A Study on the Application of the Xu-Based Approach in English Majors' Writing Teaching

Yanmei Wei[a] , Fangfang Wang *

353284245@qq.com* , [a]Weiyan106@163.com

Liuzhou Institute of Technology , Liuzhou Guangxi 545616

Abstract: The study combined with reading comprehension and writing exercises to improve students' English writing ability and scores. This study is based on the language input hypothesis, the language output hypothesis and the synergy theory and previous research. The Xu-Based Approach is used in writing teaching in the experimental class, and the traditional writing method is used in the control class.The results of this research show that Xu-Based Approach provides reading comprehension with writing practice, so that the input and output of the language are combined and promoted. The application of this method combines imitation and creativity, and has many advantages over other teaching methods.

Keywords: the Xu-Based Approach Teaching Model, English writing teaching, English majors

1   Introduction

Writing is one of the basic skills of English.---It is a basic skill of language learning. Students are required to practice this skill and apply it to their daily lives. English learners now have many writing problems, such as vocabulary, structure, and content. Loose vocabulary, grammar, and structure problems are common among students in English writing. As Nunan (1998) asserts, the most difficult part in language learning is to write coherent, rich, and fluent compositions.[1] Second, Hyland (2003) argues that writing as a writing skill is essential for students and for teachers. [2]Writing is helpful to improve foreign language abilities.

In view of the current writing situation of domestic students, it is necessary for us to seek a practical and effective writing teaching method. Based on the theory of second language acquisition, input and output theory, Professor Wang Chuming put forward the writing teaching method of "reading after writing". By continuing to write an incomplete English reading book to promote learners' writing ability and stimulate writing ideas. [11]This writing method is considered as an effective combination of reading and writing.

2 Literature Review

2.1 The Definition of the Xu-Based Approach Writing

The Xu-Based Approach writing refers to erasing the end of the selected reading article according to the student's English level, and the student continues to write the first half of the article based on the understanding given after reading the first half.[12]

This is an effective way to improve imagination. It is usually a passage given to the student that has no ending. Students need to add the ending based on the given content. This task has four requirements. Take a teaching case *Enjoy Your Whole Life* as an example: First, the general part of the continuation is about 150. Second, in the continuation part, students are required to write two paragraphs, each with the first sentence. Third, there are exactly ten underlined words and phrases （e..g:unforgettable, childhood, happy, painful, hate, pleasure,forbidden,joys and pains,different ages,enjoy） in a given paragraph, and students are required to use at least five underlined words or phrases. Fourth, students should emphasize the words used after the task. Depending on the task, their choice of content, structure and language should be consistent with the given part.

2.2 Theoretical Basis

2.2.1 Input hypothesis theory

The input hypothesis was developed by Krashen. Krashen(1985) showed in this theory that there is only one way people can acquire language acquisition. The only way to do this is by understanding the information and the learner accepts intelligible input. Understandable input means that the language input should exceed the current standard of the learner. Moreover, learners will only focus on understanding the information rather than the form of the information. Only in this way can learners gain language knowledge.[3][5]

To sum up, Krashen's input hypothesis provides solid theoretical support for reading follow-up writing. In the writing task of reading and writing, the first prerequisite for successful writing is reading. Only by reading and understanding the article and grasping the overall structure of the article can students develop their imagination and continue to write the development plot of the story as much as possible.

2.2.2 Output hypothesis theory

If there is no language output, the ultimate goal of practically using the language is difficult to achieve. This means that the theory of input hypothesis cannot support this language learning process. However, researchers point out that "understandable input alone is not enough. After observing students in French immersion courses, Swain believes that those students who perform well in listening and reading exams are not good at speaking and writing. Language input and output are very related. Language input emphasizes the ability to understand and absorb, while language output requires the use and creation of learners.[4]

The role of the output hypothesis in second language acquisition cannot be underestimated, as follows: (1) For second language acquisition, more language and writing exercises are very important. (2) The output of language not only motivates learners to use the knowledge they

have already learned, but it also reminds them that there is still language knowledge that they have not yet mastered. (3) Learners can obtain corresponding feedback through language output to test the target language acquisition level.[3]

2.2.3 Interactive synergy theory

Synergy in language research generally refers to social cognitive processes in which people cooperate with each other, adjust dynamically, and adapt to each other in interaction. Understanding synergy from the perspective of language learning. Collaboration occurs not only between people, but also between people and society and the physical environment. It is the key to second language acquisition. Synergy, simply，Simply put, the effect of "1 + 1> 2" was first proposed in 1971. The effect of "1 + 1> 2" is the principle of division of labor and cooperation, which improves efficiency through reasonable division of labor. It has attracted the attention of many scholars in the field of linguistics. Collaboration refers to the process in which people adjust and cooperate in communication and interaction to make the two adapt to each other. [6]Wang Chuming shows that foreign language learning can be improved through interaction, understanding, collaboration, output, and learning.[12]

2.3   The Related Research at Home and Abroad

As early as 1994, Chinese scholar Xie Weina proved that there is an independent relationship between the reading process and the writing process. Moreover, they all have a great influence and interaction with each other. Studies have shown that when teaching writing, teachers should combine reading with writing, which is very helpful for students.[9]

In 1999, scholar Yan Junyu also pointed out that reading is a very important part of writing. He explained that without the words and the accumulation of language in reading, it is impossible to express the author's thoughts smoothly through writing. Yan Junyu's statement reinforces that reading has a significant impact on writing.[7][15]

In addition, Chinese scholars Zhang Yan, Xu Qing, Zhang Qiang, Jiang Jianjun, etc. have also made corresponding researches on reading follow-up writing.Both of them brought the reading follow-up writing into the English class, analyzed the teaching materials, selected the rewriting materials, analyzed the learner's level, selected the correct class method, guided the students to continue writing, and took full advantage of the rewriting, Finally they concluded that although it is difficult to read subsequent writing. reading follow-up writing can not only examine students' writing ability, but also examine their reading comprehension ability. Can cultivate students' creativity and imagination.[13][14]

Many foreign scholars also attach great importance to the relationship between reading and writing, and have done a lot of research.

Carson (1993) affirmed the view that reading has an important role in English writing. He believes that language learners can improve their writing skills by expanding their reading reserves. The criterion for judging a language learner as a good reader is whether he can obtain writing ability through a large number of reading exercises and ensure the quality and level of writing.[8]

Hirvela (2004) has her own opinion on the combination of reading and writing. She believes that learners should capture the useful information in the discourse by reading, and transcribe the extracted information in their own way of expression.[10]

To sum up, reading follow-up writing are combined and promote each other. Reading provides a lot of material for writing, and writing communicates with learners in words. The essence of writing is to let the reader understand the ultimate intention of the author. It can be seen that the relationship between reading and writing cannot be underestimated.

3   Experimental Design

3.1   Experimental Subjects

In this study, 100 freshmen of English majors were selected from the Class 1 , Class 2 and Class 3 in the authors' college, which including 85 female students and 15 male students. The three classes are ordinary classes. Judging from the writing scores, there is no obvious difference between the three classes. The learning levels are equal, so the writing abilities of the three classes are at similar levels. Class 1and Class2 are experimental classes and Class 3 is the control class.The experimental class uses the teaching method of reading and writing.The control class uses traditional writing teaching methods for a period of 12 weeks, and students will undergo writing training every two weeks.

3.2   Experimental Tool

3.2.1 Questionnaires

The questionnaires for the students in the experimental class include pre-experimental questionnaires and post-experimental questionnaires.The first questionnaire consisted of 15 questions, which investigate students' English writing learning status. The second questionnaire was filled after the teaching experiment and contains 18 questions, which is to investigate the changes in student's interest in English writing after the reading follow-up writing teaching method.

3.2.2 Pre-test and Post Test

In order to that ensuring the credibility and authenticity of the data of the control class and the experimental class, this study takes the English writing scores of the academic evaluation test in the first semester of the 2022-2023 school year as the pre-test scores. After 12 weeks of teaching experiments, the experimental class and the control class also participated in the final exam of the first semester of the 2022-2023 school year of the author's college.The test paper is moderate in difficulty and has a certain degree of educational significance.

4   Analysis of the Experiment Results and Discussion

4.1   Analysis of the Pre-experimental and Post- experimental questionnaire

Before the experiment, a questionnaire analysis was performed on the students, which included the current writing status of the students and their current interest in writing.In the ques-

tionnaire, we can find that before the experiment, more than 75% of the students had a negative attitude towards English writing, and they could even say that they hated English writing. By the same token, only 25% of students have a positive attitude towards English writing. We can also see that 55% of students write compositions only once a month.

The post questionnaire can show that 78% of students think that reading the follow-up survey method has the effect of improving English writing interest. At the same time, 66% of the students believed that their self-confidence in writing was enhanced by reading and writing later. Another good thing is that 64% of students think that their English scores have improved through this 12-week experiment. Of course, 10% of them think that this way of teaching is not effective for their English learning.

4.2   Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Result

To ensure the credibility and authenticity of the data, this study takes the English writing scores of the Academic Assessment Test in the 2022-2023 school year as the pretest scores. By using SPSS 26.0 analysis, the average score of the experimental class is 15.173, with a standard deviation of 3.2219, and the average of the control class is 15.135, with a standard deviation of 3.2161. Therefore, we can see that the writing scores of the two classes are both average, Standard deviation, or standard error of the mean are all closer. In order to achieve statistical significance analysis, an independent sample T test was performed, and the results are as follows:The Levene test P value of variance shown in Table 1 is .998> 0.05, assuming that the population variances are equal. Under the null hypothesis that the population variances are equal, the p-value for interpreting the T test result is .953> 0.05, then the mean values of the two classes are considered equal. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the overall level of the two classes, and experiments can be performed.

Table1. T-test for the mean equation

	Levene test of variance equation		T-test for the mean equation						
								95% confidence interval of the difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(two sides)	Mean difference	Standard error Difference	Lower limit	Upper limit

equal variances	.000	.998	.059	98	.953	.0382	.6439	-1.2397	1.3160
variances are not equal			.059	97.82	.953	.0382	.6439	-1.2397	1.3160

Table2 is the correlation analysis of the pre-test and post-test results of the experimental class, and the correlation analysis of the pre-test and post-test results of the control class, where the correlation coefficient between the pre-test and post-test results of the P value is .00 <0.001, so the difference is significant at the 95% confidence level, and there is a significant correlation between the pre-test and post-test results, which meets the prerequisite for using the paired sample T test.

Table2. The Correlation Analysis of the Pre-test and Post-test Results

		N	Correlation coefficient	Sig.
Experimental class	Pre-test results&Post-Test Results	64	.747	.000
Comparison class	Pre-test results&Post-Test Results	36	.977	.000

The results show that the pre-test and post-rest results of experimental class are t = -13.895, (P <0.05).Therefore, the pre-test and post-rest results of the experimental class are different, and the post-rest result of the experimental class are higher. The pre-test and post-rest results of control class are t =-13.185,(P <0.05). so pre-test and post-rest results of control class are also different, and the post-rest result of control class are higher.

The average scores of the experimental class and the control class was measured. They were 19.429 and 16.402. the "Levene test of the variance equation" has a P value of 0.071> 0.05, assuming that the variances are equal. The t-test sig (two-sided) of the interpretation equation = 0 <0.05, so reject the null hypothesis that the two groups of means are equal. Although in the previous analysis we can see that the post-test results of the experimental class and the control class have improved, but the average difference between the two post-test results is 3.0266. There are obvious differences. Therefore, the second problem of this study was verified again: the application of the reading-after-write mode in English writing teaching in English majors' can improve students' English writing performance.

4.3   Implications of Reading Follow-up Writing Teaching Model

The implications of this study are as follows:

First, we must attach importance to the relationship between reading and writing, and combine reading and writing. Krashen emphasized that there must be sufficient input for language learning. In this study, not only provided students with language input during the continuation process, but also provided context and writing support. Students can obtain language information, imitate language, and express their opinions. This way of combining reading with

writing help students with language output.Second, we must be good at cultivating students' thinking. In this study, reading subsequent writing is positive in improving students' thinking. Reading and subsequent writing combine reading and writing closely, as well as language input and output. Third, give timely and effective feedback. The college learning stage is a relatively important stage in the learning life of each student. Teachers' effective feedback in writing is not only expressed in scores, but should be given guidance from various aspects to help students realize where they need to improve.

5   Conclusion

The reading follow-up reading teaching method is a method that combines reading comprehension with writing practice, so that the input and output of the language are combined and promoted. The application of this method combines imitation and creativity, and has many advantages over other learning methods. This study clearly pointed out that the application of reading and subsequent writing methods can indeed improve the writing interest and writing ability of English majors.In the follow-up reading teaching classroom, teachers use a combination of reading and writing, and students can accumulate vocabulary and sentence patterns in reading materials and apply them to the content of continuation so that the students can improve their language organization ability and writing performance.

References

[1] Nunan,D. Allison, D. Cooley,L,.Lewkowicz,Jo(1998) Dissertation writing in action: The development of a dissertation writing support program for ESL graduate research students.English for Specific Purposes. PP: 199-217.DOI:10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00011-2

[2] Hyland, T. Bolton, T,(2003) Implementing Key Skills in Further Education: perceptions and issues. Journal of Further and Higher Education.PP:15-26. DOI：10.1080/03098770305630.

[3] Krashen,S.(1981) Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. New York: Pergamon Press.

[4] Krashen,S.(1982) Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.

[5] Krashen,S.(1985) The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implication. London and New York: Longman.

[6] Jegerski Jill.(2021)Krashen and second language processing.Foreign Language Annals.PP：318-323. https://DOI: 10.1111/FLAN.12557.

[7] Yuly Asención Delaney.(2008) Investigating the reading-to-write construct. Journal of English for Academic Purposes. PP: 140-150 https://DOI：10.1016/j.jeap.2008.04.001.

[8] D.F.Ge(2015) Effects of Writing RoadmapTM 2.0 on Teachers in English Writing Teaching In International Conference on Industrial Technology and Management Science(ITMS 2015). Tianjin.PP: 96-98.

[9] Wenxiu Song (2022)Strategies for Teaching English Writing in Senior High School Based on Subject Core Literacy: A Case Study of Follow-up Writing after Reading. Journal of Educational Research and Policies. https://DOI：10.53469/JERP.2022.04(05).06.

[10]　Nygren T.(2014)Students writing history using traditional and digital archives. Human IT. PP: 78-116. https://DOI: 10.1016/S2214-109X(15)70122-1.

[11]　Wang,C.(2016) Learning by Extension. Modern Foreign Languages. PP: 784-793+873.

[12]　Wang,C.(2021) The Xu-Based Approach to Second Language Learning.Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. PP: 267-272.

[13]　Wang,C&Wang,M.(2015). Effect of alignment on L2 written production. Applied Linguistics.PP:503-526.

[14]　Rassaei, E.(2017).Effects of three forms of reading-based output activity on L2 vocabulary learning. Language Teaching Research.pp:76-95.https://DOI：10.1177/1362168815606160.

[15]　Abdi Tabari Mahmoud.(2021)Task preparedness and L2 written production: Investigating effects of planning modes on L2 learners' focus of attention and output. Journal of Second Language Writing. .https://DOI：10.1016/J.JSLW.2021.100814.