

U2AL-AZHAR UNIVERSITY
BULLETIN OF THE FACULTY
OF
LANGUAGES & TRANSLATION



جامعة الأزهر
مجلة كلية اللغات والترجمة

The Efficacy of Drawing as A Prewriting Aid for Enhancing Writing Skills Among Adult Learners

by

Dr. Haytham Bakri

*College of Language Sciences, King Saud University,
Riyadh 11652, Saudi Arabia*

The Efficacy of Drawing as A Prewriting Aid for Enhancing Writing Skills Among Adult Learners

Haytham Bakri

College of Language Sciences, King Saud University, Riyadh 11652, Saudi Arabia

Email: hbakri@ksu.edu.sa

Abstract :This study aimed to assess the effectiveness of drawing as a writing tool for adult learners. The research was conducted through empirical qualitative methods, involving the participation of 15 MA candidates in their first semester at King Saud University, Saudi Arabia. The data was gathered through four approaches: drawing, interviews, observation, and document analysis. The process involved closely observing the participants and recording the time they took to complete tasks, which then allowed for their categorization into three groups (A, B, and C) based on their writing and drawing capabilities and preferences. The results of the study indicated that participants faced more challenges when writing alone but found drawing to be a helpful prewriting activity. These findings offer guidance to adult educators looking to integrate drawing and writing into engaging lessons. By using drawing as a prewriting activity, adult learners can effectively enhance their writing skills.

Keywords :Drawing, Adult Learners, Writing Classrooms, Prewriting Activity, Document Analysis.

أثر استخدام الرسم كأداة مساعدة في مرحلة ما قبل الكتابة على تعزيز مهارات الكتابة لدى المتعلمين البالغين

هيثم طلال بكري

كلية اللغات وعلومها، جامعة الملك سعود، الرياض، المملكة العربية السعودية.

Email: hbakri@ksu.edu.sa : البريد الإلكتروني

ملخص: هدفت هذه الدراسة تقييم فاعلية الرسم كأداة مساعدة للكتابة لدى المتعلمين البالغين. اعتمدت الدراسة منهجية بحثية نوعية تجريبية، وشملت عينة مكونة من خمسة عشر طالبًا في برنامج الماجستير (الفصل الدراسي الأول) بجامعة الملك سعود. جُمعت البيانات باستخدام أربعة مناهج بحثية متكاملة، هي: الرسم، المقابلات، الملاحظة، وتحليل الوثائق. تضمنت إجراءات الدراسة مراقبة دقيقة للمشاركين وتسجيل المدة الزمنية المستغرقة لإنجاز المهام، مما أتاح تصنيفهم إلى ثلاث مجموعات (أ، ب، ج) وفقًا لقدراتهم وتفضيلاتهم في الكتابة والرسم. أظهرت النتائج أن المشاركين يواجهون تحديات جمة عند الكتابة بشكل مستقل، في حين يُعد الرسم نشاطًا تمهيدياً ذا فائدة للكتابة. تُوصي الدراسة بدمج الرسم والكتابة في تصميم دروس مهارات الكتابة، حيث يُمكن للرسم، كونه نشاطاً تمهيدياً، أن يُساهم بفعالية في تعزيز مهارات الكتابة لدى المتعلمين البالغين. الكلمات المفتاحية : الرسم، المتعلمين البالغين، مهارات الكتابة، ما قبل الكتابة، تحليل الوثائق.

Introduction

At the intersection of artistic expression and written communication, lies a pivotal inquiry: Can the act of drawing unleash the hidden potential of written expression in adult learners? While the impact of drawing on cognitive and communicative development is widely recognized, its effects on adult education are surprisingly uncharted territory. This study aims to bridge this gap by scrutinizing the impact of drawing on the writing skills of adult learners - a group often neglected in current research.

Historically, drawing has been a primal mode of communication, often preceding and aiding the development of written language. For children, drawing is a critical stepping stone in cognitive and communicative development. However, the potential of drawing in enhancing the writing skills of adults, who have different cognitive and learning processes compared to children, has not been adequately explored. Hobson (1998) suggested that drawings and other non-verbal forms are valuable “tools for discovery, planning, revision, and problem-solving” in writing, yet this perspective predominantly centers around younger learners. This oversight presents an opportunity to explore drawing as a pedagogical tool for adult learners in writing classrooms.

In this study, the term 'quality' in writing is carefully defined to encompass solid structure and grammatical correctness. This encompasses elements such as syntax, punctuation, and overall coherence. On the other hand, 'depth' pertains to the intricacy of ideas and the richness of language used. This includes the progress of ideas, the incorporation of detail, and the writer's proficiency in captivating the reader intellectually and emotionally. These benchmarks are crucial in evaluating the impact of drawing as a prewriting method on the writing abilities of adult learners.

The prevailing research, including the work of Chew (1985), Rossetto and Chiera-Macchia (2011), and Mackenzie and Veresov (2013), highlights the critical role of writing in education. Despite the rich insights derived from studies focusing on young learners, the application of these findings to adult education, particularly in the context of drawing to enhance writing, remains largely unexplored.

This study ventures into a relatively unexplored realm. By exploring the influence of drawing on the writing abilities of adult learners, it not only expands the current knowledge base but also has practical implications for adult education. This is particularly crucial in the realm of higher education, where innovative

teaching approaches can make a significant impact. With a focus on this objective, the study aimed to demonstrate the value and significance of incorporating drawing as an aid in adult writing classrooms. At the heart of this inquiry lies the central research question:

How does the inclusion of drawing as a prewriting activity affect the quality and depth of college students' written outputs?

The research question seeks to uncover the potential of integrating drawing into traditional writing pedagogies, potentially offering a novel approach to enhancing written skills in adult learners.

Literature Review

Most studies that investigated the use of drawing in a writing class focused on early childhood writing (e.g., Adoniou, 2013; Liao, Lee, Y-C., & Chan, T-W., 2013; Mackenzie, & Veresov, 2013). For example, Adoniou (2013) studied the effect of using drawing as a strategy for teaching writing to non-native English-speaking children who newly moved to Australia at the time of the study. The 10 children aged eight to nine years old used drawing as a planning tool for writing. The results show that drawing before writing improved the writing of informational text (p. 274).

Other studies did not specifically address the relationship between writing and drawing. They mainly focused on the use of visual aids, in general, as a helping tool in writing classrooms. Rossetto, & Chiera-Macchia (2011) explored the effect of visual aid on the creation of comic strip narration in Italian. The 26 students had very limited experience in writing in Italian (p. 36). The study found that visual tools can be an important part of creating meaning in second language learning (p. 37). Sa'diyah (2012) studied the effect of using a picture series-aided learning strategy on writing. The participants of the study were 28 Indonesian high school students. This study revealed that the use of the picture series succeeded in promoting the students' positive attitude toward the learning process, increased the students' attention, enhanced the students' participation during the learning activities, and improved the students' ability in writing a descriptive text.

Caldwell and Moore (1991) pointed out that drawing and discussion are “planning activities for writing, (that) ... determine the effects of each upon the quality of narrative writing” (207). So drawing is generally acknowledged as a significant tool in the developmental progression of writing activities.

When Areljung et al. (2021) conducted their study on the role of drawing in teaching science to Swedish school students, they uncovered valuable insights into the effectiveness of drawing as a prewriting aid. While their focus was on a specific subject and age group, the teachers interviewed in the study noted that drawing not only improved science learning, but also had broader educational benefits such as enhancing communication and knowledge acquisition skills for students. These findings are highly relevant to this study, as they highlight how drawing can serve as a tool for expressing and organizing thoughts. Despite the study's original focus, the underlying principles identified by Areljung et al. regarding the use of drawing as a mode of expression and organization are pertinent to our work as well.

Alhassan and Osai (2022) did research on Ghanaian school children and conducted his analysis through pre-test and post-test that he gave to both the control group and experimental group. The result that he obtained on analyzing the test scores proved that that integrating drawing in teaching English language was very successful professedly because it improved the learners' acquisition of language skills. Although the test was conducted on disabled students, it nevertheless implied that introducing drawing through writing methodology to able-minded and able-bodied adult learners would enthuse language learners and provide them with enough psychological freedom and creative space to draw pictures and write on them as they observe them. The role of the teacher is very important here as he/she is the person who is supposed to guide them actively to make them successful in the writing jobs.

Penn (2020) observed that employing drawing as a pedagogical tool kept young learners engaged in organizing, conceiving, and exemplifying the ideas derived from their drawings into the writing tasks. The research found that drawings operated as a channel for producing crucial, creative, and practical thinking and learning. Drawing, therefore, can be a viable and meaningful means of learning and using new words. Learners can use their knowledge of words in writing meaningful sentences with much ease and understanding (Wammes et al., 2016). Viewed in this way, drawing could strengthen vocabulary recall by incorporating pictorial, symbolic, and functional aspects of a memory. Blue (2020) proposed some kind of sketching pictures which he believed would help language learners at every stage and age to acquire new English words or phrases by drawing expressive sketches, portraits, figures, or a short story. In his study on the efficacy of using drawing tools to teach English writing, Altun (2015) found that drawing and sketching could help language teachers to teach English more efficiently and effectually. By asking students to comment and discuss in writing about their

drawings would create an opportunity for mutual dialogue which would help collaborative language learning which is an essential element in writing with success.

According to Tyler (2015), incorporating visual aids, such as drawing, into adult learning can enhance the transformative experience. Through storytelling and artistic expression, diverse participants were able to overcome their initial reluctance to use art and showcase their life experiences. By creating and refining their own images and receiving positive feedback, the participants were able to realize their own artistic potential. This study also highlights the importance of allowing sufficient time for experimentation, reflection, and collaboration in learning. Introducing visual elements in the learning process can significantly deepen understanding and increase engagement for adult learners.

In their 2016 study, Zorrilla and Tisdell emphasized the impact of art on education through their exploration of "Art as Critical Public Pedagogy." Within this context, they specifically highlight the use of art as a valuable tool in adult education. In relation to the current study, and by integrating art into the prewriting process, adult learners are able to question and challenge power structures, promoting critical consciousness, which is crucial for graduate students. Drawing, in particular, goes beyond mere skill development and instead serves as a mechanism for deep introspection and critical thinking. This aligns with the notion that art has the ability to disrupt dominant ideologies and facilitate meaningful discourse, thereby immersing graduate students in a more profound and reflective learning experience (Zorrilla and Tisdell, 2016).

The research has shown that incorporating drawing into prewriting activities has the potential to improve writing skills in various educational settings. Adoniou (2013) examined its effects on young non-native English speakers, while Tyler (2015) and Zorrilla & Tisdell (2016) focused on its impact in adult education. These studies demonstrate a range of potential benefits, such as enhancing language acquisition, promoting effective communication, and improving organization of thoughts. Additionally, in the context of adult learning, drawing has the potential to deepen understanding, encourage critical thinking, and develop narrative skills. Literature also suggests that incorporating drawing can boost engagement and stimulate creativity. Given these findings, this review tentatively supports the use of drawing as a valuable tool in adult education, potentially enhancing the overall learning experience.

Methodology

The methodology section of this study provides a detailed outline of the approach, participant selection, data collection methods, and analytical framework of the study, aiming for transparency and replicability.

Research approach

For this investigation, semi-structured interviews were selected for their ability to strike the perfect balance between structure and flexibility. This method enabled a thorough exploration of the subject matter, going beyond the limitations of pre-determined questions. It offered a structured framework to investigate the primary research questions while also allowing for the emergence of complex and detailed perspectives from participants. Such valuable insights may not have been uncovered through a solely structured or completely open-ended interview format.

Study participants

The study focused on a group of adult learners, specifically 15 graduate students aged between 23 to 30 years old, enrolled in the English Language and Translation MA degree program at King Saud University. These participants, all native Arabic speakers, demonstrated high English proficiency, a requirement for their graduate program, with a minimum IELTS scores around 6.5. This proficiency level underscores their strong command of the English language.

Data collection

The data collection occurred in a specially arranged private study room within the university library. This room was selected for its quiet and controlled atmosphere, ideal for concentration and minimizing external distractions. In this setting, participants were provided with writing and drawing materials—papers, coloring tools, and pencils—to complete their tasks.

Task 1 involved writing about a recent memorable experience, while Task 2 required drawing a representation of that same experience. The researcher carefully observed the participants during these tasks, noting their engagement, the time taken for each task, and their overall approach to the tasks. To ensure unbiased observations, the researcher followed a pre-established checklist, focusing on specific behaviors and interactions.

Semi-structured Interview following the tasks

Post-task, a semi-structured interview was conducted with each participant. The interview questions were tailored to elicit insights into the participants' experiences with the tasks. For instance, the researcher inquired about any difficulties encountered during the tasks, as expressed by some participants ("I don't-- I can't draw people very well..."). Other areas of focus included the participants' enjoyment of the tasks ("I felt-- I felt good doing this actually."), and their thoughts on which task was more expressive of their experience.

Data analysis

For the analysis of the written content, the study employed an online text analysis system (Text Analyzer), chosen for its ability to efficiently process and analyze the complexity and length of the texts (e.g., Madkour, 2016). This method was preferred over manual analysis for its precision and ability to handle large volumes of data. Similarly, the drawings were analyzed based on the variety of characters and the range of colors used.

The interview data were analyzed using a coding system developed specifically for this study. The system involved multiple coders and was initially tested in a pilot study with a similar demographic to ensure its reliability. The coding categories included various expressions and behaviors, such as facing difficulty, expressing doubt, showing enjoyment, and preferences between the drawing and writing tasks.

Coding system for analyzing responses to interview questions

The coding system aimed to quantify qualitative observations and interview responses. It involved scoring each participant on a scale from 1 to 5 based on the frequency of specific expressions or behaviors observed during the tasks and interviews. For example, expressions of doubt were noted and quantified ("at first, am I drawing, I-I don't know about that."), as well as comments on specific strategies used in drawing and writing ("and then I use the color to interpret reality.").

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered strictly to ethical guidelines, placing a strong emphasis on participant consent and confidentiality. All participants were adults and provided informed consent in accordance with the Institutional Review Board (IRB)

protocols. This process ensured that participants were fully aware of the study's objectives, procedures, potential risks, and their rights.

Consent was obtained in written form, with participants signing a consent form that documented their agreement to participate in the research. This form included a clear explanation of the study and was designed to ensure that participants understood their involvement. To further uphold ethical standards, participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without any repercussions.

To safeguard privacy, all personal information was kept anonymous, and confidentiality was maintained throughout the study. Data were stored securely and only accessible to the research team, ensuring that individual responses could not be linked back to any participant.

Research methodology overview

Table 1 shows the various components of the research methodology utilized in the study, detailing the approach, participant demographics, data collection and analysis techniques, and ethical considerations to ensure a robust and ethical research process.

Table 1: Summary of Research Methodology

Section	Description
Research Approach	Conducting semi-structured interviews allowed for in-depth and meaningful discussions, while still maintaining a clear structure. This also allowed for probing beyond the predetermined questions.
Study Participants	15 graduate students from King Saud University's MA English Language and Translation program, with high English proficiency.
Data Collection	Conducted in a controlled university library room with writing and drawing materials provided. Observed engagement, task duration, and task approach using a checklist to minimize bias.
Semi-structured Interviews	Following the completion of tasks, participants were asked to share their insights, difficulties, level of enjoyment, and

	expressiveness during the tasks.
Data Analysis	Efficiency and accuracy was ensured by utilizing "Text Analyzer" software to analyze written tasks. In addition, our analysis of drawings takes into account the variety of characters and range of colors used. Interview responses are coded using a system specifically designed for this study, which has been thoroughly tested and deemed reliable in a pilot program.
Coding System	By quantifying qualitative data gathered from observations and interviews and assigning a score of 1-5 based on the frequency of particular expressions or behaviors, we can gain a deeper understanding of the subject matter.
Ethical Considerations	Informed consent, anonymize personal data, and maintain confidentiality.

Results

Observations on interest and capability in the two tasks.

The researcher timed and observed the participants while they engaged in both tasks (i.e., writing and drawing). The amount of time each participant spent on each of the tasks was indicative of their relative interest in the task as well as their capability in performing the task, with longer time spent on a task being indicative of a greater interest in the task. This was also supported by observations made while performing the tasks, such as, displaying expressions of joy, frequent distractions etc. Based on observations made and time taken to complete each task, the participants were divided into three different groups. The first group spent a relatively equal amount of time on both the tasks, which indicated that they did not have a strong preference towards writing or drawing, and were relatively neutral in their interests and ability. The second group spent a much longer time on writing than on drawing, which indicated that they were more inclined towards writing in their interests or did not perceive themselves as good at drawing. The final group spent a significantly larger amount of time on the drawing task, which indicated their preference towards drawing.

Group A.

The first group of participants spent an average of 3 minutes and 29 seconds on the writing task and 5 minutes and 28 seconds on the drawing task. This indicated that they were relatively neutral towards both the tasks, and did not have a particular preference towards writing or drawing. The strategies used by this group in the writing task included verbalization techniques, self-talk and rehearsing of sentences. One of the participants even erased the complete writing to start again, a short time after starting the task. For the drawing task, this group first created an initial sketch, usually with a pencil, after which additional colors were used to complete the drawing.

Group B.

The participants in Group B spent more than twice as long on Task 1 as compared to Task 2. On an average, this group spent 4 minutes and 16 seconds in the writing task and 1 minutes and 52 seconds in the drawing task. This indicated that the participants in this group were not inclined towards the drawing task and were more interested in the writing task. This was supported by the behaviors observed during the two tasks. For example, the participants in this group spent a significant amount of time thinking about what to write, often staring at the ceiling while formulating their ideas. They often re-wrote certain sentences or words, which showed that they had a strong interest towards writing. In contrast, Task 2 was performed much more quickly, using only 2-3 colors, and not much time was spent on planning and organizing the sketch. This highlighted their inclination towards writing as compared to drawing.

Group C.

The participants in group C spent more than twice as long on Task 2 than in Task 1. On an average, these participants spent 3 minutes and 6 seconds on the writing task and 7 minutes and 26 seconds on the drawing task. Furthermore, while completing the drawing task, a look of satisfaction and/or joy was evident on the faces of most participants in Group C. These participants spent a significant amount of time to plan out their sketch, often revising their writing to identify what to draw and carefully picking out colors to use for the drawing. These observations further highlighted their inclination towards the drawing task.

Interpretation of observations and interview responses

The observations made while the respondents were completing the tasks as well as the responses of the participants in each group to the interview questions were coded into the selected variables based on the coding method devised in the methodology:

Table 2: Participant scores based on observations of tasks performed and interview responses

Identified Variables	Group A							Group B						Group C				
	P1	P3	P4	P8	P12	P15	Mean	P6	P7	P9	P10	P13	Mean	P2	P5	P11	P14	Mean
Difficulties faced in understanding and completing the tasks																		
Task instruction	1	2	3	2	1	2	1.8	1	1	2	1	3	1.6	2	1	1	1	1.3
Writing	4	1	4	2	3	3	2.8	2	3	4	3	4	3.2	1	2	2	3	2.0
Drawing	1	2	4	3	3	2	2.5	4	4	2	5	2	3.4	1	1	1	1	1.0
<i>Total</i>	6	5	11	7	7	7	7.2	7	8	8	9	9	8.2	4	4	4	5	4.3
Doubts and Uncertainty felt during task instruction and completion																		
Task instruction	1	2	1	3	2	3	2.0	0	1	2	3	1	1.4	1	2	1	3	1.8
Writing	3	3	4	2	5	1	3.0	2	1	1	5	3	2.4	3	2	1	4	2.5
Drawing	1	2	1	1	2	2	1.5	2	3	3	1	3	2.4	4	1	0	1	1.5
<i>Total</i>	5	7	6	6	9	6	6.5	4	5	6	9	7	6.2	8	5	2	8	5.8
Degree of Enjoyment in carrying out the tasks																		
Writing	2	2	3	3	3	3	2.7	2	4	3	4	5	3.6	2	1	3	1	1.8
Drawing	2	3	3	2	3	4	2.8	1	2	1	1	2	1.4	4	4	5	3	4.0
<i>Total</i>	4	5	6	5	6	7	5.5	3	6	4	5	7	5	6	5	8	4	5.8
Drawing strategies	2	2	3	3	2	2	2.3	4	2	2	1	2	2.2	3	4	2	3	3.0
Writing strategies	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.3	2	4	3	3	4	3.2	2	1	3	3	2.3
Preferences and interests of Participants																		
Only Writing	1	3	3	2	1	2	2.0	4	3	4	3	3	3.4	1	1	2	2	1.5
Only drawing	1	2	3	3	2	2	2.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	4	3.0
Towards both	1	2	2	3	2	4	2.3	1	1	2	2	1	1.4	3	3	1	3	2.5
<i>Total</i>	3	7	8	8	5	8	6.5	1	5	7	6	5	4.8	8	7	4	9	7.0

Participants in Group A faced a similar level of difficulty in performing both the writing and the drawing tasks and were not inclined more towards any of the two tasks. They had a high score in the variable facing difficulties with a total average of all the difficulties faced equal to 7.2. These participants were more

uncertain regarding the tasks, and often asked questions to clear their doubts. Almost all the participants in this group were relatively neutral towards both the tasks and did not feel that any of the two tasks was more enjoyable than the other. This is evident from their mean enjoyability score for the two tasks which is almost the same (2.7 and 2.8 respectively). Furthermore, the number of times writing and drawing strategies were used by these participants were also relatively similar. When the participants in this group were questioned about their preference in the interview, they did not seem more inclined to any of the two tasks, which is also reflected in the preference scores they were given in the two tasks.

Participants in Group B were significantly more inclined towards the writing task than the drawing task. This is reflected in their scores for enjoyment, with the overall mean score for enjoyment in writing task more than twice as much (3.6) as that of the drawing task (1.4). However, these participants faced significantly more difficulties than the other groups in describing their experience, either through writing or drawing, and had the highest mean score in the facing difficulties variable (8). This may indicate that participants who were not able to draw their experience well, also found it more difficult to describe their experience in writing, despite having a stronger preference for writing (mean preference for drawing equal to 3.4 as compared to 1 for drawing). Moreover, these participants also had more doubts about the tasks, with a mean score of 6.2 only slightly lower than that of Group A. These group of participants were more comfortable at writing, and therefore employed several writing strategies (mean score = 3.2), whereas only a few drawing strategies were employed (mean score = 2.2).

The participants in Group C received the lowest score in facing difficulties, and also enjoyed the tasks significantly more than the other two groups (mean overall enjoyability score of 5.8 as compared to 5 in Group B and 5.5 in Group A). They were also less certain regarding the two tasks, and had the lowest doubt score among all the three groups. These participants were clearly inclined towards the drawing task as compared to the writing task, spending much more time in drawing and also employing many difference drawing strategies. The results show that those participants who faced more difficulties in writing expressed their writing strategies more and those who faced more difficulties in drawing expressed their drawing strategies more. Overall, the participants enjoyed the drawing task more than the writing task. Furthermore, though several participants faced difficulties with drawing, it appears that they enjoyed the drawing task more than writing.

Analysis of complexity in writing and drawing tasks

The figures in Table 3 and 4 show in detail the analysis of both the text and the drawing tasks. The mean of each of the variables for complexity was calculated for the three different groups identified earlier and were compared against each other.

Table 3: Analysis of complexity in the writing task (means of each group)

			Group A	Group B	Group C
Length of document		Number of words	97	126	61
		Number of characters (without space)	319	508	253
Document complexity		Lexical Density	72%	56%	72%
		Readability (100-easy 20-hard)	74.3	65	56.1
		Grade	5	6	7

Table 3 illustrates that the length of the document is almost 72% longer for both Group A and Group B as compared to Group C. Some participants in Group C were relatively less well versed in English, which might indicate their lower score in the document length, as well as their preference for that drawing task. Despite this disadvantage, the overall document complexity appears to be significantly higher for Group C as compared to Group A and Group B. A likely reason for this could be that participants with a preference for drawing, are better able to collect their thoughts to create complex imagery for describing their experiences.

Table 4: Analysis of complexity in drawing (meaning of each group)

	Group A	Group B	Group C
Number of colors used	6	2	7
Number of characters drawn	7	6	17
Number of words used	2	10	17

At the same time Table 4 shows that drawings for Group C were significantly more complex and detailed than Group A and Group B. Group C used more colors and characters than both Group A and Group B.

According to the results, incorporating drawing as a prewriting activity had a positive impact on the writing quality of all participant groups. Interestingly, Group A, who had a neutral attitude towards both drawing and writing, showed that drawing played a valuable role in helping them approach writing from a more comprehensive perspective. On the other hand, Group B, who had a stronger inclination towards writing, benefited from the drawing task as a cognitive tool that aided in organizing their thoughts and ultimately leading to improved writing quality. As for Group C, who favored drawing, their writing skills were significantly enriched through the visual task, resulting in concise yet intricate written work. Overall, the inclusion of drawing as a prewriting activity not only diversified creative approaches but also enhanced the writing skills of adult graduate college students.

Conclusion

In conclusion, incorporating drawing as a prewriting tool in adult education has significant advantages for adult educators, learners, and the larger field of adult learning. By showcasing the positive impact of drawing on the structure, lucidity, and complexity of writing, in line with previous studies by Adoniou (2013) and Areljung et al. (2021), this study makes a compelling argument for revising traditional approaches to writing instruction, not just at the graduate college level, but also in other educational settings.

Drawing can be a powerful tool for adult educators when teaching writing. Not only is it a fresh and inventive approach, but it is also crucial in catering to the diverse learning needs of students. This technique, supported by Caldwell and Moore's (1991) focus on strategic planning, provides a practical means for educators to increase learners' participation and comprehension of the writing process. It calls for educators to embrace more visually-driven teaching methods, which can especially benefit those students who thrive with non-traditional, visual-spatial methods.

The use of drawing as a pre-writing tool has a valuable impact on adult learners. Drawing has been identified as an influential tool in this study, offering an opportunity for learners in this study to unleash their potential in writing. Through visualizing and organizing their thoughts, they can effectively express complex ideas and narratives, benefiting especially those who have struggled with traditional text-based methods. By providing an alternative pathway, drawing enhances the

overall learning experience and improves outcomes. Beyond individual learners, this study contributes to a larger goal of creating a more inclusive and adaptable educational framework. By incorporating visual tools such as drawing, the diverse learning styles and preferences of adult learners are catered to, leading to a more equitable and active learning environment.

However, this research also highlights an important gap: the need to understand the impact of gender on the efficacy of drawing as a prewriting technique. Future research in this direction could lead to more gender-inclusive teaching strategies, ensuring that the benefits of drawing as a prewriting tool are accessible to all learners regardless of gender.

Further research should also continue to explore different drawing techniques and their specific impacts on adult writing skills. Employing a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods will deepen our understanding of how best to integrate these techniques into adult writing curricula, making them more effective and tailored to individual learner needs.

In conclusion, this study takes us on a path towards rethinking writing education for adult learners at the graduate college level. By integrating drawing into the writing process, it uncovers the ability to inspire improved imagination, coherence, and complexity in written expression. As we gaze ahead, it is imperative for academics to delve deeper into this intersection, adding to our understanding of impactful writing methods for adult learners. Educators and students alike are encouraged to adopt this progressive approach, paving the road for more innovative and successful learning opportunities in adult education sitting.

References

1. Adoniou, M. (2013). Drawing to support writing development in English language learners. *Language and Education*, 27(3), 261-277. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
2. Alhassan, B. & Osei, M (2022). Effectiveness of integrating drawing in teaching English language in intellectual disability classroom. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJonSES)*, 4(1), 74-86. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
3. Altun, M. (2015). The Use of Drawing in Language Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Education and Instructional Studies in the World*, 5(4), 91-93.

-
4. Areljung, S., Due, K., Ottander, C., Skoog, M., and Sundberg, B., (2021). Why and how teachers make use of drawing activities in early childhood science education. *International Journal of Science Education*, 43 (13).2127-2147. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
 5. Blue, J. (2020). *Using Drawing as a Tool to Learn English*. Cambridge University Press and Assessment. [Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.](#)
 6. Caldwell, H. and Moore, B.H. (1991). The Art of Writing: Drawing as Preparation for Narrative Writing in the Primary Grades. *Studies in Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research*, 32(4), 207-219. DOI: [Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.](#)
 7. Chew, C. (1985). Instruction can link reading and writing. In J. Hansen, T. Newkirk,& D. Graves(Eds.). *Breaking ground: Teachers relate reading and writing in the elementary school* (pp. 169-173). Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.
 8. Cong, X. & Jiang, X. (2021). Role of Language Teachers in the Teaching of Academic Writing Analysis Based on Multinational Academic Writing Literature. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 555. 456-460. DOI: [Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.](#)
 9. Hobson, E. (1998). Drawing students into writing: A faculty development workshop. In P. Childers, E. Hobson , & J. Mullin (Eds.), *Articulating: Teaching writing in a visual world*, (pp. 137-147). Portsmouth N.H. Boynton/Cook Publishers.
 10. Horn, M. and Giacobbe, M.E. (2007). *Talking, Drawing Writing: Lessons for Our Young Writers*. Ist. Edition. Portsmouth: Stenhouse Publishers.
 11. Liao, C. C. Y., Lee, Y.-C., & Chan, T.-W. (2013). Building a self-generated drawing environment to improve children's performance in writing and storytelling. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 8(3), 449–464. Retrieved from [Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.](#)
 12. Mackenzie, N., & Veresov, N. (2013). How drawing can support writing acquisition: Text construction in early writing from a Vygotskian perspective. *Australasian Journal Of Early Childhood*, 38(4), 22-29. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**

-
13. Madkour, M. (2016). The effect of digital dialogued journaling on improving English writing: A linguistic communicative approach. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 241-263.
 14. Penn, L. R. (2020). Room for monsters and writers: Performativity in children's classroom drawing. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 21(3), 208–223. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
 15. Pinto, G., and Incognito, O. (2021). The relationship between emergent drawing, emergent writing, and visual-motor integration in preschool children. *Infant and Child Development*, 31(2), 1-11. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
 16. Rossetto, M., & Chiera-Macchia, A. (2011). 'Visual learning is the best learning - it lets you be creative while learning' Exploring ways to begin guided writing in second language learning through the use of comics. *Babel*, 45(2/3), 35-40.
 17. Sa'diyah, H. (2012). Improving students' ability in writing descriptive texts through a picture series-aided learning strategy. *English Teacher*, XL, 164-182.
 18. Text Analyzer. (2006, April 1). Retrieved November 5, 2014, from **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
 19. Tyler, J. A. (2015). From Spoke to Hub: Transforming Organizational Vision and Strategy With Story and Visual Art. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 65(4), 326-342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713615595066>
 20. Wammes, J. D., Meade, M. E., & Fernandes, M. A. (2016). The drawing effect: Evidence for reliable and robust memory benefits in free recall. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 69(9), 1752-1776.
 21. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
 22. Williams, J.D. (2014). *Preparing to Teach Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice*. 4th Edition. New York: Routledge. **Erreur ! Référence de lien hypertexte non valide.**
 23. Zorrilla, A., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Art as Critical Public Pedagogy: A Qualitative Study of Luis Camnitzer and His Conceptual Art. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 66(3), 273-291. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713616645666>