below.

Table 7: Experimental group pre-test and posttest Paired Sample Statistics

	Mean	N	Std Deviation	Std. Error mean
Pair1 exp pre	1.0103	35	.47958	.09787
Content	2.1318	35	.50172	.10161
Exp post				
Pair2 exp pre	1.0746	35	.51936	.10459
Organization	2.0103	35	.43333	.09014
Exp post				
Pair3 exp pre	1.0603	35	.3953	.08365
Language use	2.075	35	.4352	.0904
Exp post				
Pair4 exp pre	1.4675	35	.54380	.10874
Mechanics	1.8460	35	.73675	.14135
Exp post				
Pair5 exp pre	1.1818	35	.50172	.10161
Style	2.1400	35	.44570	.09214
Exp post				
Total Exp pre	5.7945		2.43976	.49646
Exp post	10.2031		2.55297	1.3269

Table 7 portrays those experimental group students test scores on the pre-test of each rubric. The posttest mean scores were higher than that of the pre-test in all rubrics categories. The total mean posttest experimental group was 10.2031, std. deviation 2.55297, std. error mean 1.3269 indicated that students writing performance were improved than the total mean pre-test experimental group 5.7945 std. deviation 2.43976 std. Error mean.49646.

But to examine whether the extent of the mean increment was significant or not, the researcher computed paired sample t-test. The presentation is seen in the table below

Table 8: Experimental group pre-test and posttest Paired Samples T-test

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig(2tailed)
	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	upper			
Pair1 Content Exp pre-post	-1.02032	.36112	.06012	-.98326	-.85959	-13.082	34	.003
Pair2 Organization Exp pre-post	-.83460	.61594	.11171	-.88509	-.58634	-6.6261	34	.000
Pair3 Language use Exp pre-post	-.81318	.44883	.08346	-.80625	-.62232	-8.679	34	.011
Pair4 mechanics Exp pre-post	-.27746	.83397	.14856	-.60284	-.05431	-1.373	34	.024
Pair5 Style Exp Pre-post	-.85603	.41680	.07805	-.83811	-.67618	-10.749	34	.007

The result in table 8 proved that there was a statistically significant increase in mean scores for all rubrics' scores result. That is in content score, it increases from pre-test (M=1.0103 SD=.47957 to post test score (M= 2.1318 &SD=.50172), $t(34) = -13.082$, $P = .003$, $P < .05$ (2tailed). The mean increase in post scores was -1.02032 with a 95% confidence interval boundary from --.98326 to -.85959. Organization scores also showed significant mean increase from pre (M=1.0603&SD= .3953) to posttest mean score (M=2.0750 &SD=.4352, $t(34) = -6.6261$, $P = .000$ $P < .05$ (2 tailed). The mean increase in post scores was $-.81318$ with a 95% confidence interval boundary from $-.88509$ to $-.58634$.

Similarly, language use scores mean increase from pre to posttest was (M=1.0603 &SD= .3953 and (M= 2.075 &SD= .4352), $t(34) = -8.679$, $P = .011$, $P < .05$ (2tailed). The mean score increased in post $-.81318$ with a 95% confidence interval boundary from $-.88509$ to $-.58634$. Mechanics scores also showed significance mean increase from pre (M=1.4675 &SD=.54380) to posttest mean score (M=1.8460 &SD= .73675), $t(34) = -1.373$, $P = .024$ $P < .05$ (2 tailed). The mean score increased in post $-.27746$ with a 95% confidence interval boundary from $-.60284$ to $-.05431$. The same way, style scores mean increase from pre to posttest was (M=1.1818 &SD= .50172 and (M= 2.1400 &SD= .44570, $t(34) = -10.749$, $P = .007$. $P < .05$ (2 tailed). The mean score increased in post $-.85603$ with a 95% confidence interval boundary from $-.83811$ to $-.67618$.The finding

shows that the intervention brought improvement on students writing performance. Therefore, the hypothesis (HO3) was rejected.

6. Discussions

In this section, the finding obtained from the analysis of quantitative data. The main instrument used in this study was questionnaire. First, the pre and post questionnaire discussions were administered for experimental and control group, then pre and post questionnaire experimental discussions were provided, finally pre and post questionnaire for each analytical rubric discussions were made.

The finding of pre-intervention questionnaire indicates the two group students have had equal perceptions of writing through integrated skills. The finding of the independent sample statistic and independent sample test result related to students' writing perception indicates that there was no any significance difference between control and experimental group. This implies that the pretest did not influence students' writing perception that they already had about writing perception. Whereas, the finding of post questionnaire on the same writing perception indicates a statistically significant mean score difference between the two groups. When made clear, the experimental group of students considerably improved their writing perception than the control group did. The possible reasons for this significant difference might be, first, the exposure of experimental group students to the intervention, whereas the control group students' were not. Literature confirm this finding noting as students with very poor writing skill, and negative attitude towards writing activity may be due to lack of teaching writing lessons through integrated skills (Oxford, 2001; Richard, 2001).

The findings in answering the research question two related to examining teaching writing through integrated skills on students writing perception varied before the intervention. The findings of students' writing perception on results for the experimental group participant significantly corroborate that of the pre-questionnaire finding in the low significant levels. In pre-questionnaire findings, there were low mean score experimental group students writing perception. From these findings, hence, we can reasonably conclude that the consistency of mean scores was not because of any defect in teaching and learning of integrated skills but non-exposure of students to intervention.

On the contrary, the finding of post- intervention questionnaire related to the writing process in line of before writing stage, during the writing stage, at post writing stage and the result of integrated skills teaching levels revealed that there was a considerable difference between the experimental groups on the post questionnaire result. In other words, before treatments students had no appropriate perception about integrated skills, whereas after treatment students' perception level improved because of intervention. This voice is echoed by Hailong(2017) concept that skills should lion share to each other to encourage students to improve their writing skills in English class.

The third reason can be the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills did to the students' during the writing process in line of contents, organization, language use, mechanics and style before and after intervention. Thus, it could be concluded that the intervention has brought change into experimental group students' writing perception so that the students significantly improved their writing perception than before the intervention. To this end, the finding tells us that teaching writing through integrated skills is a predictor for the students' writing perception and their writing skill to be improved. The above statement supports Jing (2006) idea. He proved that presenting lessons in integrated fashion help learners to see and use English to enhance their performance skills.

7. Conclusion

This means the results from the statistical analysis revealed that there was improvement between the pre-questionnaire and post questionnaire. This is because of teaching writing through integrated skills provide the basis for changing students' writing perception compared to students' learning English through the conventional method without teaching writing through integrated skills. The conclusion of the second objective was the intervention group resulted in the development of students' writing skills and perception change in the post questionnaire which could indicate that there is a relation between teaching writing through integrated skills and students writing skills perception change. The positive improvement of students' perception towards writing due to teaching writing through integrated skills also indicated that the students are more motivated and confident in writing activity after treatment. The conclusion of the third objective was the experimental group perception of students before and after intervention on pre-writing, while writing and post writing indicated that there was perception change between pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire on each writing stage due to treatment.

8. Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the researcher recommends the following:

- ❖ Investigating the effect of teaching writing through integrated skills on improving students' writing perception than conventional way of teaching writing skill is recommended.
- ❖ The improvement of students' perception after treatment than before treatment is recommended.
- ❖ The improvement of students' perception after treatment on each writing stages are recommended.
- ❖ Providing students with several opportunities to communicate and express their ideas and thoughts promotes their ideas and thoughts promotes their self-confidence and positive perception on teaching writing through integrated skills.
- ❖ Similar studies should be carried out on using integrated skills to enhance the reading skills, speaking or listening skills.
- ❖ This research can be replicated in high school on the other levels to investigate whether the results will be the same or not.

9. References

- Brewer, B., (1999). *Perception and Reason*. OUP, Oxford, England
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE. Thousand Oaks. USA.
- Cress Well, J. W. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed methods Approaches (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2011). Controversies in mixed methods research. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research, 4*, 269-284.
- Dorneyi, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Hailong, T. (1991). *An Integrated Approach to Text-based English Teaching*. Teaching English In China, ELT Newsletter, 23.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching 4 th ed*. Harlow: Pearson
- Jing, W. U. (2006). Integrating skills for teaching EFL—Activity design for the communicative classroom. *Sino-US English Teaching, 3(12)*, 122-133.
- Oxford, R. (2001). *Integrated Skills in the ESL/EFL Classroom*. ERIC Digest.
- Richards, J.C.(2001). *The Context of Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rogers. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd Edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.