

The Effect of Writing Practice on Improving Speaking Skill among Pre-intermediate EFL Learners

Ehsan Namaziandost

Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

Akram Abdi Saray

Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Salmas Branch, Islamic Azad University, Salmas, Iran

Fariba Rahimi Esfahani

Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

Abstract—The productive skills of a language are writing and speaking which share resembling elements. However, there has been rare endeavor to examine the effect of writing practice on the speaking improvement of the learners. This study investigated the effect of writing practice on improving speaking skill among pre-intermediate EFL learners. To this end, the researcher selected two pre-intermediate intact classes and randomly assigned them in two equal groups; one experimental group (n=25) and one control group (n=25). Then, both groups were pretested through a Key English Test. Afterwards, the respondents of the experimental group received the treatment which was learning speaking skill through writing practice. The control group was deprived of the treatment and they were taught in the classroom using traditional methods of teaching. After 20 sessions of treatment, the two groups were administered another sample of the Key English Test as post-test. Data were analyzed by Paired and Independent Samples t-test. The results indicated that not only writing proficiency, but also the speaking proficiency of the experimental group had significantly improved. The findings revealed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group ($p < .05$) on the post-test.

Index Terms—practice writing, writing proficiency, speaking proficiency, EFL, pre-intermediate learners

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Preliminaries

Developing the four principal skills of listening, reading, speaking and writing is indispensable for learning a new language; therefore, rehearsing the four modalities in differing degrees and amalgamation is a benignant way of teaching a foreign language (Oxford, 1990). As indicated by Jordan (1997), in learning a second language it is stressed that all the language skills ought to be worked on simultaneously and concentrating on one skill should not cut off learning the other skills. The language learning skills have been segregated into two primary groups containing receptive (listening and reading) and productive (writing and speaking) skills. Inspecting the interrelatedness among the ingredients of skills in every group as well as their reciprocal influence can result to the advancement of their factual usage in practicable teaching processes. This research chiefly centralized on the productive skills and the one-directional impact of writing practice on the speaking performance was investigated.

Speaking is characterized as the interpersonal function of language through which meaning is created and transmitted (Hughes, 2013) and “writing is an approach to yield language you accomplish naturally when you speak” (Meyers, 2005, p. 2). Hinkel (2013) claimed that acquiring an appropriate level of linguistic bases is essential for developing writing skill to empower students to overcome a range of lexical and grammatical skills needed for writing progression. According to Silva (1990), writing commonly pursues a standardized form of grammar, structure, and vocabulary which is inextricable from the structure of spoken sentences. As a result, writing practice not only aggrandize students’ vigilant notification of the sentence structures while speaking but promote their speaking proficiency. El-Koumy (1998) carried out a study interrogating the influence of dialogue journal writing on EFL students’ speaking proficiency, in which the findings uncovered the considerable performance of the experimental group. He appends that multiple investigations have dealt with writing skill from various perspectives but not presuming it as a means of speaking proficiency growth. Considering the resembling syntactic models in writing and speaking, the relevance between writing and speaking has been surveyed (Cleland & Pickering, 2006). Furthermore, Zhu (2007) demonstrated that high proficiency students write and speak better than low language proficiency ones. Regarding the extant relationship, the current study tried to examine the impact of writing practice on speaking development of pre-intermediate level students through the following questions.

B. Objectives and Significance of the Study

There have been rare similar studies which examined the effects of writing practice on improving Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill. Therefore, the main objective of the present study is to inspect the possible impacts of writing practice on Iranian EFL learners' speaking improvement. This study aims to enhance Iranian EFL learners' speaking through teaching them to practice writing more.

The findings of the present study may help Iranian EFL learners to be more fluent speakers through practice writing frequently. The current study can contribute to the existing literature on speaking instruction by examining the role of practice in writing. The results of the current study can encourage English teachers and material developers to provide the students with their favorite topics to maximize their learning. In addition, results of this study may convince English instructors and material developers that one source of L2 English speaking problems is the lack of practice in writing.

C. Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study is an attempt to answer the following research question:

RQ1. Does writing practice have any significant effect on improving Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' speaking skill?

RQ2. Is there any significant difference among Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' speaking improvement who practice writing frequently than those who did not?

This study is designed to test the following null hypothesis:

HO 1. Writing practice does not have any significant effect on improving Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill.

HO 2. There is not any significant difference among Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' speaking improvement who practice writing frequently than those who did not.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Second Language Writing

"Writing is a mandatory gadget for learning and communicating. We utilize writing as an inductor to collect, maintain and extend information" (Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2013, p. 5). As the result of various metamorphoses in opinions toward writing practice and its momentous role for second language learning, miscellaneous pedagogical approaches are suggested by diverse scholars (Matsuda, 2003), as well as a number of theories to protect teachers' genuine training and comprehending of L2 writing. The theories are viewed as components of a jigsaw and the goal of a modern theory is not to substitute the antiquated one but to function as a supplement (Hyland, 2003). Matsuda (2003) alludes that the approaches consist of writing as sentence-level structure, writing as discourse-level structure, writing as a process, and writing as language utilization in context. However, the categorization proposed by Hyland (2003) comprises of some more dimensions consisting of concentrating on language structure, text function, content (themes and topics), creative articulation, writing processes and genres and contexts of writing. The classifications reveal that guided writing is embedded into the first phase, writing as sentence-level structure. At this stage writing is assumed as a product that concentrate on text units, vocabulary selection, grammatical specifications, content, organization and cohesive instruments (Hyland, 2003). A proficient teacher requires to be able to teach sentence structures such as grammar, punctuation, capitalization, etc., and teaching these skills can simplify learning the sentence constructions in addition to boosting the quality of the entire text (Graham et al., 2013).

Moreover, Matsuda (2003) claims that controlled composition was likewise suggested at the first step and Pincas (1962) accentuates the significance of controlled and guided composition in similar stage in order to barricade mistakes happening owing to L1 to L2 transmutation. Matsuda (2003) also believes that controlled writing was produced out of behavioral and habit formation theory of learning, in which the emphasize was on the sentence level progression through replacement exercises (p. 19) that can obliterate the possibility of making mistakes (Pincas, 1982). Above all, Hyland (2003) elucidates training writing skill in four distinguished phases. The first phase entitled acquaintance tends to teach some grammatical structures and words. Via the second phase which is controlled writing, learners accomplish sentence-based activities. In the third phase writing happens based on a sample text which is named guided writing, and the last phase manages open writing exploiting the taught patterns. He likewise believes that task-based writing assignments by performing workouts suchlike complete in the gaps can be assisting and useful to controlled writing, and they can upgrade the students' attention on attaining accuracy and preventing mistakes (Pincas, 1982; Matsuda, 2003).

B. Interrelation between Writing and Speaking

Albeit writing and speaking are two segregate skills of language with special discrepancies, they both belong to the taxonomy of productive skills and because of sharing many similar members they are very much interdependent (Jordan, 1997). Writing appears too hard for students and learning to compose is even more intransigent. A teacher requires to create a convenient perimeter for learners to cheer them to compose and prepare them with obvious objectives and sensible expectances of what they aim to write (Graham et al., 2013). Weissberg (2006) believes that students can enhance their language skills in addition to their social interplay skills through vital writing practice, since oral and written skills share the identic strategies such as topic choice and giving remarks.

Writing can facilitate comprehension and reminiscing of the learning purpose. (Graham et al., 2013). Nation and Newton (2009) remark that, written input can be a very authoritative factor to patronize speaking. In a study on the impact of written input on communication, Newton (1995) discovered that all the vocabulary utilized by learners for negotiation are the ones present in their written input. The advancement of verbal working memory of the oral proficiency can straightly affect the quality of the writing assignments (MacArthur et al., 2008).

Concerning the relation among writing and speaking, Cleland and Pickering (2006) administered an examination in which they attempted to explore the mechanisms utilized in writing and speaking building distinctive syntactic examples, however they characterized syntactic priming as the propensity of the speaker to reduplicate formerly utilized syntactic structures. Applying three various tests with the utilization of syntactic priming, findings demonstrated that the syntactic operation rooted in both spoken and written production were similar. The consequence of their investigation is congruent with MacArthur et al.'s (2008) results that "There is a considerable interrelation between the sophistication of grammar or syntax in terms of density and embedding used in speech and writing" (p.172).

Zhu (2007) carried out a research in which the relationship between speaking and writing skill in college-level students was contemplated. In their examination the syntactic development of 10 college-level ESL students currently studying in an American university was decomposed both in speaking and writing, and the consequences revealed that there is a positive connection among college-level ESL students' speaking and writing proficiency. The result demonstrated that high skilled students had both superior writing and speaking potency than the low proficient ones. The common crucial cognitive potencies among writing and oral language makes the two especially related to each other (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2008).

Generally, going through diverse studies related to writing and speaking skills, it was indicated that numerous researchers have worked on these two skills independently or in some instances concerning their help to throughout language learning, but none of these researches examined the reciprocating connection among writing and speaking. In general, theoretically it is believed that there is a noteworthy relationship among writing and speaking skill (Brown, 2001; Bygate, 1987; Luoma, 2004; Nation & Newton, 2009; Newton, 1995; Rivers, 1981; Zhu, 2007) but empirically the sole and the most pertinent study is the one carried out by El-Koumy (1998), in which he propounded the impact of dialogue journal writing on the speaking proficiency of the learners. Thus, this examination intended to explore the effect of writing practice on speaking improvement of pre-intermediate EFL learners, which has seldom come to the focus of consideration in studies administered by other researchers.

C. Empirical Background

Rausch (2015) in a study researched the possible relation among speaking and listening skills for English learners. In addition to the analysis of standardized test consequences in these areas, pre- and post-test findings and student studies were checked to specify the impact of teaching in discursive speaking on students' potency to write contentiously. Discoveries contained:

1. English learners would be best served by premeditated layout of speaking training which utilizes scaffolding and analysis of instances to train standard academic language models and heuristics.
2. Such deliberate teaching of speaking seems to be transmissible, also profiting English learners' writing skills. However, while students are able to outstretch skills relating to critical analysis and organization, they will require extra training on skills, for instance, spelling and other conventions, which are monopolized to writing.
3. Instructing rhetoric through applying speaking amplitude additionally exhibits the merit of accentuating the requirement for lucrative schematization. The time-bound nature of speaking, which doesn't permit for considerable pausing or reconsideration, obliges learners to adopt beneficent planning propensities that, when exchanged to writing, become extremely advantageous.

Furthermore, Fathali and Sotoudehnama (2015) utilizing a pretest-posttest controlled group plan in a quasi-experimental approach examined the impact of guided writing practice on the speaking proficiency of Iranian EFL students. Two elementary intact classes which were arranged based on the institute's placement test were chosen for the examination. The homogeneity of the students was investigated via Key English Test (2007) as the pretest of the research, and the classes were randomly divided into the experimental group (n=26) and the control group (n=26). The experimental group was furnished with 10 guided writing worksheets in the last 15 to 20 minutes of the class, while the control group went through the method of a usual institute class in which they dealt with workbook activities within the aforesaid time. The quantitative analysis of the posttest utilizing an independent samples t-test demonstrated that not only writing proficiency, but also the speaking proficiency of the experimental group had outstandingly developed. Furthermore, at end of the semester a semi-structured interview investigated the experimental group learners' attitudes toward the function of writing practice in enhancing their speaking skill. The content analysis of the interview transcriptions uncovered that the learners keep positive attitudes toward the guided writing worksheets at the end of the term, though they did not have the identical attitude at the outset.

III. METHOD

A. Participants

To carry out this study, two intact pre-intermediate classes were selected from a private language institute in Ahvaz, Khuzestan, Iran. The two intact classes were randomly assigned into the experimental (n=25) and the control group (n=25) of the study. Albeit they were specified to this level based on the institute's rigid criteria and placement test, in order to make sure of the homogeneity of the participants in the two groups regarding their writing and speaking potency, which were the major focus of the study, they all participated in the speaking and writing parts of a sample of Cambridge Key English Test (2007). The participants were all male and their age range was between 13 to 16. The first language of all participants was Persian.

B. Instrumentation

The writing and speaking parts of Key English Test (KET) was applied as the pre-test of the study. Cambridge examinations cover all four language skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing. They are planned around four necessary qualities: validity, reliability, impact and practicality.” (University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations, 2008, p. 2). Speaking section has two parts (Interview, Collaborative task) which must be taken it with another candidate. There were two testers. One tester talks to student and the other tester listens. Both examiners give scores for students' efficiency. The writing section has four parts (Word completion, Open cloze, Information transfer, Guided writing). Although the reliability of KET has been previously surveyed and approved by the University of Cambridge, the researchers once more investigated the reliability of the speaking section, the main concern of the study, through the parallel speaking tests of the study. The reliability was found to be 0.96, which showed the test to be reliable for the present study (Larson-Hall, 2010).

Finally, another sample of writing and speaking sections of KET was performed as posttest of the study to examine the impact of treatment, i.e., writing practice on speaking skill. Also, the reliability of the posttest was also checked resembling to pretest and it was .091.

C. Data Collection Procedures

In the first step, 50 homogeneous pre-intermediate participants were selected and randomly divided into two groups- experimental group and control group. Then both groups were pretested through a test containing the writing and speaking sections of the sample Key English Test (2007). Students of both experimental and control groups were at pre-intermediate level and they studied *Interchange* of Cambridge University Press. After that, the researcher practiced the treatment on experimental group which was using writing practice. Both experimental and comparison groups passed a period of 12 sessions, in which each session lasted about 70 minutes. In a typical institute class, the teacher teaches the student's book for about 70 to 75 minutes, and during the remaining time students can work on the workbook exercises or any additional activities provided by the teacher to improve second language learning. The workbook exercises contain a diversity of activities suitable with vocabulary and grammar structures of the targeted unit. Furthermore, during the treatment, the researcher provided multiple extra assignments for experimental group on writing including writing about 150 words on a topic and then practice it for speaking. In each session, one topic was given to the whole group and ask them to write whatever they know about it; then after practicing it, they should speak what they have written. In another activity, the researcher gave a text to students and asked them to summarize it, then speak whatever they understand from the text. Moreover, the researcher gave a sequence of pictures which the student must write a short story and finally every student loudly spoke what he wrote. It is worth mentioning the many activities including writing model texts such as letters, postcards, and personal information writings were also performed in the experimental group.

The control group of this study elapsed a typical institute class and dealt with their workbook exercises for about 25 minutes at the end of each session, whereas the experimental group learners were prepared with various writing activities during the last 25 minutes at the end of every session. At the end of the term the writing and speaking section of another sample of the Key English Test was utilized as the posttest of the research. The writing and speaking tests were all registered, transcribed and scored based on Cambridge ESOL examination instruction for speaking at the pre-intermediate level. To make sure about the reliability of the speaking scores, pre-test and post-test transcriptions were rescored by another teacher who was present in the exam sessions as well. In order to examine the internal consistency of the two sets of scores by the two raters, Cronbach Alpha coefficient was utilized (Dornyei, 2007). Internal consistency of the scores were affirmed by the Cronbach Alpha 0.913 for the pre-test scores and 0.963 for the post-test scores respectively.

D. Data Analysis Procedures

After gathering the data through the above-stated instruments, the scores of each group were calculated and compared with each other. The data were analyzed with the help of SPSS (Statistical Firstly, in order to check the normality of the data, Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was applied. Package for Social Science) software. Then, Independent and paired samples t-test were also applied to get the final results.

IV. RESULTS

In order to analyze the gathered data, the SPSS software version 25 (Statistical Package for Social Science) software was used. First of all, it is worth mentioning that the normality of the distribution of both pretest ($Z= 1.248$; $p =0.089$) and posttest scores ($Z= 0.793$; $p =0.556$) was checked through One-sample K-S and the findings revealed that test distribution was normal.

TABLE 1.
GROUP STATISTICS (PRE-TEST OF BOTH GROUPS)

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Pre-test	Experimental group	25	15.0000	2.72336	.54467
	Control group	25	15.2800	2.03142	.40628

In table 1, the descriptive statistics of both groups is presented. The means of both groups are almost equal. The control group's mean score is 15.2800 and the experimental group's mean score is 15.0000. This means that both groups are somehow similar since they are homogeneous at the beginning of the treatment.

TABLE 2.
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST (PRE-TEST OF BOTH GROUPS)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3.374	.072	-.412	48	.682	-.280	.679	-1.646	1.086
Equal variances not assumed			-.412	44.39	.682	-.280	.679	-1.649	1.089

Table 2 shows the scores of both groups on the pre-test. Since the Sig (.682) is greater than 0.05, the difference between the groups is not significant at ($p<0.05$). In fact, they were at the same level before receiving the treatment.

TABLE 3.
GROUP STATISTICS (POST-TEST OF BOTH GROUPS)

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Post-test	Experimental	25	26.4400	1.60935	.32187
	Control	25	21.8000	2.30940	.46188

Table 3 displays the descriptive statistics of both groups on the post-test. The means of the groups are different. The experimental group's mean score is 26.4400 and the control group's mean score is 21.8000. This means that the experimental group outperformed the control group on the post-test.

TABLE 4.
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES T-TEST (POST-TEST OF BOTH GROUPS)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.792	.187	8.24	48	.000	4.640	.562	3.50808	5.77192
Equal variances not assumed			8.24	42.8	.000	4.640	.562	3.504	5.775

Table 4 demonstrates the post-test scores of control and experimental groups. Since the Sig (.000) is less than (0.05), there was a significant difference between the mean scores of post-test in both experimental and control groups. The experimental groups got better scores on the post-test. It can be concluded that the treatment had positive effects on the performance of the experimental groups on the post-test.

TABLE 5.
PAIRED SAMPLES STATISTICS (PRE AND POST-TESTS OF BOTH GROUPS)

Pair 1	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Exp. Pre	15.0000	25	2.72336	.54467
	26.4400	25	1.60935	.32187
Pair 2	15.2800	25	2.03142	.40628
	21.8000	25	2.30940	.46188

Based on the descriptive statistics in Table 4.5, the mean scores of the experimental group on the pre and post-tests are 15.0000 and 26.4400 respectively. The mean scores of the control group on the pre and post-tests are 15.2800 and 21.8000 respectively.

TABLE 6.
PAIRED SAMPLES TEST (PRE AND POST-TESTS OF BOTH GROUPS)

Paired Differences		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Exp. Post – Exp. Pre	11.44	2.873	.574	10.253	12.626	19.90	24	.000
Pair 2	Cont. Pre- Post	6.52	2.709	.541	5.401	7.638	12.03	24	.000

In the table above, paired samples t-test is used to compare the pre and post-tests of each group. Since Sig (.000) is less than 0.05, the difference between the post-test and pre-test of the experimental group is significant. So, instruction was effective in the experimental group. Moreover, as Sig (.000) is less than 0.05, the difference between the post-test and pre-test of the control group is also significant.

V. DISCUSSION

After analyzing the data and obtaining the results, the researcher arrives at the discussion section to answer the question and compare and contrast it with the previous studies. So the question of the present research is answered below.

RQ1. Does writing practice have any significant effect on improving Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' speaking skill?

This study focused on the possible effect of writing practice on Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill. The students' pretest and posttest scores on speaking were analyzed to see if there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of speaking improvement. The results of the descriptive statistics of the groups indicated that the experimental group outperformed the control group on the posttest measure of speaking improvement.

In order to test whether this difference between the groups is large enough to reject the null hypothesis at the significance level of .05, an independent samples t-test was used. Upon reviewing the results of the independent samples t-test, the experimental group turned out to significantly outperform the control group after the intervention, indicating that the writing practice activities were successful in enhancing Iranian EFL learners' speaking while answering grammar tests. Hence, the null hypothesis of the study that "writing practice does not have any significant effect on improving Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill" was rejected at .05 level of significance.

Results of the posttest indicated the positive effect of writing practice on both writing and speaking ability development of the learners. Based on the results of the study, the authors now believe that writing practice is beneficial, not only in support of writing proficiency, but also in speaking enhancement at the pre-intermediate levels of language proficiency. Furthermore, the findings of the study support the previous study carried out by El-Koumy (1998) who checked the impact of dialogue journal writing on EFL students' speaking skill, in which results demonstrated that the experimental group equipped with dialogue journal writing, considerably outperformed the control group regarding speaking development.

According to Rivers (1981), absence or lack of systematic practice in primal stages of language learning can bring deficiencies in advanced levels. Since pre-intermediate level students are repeatedly persuaded to work on writing high-handedly, they usually state themselves via connective phrases and extravagant types of native language. As a result, Hyland (2003) stresses the significance of the four stages of familiarization, controlled writing, guided writing and ultimately open writing in the process of instructing and rehearsing writing skill, and he take to account this hierarchy as an indispensable factor for learners' writing advancement. Accordingly, it is essential to pay attention to the appropriate way of writing practice from the primary stages of language learning in order to hamper fossilization of inaccurate forms.

Concerning the connection among writing and speaking, many researchers believe in resemblances and discrepancies between these two skills. These comparisons and contrasts contain both theoretical (Brown, 2001; Bygate, 1987; Chastain, 1976; Jordan, 1997; Luoma, 2004) and practicable dimensions (Cleland & Pickering, 2006; El-koumy, 1998; Hyes, 1988; Zhu, 2007).

It is believed that although writing and speaking are two segregated skills, they both belong to the productive skills of language and they share some identical elements, these two skills are related to each other but with diverse ways of production (Cleland & Pickering, 2006; Oxford, 1990). Although numerous scholars trust in the diversity among spoken and written language theoretically, this study as a practicable one showed that writing can be fruitful for the

progression of both writing and speaking proficiency. In other words, the theoretical differences between writing and speaking have not functioned as impediments in contributing one to the other.

RQ2. Is there any significant difference among Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' speaking improvement who practice writing frequently than those who did not?

In order to arrive at a logical answer to the second research question, the obtained data were analyzed through independent and paired samples t-tests. According to results presented in result section, there was a significant difference in speaking scores among experimental group using writing practice and control group which received instruction directly and conventionally by the teacher. Based on obtained results the means of two groups were different. Based on the result section, there were significant differences between the two groups. The results of the post-test may show the difference between the two groups in case of the use of writing practice. The experimental group of writing practice instruction outperformed the group of traditional instruction. It shows that the use of writing practice might be of more use than the use of traditional concerning speaking improvement. So, the second null hypothesis was rejected. Generally, the results showed that the experimental group's scores were higher than the control group's score which shows the positive effect of writing practice instruction on speaking enhancement.

The findings of this study are in line with Fathali and Sotoudehnama (2015) who checked the impact of guided writing practice on the speaking proficiency of Iranian EFL students. The quantitative analysis of the posttest utilizing an independent samples t-test demonstrated that not only writing proficiency, but also the speaking proficiency of the experimental group had outstandingly enhanced.

VI. CONCLUSION

The major concern of the present study was to explore the effectiveness of writing practice training on speaking proficiency of the EFL students. Findings of the current study revealed that writing practice can affect both writing and speaking improvement of the pre-intermediate EFL learners significantly. It can be deduced that, writing practice not only can help writing proficiency, but can also be highly beneficial in advancing speaking proficiency of pre-intermediate learners. Through the consequences of the speaking post-test, it was manifested that students had progressed significantly utilizing accurate grammatical structures and vocabulary items. Hence, the findings of the study can urge the EFL teachers to train predestinated grammatical structures via writing practice, in order to hinder the fossilization of fallacious structures which may occur through speaking practice. The study can likewise notify the EFL teachers about the importance of the interrelation among language skills and the significance of consisting writing practice in the syllabus of language teaching classes even at the pre-intermediate levels. Moreover, the result of the present study can work as a guideline for material developers in designing English course books and stress the merits of consisting various types of writing practice for pre-intermediate level students.

Further studies can also be performed for adults and higher levels of language proficiency with other types of writing. It is worth noting that the learners of this research were only males and carrying out a further examination with female students may result into various results.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Pearson.
- [2] Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [3] Cleland, A. A., & Pickering, M. J. (2006). Do writing and speaking employ the same syntactic representations? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 54(2), 185-198.
- [4] El-Koumy, A. S. A. (1998). Effect of dialogue journal writing on EFL students' speaking skill. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED424772).
- [5] Fathali, S., & Sotoudehnama, E. (2015). The impact of guided writing practice on the speaking proficiency and attitude of EFL elementary learners. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 7 (1), 1-25.
- [6] Graham, S., MacArthur, C. A., & Fitzgerald, J. (2013). *Best practices in writing instruction* (2nd). New York, NY: Guilford.
- [7] Hinkel, E. (2013). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [8] Hughes, R. (2013). *Teaching and researching: speaking* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [9] Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.), (2008). *Handbook of writing research*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- [13] Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*, 12(2), 15-34.
- [14] Meyers, A. (2005). *Gateways to academic writing: Effective sentences, paragraphs, and essays*. London, UK: Longman.
- [15] Newton, J. (1995). Task-based interaction and incidental vocabulary learning: A case study. *Second Language Research*, 11(2), 159-176.
- [16] Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [17] Oxford, R.L. (1990). Language learning strategies and beyond: A look at strategies in the context of styles. In S.S. Magnan (Ed.), *shifting the instructional focus to the learner* (pp.35-55). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

- [18] Pincas, A. (1962). Structural linguistics and systematic composition teaching to students of English as a foreign language. *Language Learning*, 12(3), 185-194.
- [19] Pincas, A. (1982). Teaching English writing. London, UK: Macmillan.
- [20] Rausch, P. (2015). The Relationship between English Speaking and Writing Proficiency and Its Implications for Instruction. *Culminating Projects in English*, 10, 1-61.
- [21] Rivers, W. M. (1981). Teaching foreign language skills (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [22] Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Development, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp.11-23). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- [23] Weissberg, R. (2006). Connecting speaking and writing in second language writing instruction. Ann Arbor, US: The University of Michigan Press.
- [24] Zhu, X.-h. (2007). what do we know about the relationship between speaking and writing in college-level ESL students? *US-China Foreign Language*, 5(3), 31-40.

Ehsan Namaziandost was born in Shiraz Province of Iran in 1985. He holds an MA degree in TEFL from Islamic Azad University of Ahvaz. Now, he is a Ph.D. student in TEFL at Islamic Azad University of Shahrekord. His main interests of research are second language acquisition, EFL teaching, teaching and testing, teaching speaking, communication and language learning strategies. His research papers and articles have been published by different international journals.

Akram Abdi Saray was born in West Azerbaijan Province of Iran in 1993. She holds a master's degree in TE FL from Islamic Azad University of Salmas. Her major research interests are translation and vocabulary learning.

Fariba Rahimi Esfahani is a faculty member at Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord Branch. She got her PhD in applied linguistics from Science and Research branch at Khorasgan, Esfahan. Her research interests are second language vocabulary learning and teaching, linguistics, and code switching.