

**İNGİLİZCE OKUMA BECERİLERİNİN ÖĞRETMEN MODELLEMESİ YOLUYLA  
STRATEJİ GİBİ İRDELENMESİNİN OKUMA ANLAMA GELİŞİMİNE ETKİLERİ**

**THE EFFECTS OF RECASTING READING SKILLS AS  
STRATEGIES THROUGH TEACHER MODELING ON  
READING COMPREHENSION  
IMPROVEMENT**

**SERKAN GERİDÖNMEZ  
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)  
Eskişehir 1999**

**THE EFFECTS OF RECASTING READING SKILLS AS STRATEGIES THROUGH  
TEACHER MODELING ON READING COMPREHENSION IMPROVEMENT**

**İNGİLİZCE OKUMA BECERİLERİNİN ÖĞRETMEN MODELLEMESİ YOLUYLA  
STRATEJİ GİBİ İRDELENMESİNİN OKUMA ANLAMA GELİŞİMİNE ETKİLERİ**

**Serkan Geridönmez**

**THESIS OF MASTER OF ARTS  
Advisor: Yar.Doç. Dr Handan Kopkallı Yavuz**

**Eskişehir  
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü  
Ocak 1999**

## YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÖZÜ

### İNGİLİZCE OKUMA BECERİLERİNİN ÖĞRETMEN MODELLEMESİ YOLUYLA STRATEJİ GİBİ İRDELENMESİNİN OKUMA ANLAMA GELİŞİMİNE ETKİLERİ

Serkan Geridönmez

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı  
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,  
Danışman: Yar. Doç. Dr Handan Kopkallı Yavuz

Bu çalışmada, okuma becerilerinin öğretmen modellemesi yoluyla birer strateji gibi irdelenmesinin Türkiye’de başlangıç seviyesinde İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerinin İngilizce bir materyali okuyup anlama becerisi gelişimine olan etkisi, geleneksel okuma becerileri öğretiminin aynı gelişime olan etkisi karşılaştırılmıştır. Ayrıca Oxford (1990)’un Dil Öğrenimi Stratejileri Belirleme Anketi’nden okuma becerisine uyarlanan bir anket eğitim öncesi ve sonrası verilerek bu iki okuma öğretimi yönteminin öğrencilerin çalışmaya özel okuma stratejileri kullanımına olan etkisi karşılaştırılmış ve buna ek olarak bu çalışmadaki denek sayısı ile sınırlı kalarak, başlangıç seviyesindeki Türk öğrencilerinin genel okuma stratejileri hakkında da veri elde edilmiştir. Bu ikinci veri genelleme yapılamayacak kadar sınırlı sayıda öğrenci ile yapılmış olsa da, genel hakkında bir fikir verebileceği düşünülerek bu çalışmaya dahil edilmiştir.

Bu çalışmada, veriler 1997-98 öğretim yılı Güz döneminde Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri Hazırlık programına katılan öğrencilerden başlangıç seviyesinde bulunan 40 öğrenciden alınmıştır. Bu öğrenciler deney grubu ve kontrol grubu olarak iki gruba ayrılmış, deney grubuna Pearson and Dole (1987)’un okuma öğretimi modeli temel alınarak okuma becerilerini öğretmen modellemesi yoluyla birer strateji gibi irdelenmesi yöntemi Güz dönemi boyunca uygulanmış, diğer gruba ise geleneksel okuma becerileri öğretimi aynı dönem içinde uygulanarak okuma anlama becerisi ve strateji kullanımındaki gelişimleri dönem başında ve sonunda verilen ön ve son testlerin ve anketin sonuçlarına göre karşılaştırılmıştır. Eğitim sırasında öğretilen okuma becerileri; zor kelimeleri tahmin etme, parça içeriğini tahmin etme,

parça içindeki göndermeleri bulma, detayları ve genel anlamı bulmak için hızlı okuma ve detaylı okumadan oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışmada ön test ve son test olarak araştırmacı tarafından öğretilen okuma becerilerini ölçen bir okuma sınavı ve Practice TOEFL'in kelime ve okuma anlama bölümü kullanılmıştır. Okuma stratejilerinin belirlenmesinde ise daha önce sözü edilen anket kullanılmıştır. Bu testler ve anket hem eğitim öncesi hem de sonrası uygulanarak her gruptaki öğrencilerin gelişimi aldıkları sonuçlara göre hem kendi içlerinde hem de diğer grupla karşılaştırılmıştır. Ayrıca her beceriyi tek tek ölçmek için eğitim sırasında küçük ara sınavlar verilmiştir. Son olarak, eğitim sonrası yine araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan düşünce anketi verilerek öğrencilerin her iki yöntemle ilgili düşünceleri, olumlu olumsuz eleştirileri ve eğitim etkili olup olmadığına dair veri elde edilmiştir.

Bu test ve anketlerin sonuçlarına göre, deney grubu öğrencilerinin kontrol grubu öğrencilerine göre hem okuma anlama becerisi gelişimi hem de strateji kullanımı konusunda daha fazla bir gelişim kaydettikleri saptanmıştır. Düşünce anketine göre ise deney grubu öğrencilerinin çoğunluğu (%83.9) kendilerine uygulanan eğitim hakkında olumlu düşünceler belirtmiş ve bu yöntemin kendilerine İngilizce bir metni nasıl okumaları gerektiği konusunda gerekli ipuçlarını verdiğini söylemişlerdir. Diğer grupta ise olumlu görüş bildirenlerin oranı %47.5 kararsızların oranı ise %30 olarak belirlenmiştir. Son olarak strateji anketinin bir sonucu olarak, deneklerin genel okuma stratejileri kullanımı en sık kullanılanlardan en az kullanılanlara doğru şu şekilde saptanmıştır: sosyal stratejiler, metabilşsel stratejiler, bilişsel stratejiler, telafi stratejileri, hafıza stratejileri ve afektif stratejiler.

THESIS OF MASTER OF ARTS  
ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF RECASTING READING SKILLS AS STRATEGIES THROUGH  
TEACHER MODELING ON READING COMPREHENSION IMPROVEMENT

Serkan Geridönmez  
English Language Education Department  
Anadolu University Social Sciences Institute,  
Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Handan Kopkallı Yavuz

In this study, the effects of recasting skills as strategies through teacher modelling on elementary level EFL Turkish students' reading comprehension improvement were compared to the effects of traditional reading skill instruction on this improvement. In addition, by administering a strategy inventory at the beginning and at the end of the treatment which was adapted from Oxford's (1990) SILL ( Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) by including only the items related to the reading skill, the data about the use of study-specific strategies was obtained. As another purpose of this, the use of general reading strategies of elementary EFL Turkish students was analysed. Although the data gained from this purpose is too limited to make a generalisation about whole elementary EFL Turkish students, it was included in this study thinking that it may give at least an idea about the issue.

The data was collected from 40 elementary level students attending Intensive English Program of Communication Sciences Faculty at Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey. These students were divided into two groups, an experimental group and a control group. The control group was exposed to traditional reading skill instruction and the experimental group received an instruction as recasting reading skills as strategies through teacher modelling. Five skills were taught during the study, guessing difficult words, predicting, finding your way around a text, skimming and scanning and looking for detailed information.

At the end of the treatment the improvement of the subjects in terms of reading comprehension and strategy use of the subjects were compared within the groups and between the groups by analysing the scores they got from the pre and post tests and their answers to the inventory which were applied at the beginning and at the end of the treatment sessions. Also during the treatment, the quizzes about each skill were administered to test each skill

separately. In this study, as pre-tests, a researcher-prepared reading exam testing the skills taught to the subjects and the vocabulary and reading comprehension part of Practice TOEFL were used. Additionally, to determine the use of general reading strategies by the students and the use of study-specific strategies, the strategy inventory mentioned earlier was administered. Finally, in order to obtain data about the subjects' opinion about the instruction methods applied to them and efficiency of the instruction, an attitude questionnaire was administered at the end of the treatment sessions.

According to the results of these tests and the inventory, it was observed that the experimental group gained more improvement both in reading comprehension and the use of study-specific strategies compared to the control group. The attitude questionnaire showed that majority of the experimental group subjects (%83.9) expressed positive opinion about the instruction applied to them and they stated that this instruction gave them enough clues about efficient reading in English. In contrast, only %47.5 of the control group were satisfied with the instruction applied to them and %30 of them stated " I am not sure if this instruction was effective or not". Finally, according to the results of the strategy inventory, the reading strategies used by the subjects in this study were as follows: social strategies, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, memory strategies and affective strategies in the order from the most commonly used to the less commonly used.

## DEĞERLENDİRME KURULU ÜYELERİ

Danışman: Yar. Doç. Dr Handan Kopkallı Yavuz

Üye : Zülâil Balpınar

Üye : F. Hülya Özcan

İmza

Zülâil B

F. Hülya Özcan

Tezin kabul edildiği tarih: 23-3-1999

Tezin ilgili yasa ve yönetmeliklerin öngördüğü teknik ve bilimsel koşulları karşıladığı ve adayın

“ İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı” nda Yüksek Lisans derecesi almaya hak kazandığı anlaşılmıştır.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Associate Professor Handan Kopkallı Yavuz, my thesis advisor, for giving me guidance and support for the preparation of this thesis.

I am also indebted to Prof. Zülal Balpınar and Ass. Prof. Hülya Özcan for their invaluable comments about my study.

I am also grateful to Cengiz Bal for his help with the statistical data analysis of this thesis.

I must express my special thanks to my wife for her patience and understanding and to my one year old daughter, Özgenur, who gave me sleepless nights but too much morale with her smiles.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### SECTIONS

#### Pages

Özet	iii
Abstract	v
Değerlendirme Kurulu ve Enstitü Onayı	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Özgeçmiş	ix
Table of Contents	x
List of Tables	xii

### CHAPTER I

#### INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem .....	1
1.2 Teaching Reading Skills as Strategies .....	7
1.3 Explicit Comprehension Instruction .....	8
1.4 Aim and Scope of the Study .....	9
1.5 Research Questions .....	10
1.6 Limitations of the Study .....	10

### CHAPTER II

#### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Related Studies Conducted .....	11
-------------------------------------	----

### CHAPTER III

#### METHODOLOGY

Introduction .....	15
3.1 Subjects .....	15
3.1.1 Experimental Group .....	16
3.1.2 Control Group .....	16
3.2 Instruments .....	16
3.2.1 Michigan Placement Test .....	16
3.2.2 Reading Strategy Inventory .....	17
3.2.3 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam .....	17
3.2.4 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL .....	18
3.2.5 Quizzes .....	18
3.2.6 Opinion Questionnaire .....	18
3.3.0 Materials .....	19
3.3.1 Course Book .....	19
3.3.2 Reading Passages .....	19
3.4 Procedure .....	20
3.4.1 Instruction: Experimental Group.....	20
3.4.2 Instruction: Control Group .....	22
3.5 Data Analysis .....	23

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS

Introduction .....	25
4.1 Strategy Inventory .....	25
4.2 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam as one of the Pre-test .....	30
4.3 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL as the Second Pre-test .....	30
4.4 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam as one of the Post-test .....	31
4.5 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL as the Second Pre-test .....	33
4.6 Quizzes .....	35
4.7 Officially Administered First and Second Midterms .....	38
4.8 Opinion Questionnaire .....	40

## CHAPTER V

## DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary .....	45
5.2 Discussion .....	47
5.3 Difficulties Observed During the Treatment and Suggestions to the Future Researchers .....	51
5.4 Conclusions .....	52
5.1 Suggestions for Further Studies .....	54

## APPENDICES

Appendix A »» Reading Strategy Inventory .....	55
Appendix B »» The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam .....	58
Appendix C »» Attitude Questionnaire .....	62
Appendix D »» Classification of the Strategies in the Inventory and the Average Ranges for each Subject .....	63
Appendix E1 »» The Summary of the Results of the Tests and Exams for the Experimental Group .....	64
Appendix E2 »» The Summary of the Results of the Tests and Exams for the Control Group .....	65
Appendix F1 »» Quiz Results of the Experimental Group .....	66
Appendix F2 »» Quiz Results of the Control Group .....	67

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	68
-------------------	----

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 4.1 The Frequency of General Reading Strategy Use by Turkish Elementary EFL Students .....	27
TABLE 4.2 The Average Ranges for the Study-Specific Strategies in Pre-treatment Administration of the Strategy Inventory .....	28
TABLE 4.3 The Average Ranges for the Study-Specific Strategies in Post-treatment Administration of the Strategy Inventory .....	29
TABLE 4.4 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam as pre-test T-test for Independent Samples .....	30
TABLE 4.5 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL as Pre-test T-test for Independent Samples .....	31
TABLE 4.6 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam as Post-test T-test for Independent Samples .....	31
TABLE 4.7 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam T-test for Dependent Samples(Control Group) .....	32
TABLE 4.8 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam T-test for Dependent Samples(Experimental Group) .....	32
TABLE 4.9 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam T-test for Independent Samples for the Changes in the Scores Between Pre and Post-test .....	33
TABLE 4.10 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL as Post-test T-test for Independent Samples .....	34
TABLE 4.11 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL T-test for Dependent Samples (Control Group) .....	34
TABLE 4.12 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL T-test for Dependent Samples (Experimental Group) .....	35
TABLE 4.13 Quiz 1 T-test for Independent Samples .....	36
TABLE 4.14 Quiz 2 T-test for Independent Samples .....	36
TABLE 4.15 Quiz 3 T-test for Independent Samples .....	37
TABLE 4.16 Quiz 4 T-test for Independent Samples .....	37

<b>TABLE 4.17 Quiz 5</b>	
<b>T-test for Independent Samples .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>TABLE 4.18 Officially Administered First Midterm</b>	
<b>T-test for Independent Samples .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>TABLE 4.19 Officially Administered Second Midterm</b>	
<b>T-test for Independent Samples .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>TABLE 4.20 Officially Administered First and Second Midterm</b>	
<b>T-test for Dependent Samples (Control Group) .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>TABLE 4.21 Officially Administered First and Second Midterms</b>	
<b>T-test for Dependent Samples (Experimental Group) .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>TABLE 4.22 The Number of the Subjects for each Statement in the Opinion</b>	
<b>Questionnaire and Their Percentages in the Population</b>	
<b>(Experimental Group and Control Group .....</b>	<b>44</b>

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. 1 Background to the Problem

Reading knowledge is important for academic studies, professional success and personal development. This is true especially for English since much professional, technical and scientific literature is published in English. Thus, reading ability is often a need for learners of English as a foreign language (EFL). However, despite this specific need for the foreign language reading ability, it is the common experience that most students fail to learn to read adequately in the foreign language. Results of research support the view that reading in a language which is not the learners' first language is difficult (Mac Namara 1970) (cited in Alrerson 1984). Students encounter many problems, such as identifying the topic or message of a text and inferring the meaning of unknown words, understanding details, drawing inferences, understanding the grammatical and semantic relationships between the sentences and paragraphs in the passage.

There are some speculations about the reasons of these difficulties. For example, Jolly (1978) argues that success in reading in second language heavily depends on one's first language

reading ability rather than his/her proficiency in that language. He also adds that reading in a foreign language requires the transfer of old skills, the skills one uses in his/her first language, not the learning of the new ones. Thus, students fail to read in the foreign language because they do not have old skills or because they have failed to transfer them.

As a different point of view, Kern (1989) states:

" Reading in a foreign language is cognitively demanding and it includes coordination of attention, memory perceptual process and comprehension process along with separating main ideas from details, searching for cohesive elements and contextual guessing. In fact when one begins to read in another language many of these processes are not used and students begin to translate word by word."

Yorio (1971) also states that reading problems of foreign language learners are largely due to imperfect knowledge of the language and due to native language inferences in the reading processes. His view involves four factors for effective reading; a) knowledge of the language, b) ability to predict or guess in order to make the correct choices, c) ability to remember the previous cues, and d) ability to make necessary associations between the different cues that have been selected.

Thus the aim of teaching reading should be to overcome these difficulties encountered in reading classrooms and to make students aware of the clues for effective reading. There were some attempts towards an effective reading instruction in the history of ELT.

Beginning with Thorndike in the early 1920s and 1930s, psychologists considered learning as a series of Stimuli-Response bonds . This approach led to some psychological research on human skills and performances and psychologists began to conduct analyses of subskills that make up skills and performances. Smith (1965) explains how reading was viewed as a skill that could be divided into component of subskills involved in both decoding and comprehension. Examples of

comprehension subskills included sequencing events in a story, predicting outcomes of a story, drawing conclusions, finding the main idea and so forth. Further it was believed that reading could be improved by teaching each of these necessary subskills at a minimal level of mastery (Rosenshine 1980).

Most of the comprehension curriculum as we know it today emerged from this task-analytic behavioral conception of reading (Dole, Duffy and Pearson 1991). Guthrie (1973) described this curriculum as an "assembly-line model" of skill acquisition. In such a curriculum, it is assumed that each skill can be mastered and these subskills constitute reading comprehension.

This comprehension instruction consisted of asking specific questions about the selection they read. It was hoped that if students practiced answering these questions, they would get better at it (Pearson and Dole 1987). In other words reading instruction overemphasized instruction and practice on literal comprehension, such as answering detail questions. Traditionally, instructional theorists and teachers have relied on drill and practice model of instruction that contained an introductory to a passage through pre-reading questions and that is repeatedly exposing students to tasks such as comprehension questions and completing skill exercises (vocabulary, referring expressions, finding the main idea, true- false statements etc.) until they have achieved mastery (Duffy & McIntyre, 1982; Durkin 1978, 1979). Although they gave many workbook assignments and asked many questions about the text content, Durkin (1978) judged that these exercises mostly tested students' understanding instead of teaching them how to comprehend. Each lesson contained an introductory reading followed by traditional "who/what/when/where" comprehension questions.

In the traditional view, beginner readers acquire a set of skills that sequentially build towards comprehension ability. Once the skills have been mastered, readers are viewed as experts who comprehend what they read. In this view, readers are passive recipients of information in the text. Also the textbooks used in this traditional reading instruction continue to deal with the skills in the old way. For example in "guessing difficult words" study, prefixes and suffixes such as "-r, -tion etc." are presented as drill exercises isolated from real reading (Durkin 1981, Osborn

1984). Again, main idea is presented as a task of reading paragraphs and selecting the best main idea from the choices. Even if they are able to do these exercises, they never use it when actually reading, since real readers do not select the appropriate main ideas for the paragraphs and articles they read. Instead, students are required to do isolated exercises which have little relevance to the task of making sense out of text (Duffy and Roehler 1987).

According to the results of the studies conducted by Anderson et al.(1986), when skills are taught through automatized isolated exercise, the learning is not affective. When this happens, students associate skills with "paper and pencil exercise" (Duffy and Roehler 1987) rather than with reading.

Some started to criticize this discrete comprehension skills curriculum based on behavioristic analyses of the reading process.

For example Sochor (1959) argued:

" Much of the variability in what constitutes reading is due to insufficient research evidence on reading abilities themselves and on basic and related factors which might contribute. Research workers have been able to clarify sufficiently the nature, independence or difficulty levels of comprehension abilities in reading." (p 47-48)

Over the last 20 years, research in reading has provided some answers to the problems identified by Sochor (1959). Such research have resulted in a new understanding of the reading process and a different view of what is important to teach. This new view is "cognitively based view of reading comprehension"(Dole et al 1991). In this view, reading is seen as a more complex process than what early reading researchers assumed; above all it is no longer considered a set of skills to be mastered. (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott & Wilkinson 1984).

Cognitively based view of reading comprehension emphasize that all readers use their existing knowledge and a range of cues from the text and the situational context. According to this view, even beginner readers can behave like experts when presented with texts (Dole et al 1991).



Thus, two important characteristics of readers - the background knowledge the students bring to the text and the strategies they use to foster and maintain understanding - play important roles in distinguishing traditional and new views of reading comprehension.

Expert readers possess a set of flexible and adaptable strategies that they use to make sense of the text and to monitor their ongoing understanding. They also possess a set of concepts about those strategies. This cognitive view of comprehension gives much more emphasis to reading strategies than to skills.

"Strategies are thought of as conscious and flexible plans readers apply and adapt to a variety of texts and tasks. Skills, by contrast, are viewed as highly routinized, almost automatic behaviors." (Duffy & Roehler 1987).

There are several distinctions between traditional skills and what is referred to as strategies in this study.

"First, there is a distinction in intentionality. Strategies emphasize intentional and deliberate plans under the control of the reader. Good readers make decisions about which strategy to use, when to use it and how to adapt it to a particular text (Pressley, Goodchild et al. 1989). Skills are more or less automatic routines. Second, there is a distinction in cognitive sophistication. Strategies emphasize reasoning. Readers use reasoning and critical thinking abilities as they construct meaning from the text. Skill, on the other hand, tend to be associated with lower levels of thinking and learning. Third, there is a distinction in flexibility. Strategies are inherently flexible and adaptable. Readers modify strategies to fit different kinds of texts and different purposes. By contrast, skills require consistency in application across a variety of texts. Fourth, there is a distinction in awareness. Strategies imply metacognitive awareness, good readers can reflect on what they are doing while they are reading (Baker & Brown 1984). They are aware of whether they understand or do not understand and this awareness leads to regulation and repair. On the other hand, in the traditional skill curriculum, it is assumed that with repeated practice and drill, readers would automatically apply the skill they learn to whatever they read.

There is no place for the intentional or conscious use of these skills, it is simply assumed that they will be used automatically or unconsciously".  
(Dole et al 1991: 242)

The cognitive view of reading presents a different view of the reader. The traditional view assumes a passive reader who has learned a large number of skills and automatically and routinely applies them to all texts. The cognitive view requires an active reader who constructs meaning through combining existing and new knowledge and the flexible use of strategies to foster, monitor, regulate and maintain comprehension. Therefore reading comprehension instruction based on a cognitive view of reading emphasizes teaching a set of strategies that students can use to comprehend text. The goal of instruction is to develop a sense of conscious control or metacognitive awareness over a set of strategies that they can adapt to any text they read (Pressley et. al. 1989). Also, in a cognitively based view of comprehension instruction, the teacher becomes a mediator who helps students to construct understandings about (a) the content of the text itself (b) strategies that aid in interpreting the text and (c) the nature of reading process itself.

As Duffy and Roehler (1987) states:

"In teaching strategies the object is to develop thoughtful and conscious reasoning about problems encountered in real text where each situation demands slightly different response. Students who receive strategy instruction learn to reason adaptively with their knowledge about how reading works. In teaching reading skills, the object is to create automatized accuracy through drill and practice activities such as worksheets which call repeatedly for the same response. Students who receive skill instruction learn to answer isolated exercises quickly and accurately. Furthermore, when this happens, students come to associate skills with paper and pencil exercises rather than with reading".

In short, this cognitive view emphasize strategic instruction more than isolated skill exercise based instruction. A study conducted by Duffy et al. (1987) showed that when teachers provided explicit explanation about how skills are actually used, students conceptualized reading as a

strategic process and used skills strategically rather than automatically to remove blockage to meaning in real texts. In contrast, when teachers taught skills as procedures to be followed, they were not successful in using them in real text situations. This research implied that skills should be presented as strategies, not as automatized procedures.

## 1.2 Teaching Reading Skills as Strategies

In order to teach a reading skill as a strategy, instructions must meet conditions, which refers to "recasting skills as strategies" (Duffy and Roehler, 1987).

1- The teacher describes, models and provides practice in the situation where the strategy will be used. That is, strategy is presented to students within real context of the real reading problem it will solve, so that students can practice the adaptive, flexible thinking associated with strategic reading.

2- The teacher models the alternatives, showing how the reader, when encountering such a blockage, thinks about various ways to remove the blockage. For instance, the teacher models how the reader thinks about alternative strategies for figuring out unknown words (analyzing context, structural analysis, phonics etc.).

3- The teacher models the thinking process in using a strategy. For example the teacher says " Before I read a passage, first I look at the title and think about whatever I know about the title's subject. I do not start reading before a detailed analysis of the title and it really helps me in many ways. For example in this passage ...". In other words, this modeling is descriptive rather than prescriptive.

4- The teacher interacts responsively with the students as they develop understanding of how to use the skill strategically. While the teacher provides much guidance in the lesson, the responsibility for the thinking is gradually shifted to the students, which is called "gradual release of responsibility" by Pearson (1985). During this shift, the teacher makes spontaneous instructional adjustments as students restructure their understandings. This responsive information given by the teacher is the heart of the instructional effectiveness because it is the teacher's sensitivity to students'

understandings which determine what students ultimately come to understand. Instead of learning to complete the worksheet accurately, students learn to think their way through a problem situation encountered in reading. In short, they learn to use skills as strategies to identify blockages, to think about alternative ways to remove blockages and reason with what they know about how reading works.

It is a known fact that good readers make use of their background knowledge. However only background knowledge about the topic of the passage is mostly emphasized in reading instruction. There is also another background knowledge, which is the one about how reading works to make sense out of text. Knowledge about the use of strategies is an example of this type of background. It helps readers to recognize situations where blockage occurs and to remove these blockages. This recasting skills as strategies instruction aims at improving this background knowledge (Duffy and Roehler 1987).

### 1.3 Explicit Comprehension Instruction Model

Pearson and Dole (1987) in their article, describe an instruction model which emphasizes the implementation of the above mentioned conditions in a classroom environment. This model is called Explicit Comprehension Instruction Model and it includes four steps; 1) modeling 2) guiding 3) consolidation 4) application. The modeling step emphasizes the first three conditions mentioned by Duffy and Roehler (1987) above in their definitions of "recasting skills as strategies", and second and third steps (guiding and consolidation) emphasizes the fourth condition. Finally, since it is for classroom implementation, the last step (application) is used to assess the students' achievement through exams and quizzes. Coming to the details of these steps, Pearson and Dole (1987) explain these four steps as follows.

- a) Modeling: Usually in this step teachers emphasize what a given strategy is and how to apply that strategy in a given reading selection. To illustrate this, teachers begin by modeling for students how to apply the strategy. Often, this involves teachers thinking aloud as they are reading and "sharing the cognitive secrets of the teacher's success".

- b) **Guided Practice:** In this step teachers and students work together to figure out how they went about applying the strategy. Teachers' role is work with students to discuss why they rejected some information and what they found difficult or confusing and why. Teachers also provide feedback and encouragement for students as they share their cognitive secrets.
- c) **Consolidation:** Here teachers consolidate, helping students see what the strategy is and how to apply it. They may also ask students why they should use the strategy.
- d) **Application:** Teachers ask students to apply the strategy to real texts. Students look for examples of the strategy in the selections they read. They realize the true "ownership" of the strategy.

For the instruction practice, step "b" and step "c" are combined since they are related with each other and they may be implemented together.

#### **1.4 Aim and the Scope of the Study**

This study aims at exploring the effect of recasting skills as strategies through teacher modeling based on Pearson and Dole's (1987) model on students' reading comprehension improvement. The reading comprehension improvement of the subjects receiving instruction through this model is compared with the improvement of the subjects receiving traditional reading skill instruction. These instructions will emphasize the following five skills; guessing difficult words, predicting, finding your ways around a text (referring expressions), skimming and scanning and looking for detailed information.

Finally, the subjects' opinions towards the instruction types to be applied in this study, will be assessed through an opinion questionnaire.

## **1.5 Research Questions**

The research questions to be answered in this study are as follows

- 1- Which reading strategies do elementary Turkish EFL students use while reading an English passage?
- 2- Is there a difference between Pearson and Dole's (1987) Explicit Comprehension Instruction model and traditional reading skill instruction in terms of improving students' reading comprehension? If there is, then which type of instruction helps improve students' reading comprehension?
- 3- Does Pearson and Dole's (1987) Explicit Comprehension Instruction model improve the use of study-specific strategies?
- 4- What are the opinions of the subjects towards the instruction type applied to them? Were they satisfied with the instruction type or not?

## **1.6 Limitations of the Study**

This study was limited carried out only with the students attending two different classes in Intensive English Program of Communication Sciences Faculty of Anadolu University, Eskisehir.

In this study, only five skills - guessing difficult words, predicting, finding your way around a text, skimming and scanning and looking for detailed information- were covered . Other reading skills such as finding the main idea, drawing inferences etc. were not included in this study.

This study was also limited to elementary level Turkish EFL students and to the reading skill.

In the next chapter, literature related to the issues in this study are discussed.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### 2.1 Related Studies Conducted

Oxford (1990) has introduced three different types of strategy training: Awareness training, one-time strategy training, and long-term strategy training. The aim of awareness training is to make students aware of the existence of different strategies, but they are not actively involved in how a certain strategy works by trying out. One time strategy training involves learning and practicing one or few strategies in one or few sessions. Long-term strategy training also involves learning and practicing strategies with language tasks, but long-term training is more prolonged and covers a greater number of strategies.

Starting with the criticism about the use of discrete skill instruction, much research in the 1980s mostly focused on discovering how to teach reading comprehension strategies directly. In such studies, readers were directly taught how to perform a strategy that skilled readers used during their reading. Then their abilities both in strategy use and text comprehension were compared either to their own performance before instruction or to the performance of similar readers who were not

taught the strategy directly, but through basal reading instruction, which emphasizes the isolated skill instruction.

In this line of research, Barnett (1988) compared traditional French reading class and a class trained on strategies through explicit comprehension instruction model. The results showed that there were no statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of comprehension. Thus, he concluded that this may be due to the students' high proficiency level, advanced level students do not benefit from this type of instruction.

Paris et. al.(1984) investigated the effects of explicit strategy training model to increase students' awareness of the importance of using cognitive and metacognitive strategies in reading. Subjects were taught general approaches of checking their comprehension, recognizing problems and using strategies to resolve the problem. An important aspect of this training was to explain the rationale behind the usefulness of the comprehension and monitoring strategies. They found that students who received direct instruction were more aware of comprehension strategies. Also the students with higher strategy awareness performed better on comprehension measures such as cloze passages and error-detection measures. Thus instruction on comprehension and metacomprehension strategies, which includes increasing students awareness of the importance of strategies seem to promote independent and self-controlled use of strategies.

Stevens et al (1991) conducted a study in which two groups receiving different instructions were compared. Experimental group was exposed to explicit instruction model integrated with cooperative learning in reading. Control group received traditional reading instruction, which focuses on skill development. The results of this study showed the significant impact of explicit instruction and cooperative learning on teaching students' specific reading comprehension strategies.

There were also other studies in which explicit comprehension instruction model was compared to traditional reading skill instruction(Hansen and Pearson 1983; Ogle 1986; Baumann 1984; Raphael 1985; Fitzgerald and Spiegel 1983 and Ambuster et al 1987) . The results of these studies showed that comprehension can in fact be taught and many strategies have been taught



successfully. But these studies were criticized on the bases that they were "one strategy at a time studies", and they did not use a classroom environment and the numbers of the subjects were between 1 and 5. Some of the strategies that were taught in these studies are,

- using background knowledge to make inferences (Hansen and Pearson 1983) or set purposes (Ogle 1986),
- getting the main idea (Baumann 1984),
- identifying the sources of information needed to answer questions (Raphael 1985),
- using the typical structure of stories (Fitzgerald and Spiegel 1983) or expository texts (Ambuster et al 1987) to help students to understand what they are reading.

(Fielding and Pearson 1994: 65)

Kern (1989) evaluated the effect of explicit instruction on intermediate level French EFL students' reading comprehension and inferential ability. The subjects were divided into two groups first as the experimental and control group and later each group was divided into three subgroups as high, middle and low level according to their language proficiency level. The experimental group received explicit comprehension instruction and the control group received traditional reading instruction. In the experimental group, all levels showed improvement, low level improving more compared with the middle and high levels. In the control group, high level showed a decrease in their scores and the other levels showed less improvement compared with the experimental group. These results imply that the subjects who had the greatest difficulty in reading L2 texts benefited most from explicit comprehension instruction compared to other group and to other levels in terms of reading comprehension and inferential ability.

The research carried out by Duffy et.al ( 1987) compared two groups, one getting explicit reading strategy instruction and other getting traditional reading instruction and found that the students benefited from explicit instruction in reading, elementary and beginning levels being the ones

getting the most benefit. In another research, Hosenfield (1985) taught word-guessing techniques to individual students through explicit comprehension instruction and found that their problem solving behavior upon encountering an unknown word improved.

Finally, Duffy et al (1987) found that when teachers use this explicit comprehension instruction model, students were more successful than the ones who received traditional reading skill instruction in terms of reading comprehension ability.

As the studies discussed above suggest, almost all of the research in the field focused on one time strategy training or compared explicit reading strategy model to traditional reading technique. In addition, much of the research on strategy training has not used a regular classroom teaching situation to carry out the training. Instructional objectives in strategy training are not met in 30 minute lessons. Rather it takes many lessons for teachers to help students build understanding about the nature of strategic reading, the different types of reading strategies and relationships between them, the adaptation of different kinds of strategies and combining them. Also, according to the studies advanced students do not benefit from explicit comprehension instruction since they may already be aware of strategic reading. Finally, most of the studies were conducted in ESL environment. In this study, taking those criticisms into consideration, a long term experimental design was used to determine whether exposing elementary EFL students to a special instruction, - Pearson and Dole's (1987) explicit comprehension instruction model - would help improve their reading comprehension more compared to that of a traditional reading skill instruction.

The difference of this study then, is that it focuses on more strategies; cognitive, metacognitive and affective strategies, it uses a natural teaching environment – actually teaching in the classroom - and a regular classroom teacher who is the researcher at the same time.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Introduction**

In this chapter, subjects, the instruments used, data collection procedures and the procedures followed during the treatment sessions are discussed.

#### **3.1 Subjects**

41 monolingual students attending the Intensive English Program of Communication Sciences Faculty at Anadolu University, Eskisehir were chosen as the subjects of this study. Subjects' English proficiency level was elementary as determined by the placement test administered at the beginning of the 1997-1998 academic year. Their scores ranged from 12 to 32 . They share the same native language, which is Turkish and their ages range between 17 and 23. Students were divided into two groups; an experimental group and a control group.

### **3.1.1 Experimental group**

20 students attending class H4, short for preparatory class 4 in this program, was the experimental group. The main instruction type for this group was cognitively based reading and they received an instruction in which the author recasted skills as strategies through modeling based on Pearson and Dole's (1987) explicit comprehension model.

### **3.1.2 Control group**

21 one of the subjects attending class H3, short for preparatory class 3 in this program, was the control group. During the treatment session one student did not attend the courses regularly and did not take the post tests. Therefore he was excluded from the analysis and the number of the students in the control group decreased to 20. This group was exposed to traditional reading skill instruction based on the isolated exercise type.

## **3.2 Instruments**

The following instruments were used to determine different factors such as language proficiency, strategy use of the students and to obtain their opinions about the instruction.

### **3.2.1 Michigan Placement Test**

This is a standard test officially administered to place the students enrolled in the Communication Sciences Faculty at Anadolu University, Eskisehir in various classrooms according to their level of English. Students who score less than 60 points are placed in classes based on their scores. Students scoring 60 or above they are subject to take other exams, such as speaking writing and another proficiency exam. (Students scoring 70 or above are exempt from preparatory school). Michigan Placement Test is composed of three parts; listening comprehension, grammar and vocabulary and reading comprehension parts. There are a total of 100 questions and scores are calculated on a 100 point scale.

### 3.2.2 Reading Strategy Inventory

To determine the reading strategies students use , an adapted version of Oxford's (1990) SILL ( Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) was administered. The inventory given to the subjects in this study included only those items related to reading skill. Cognitive, metacognitive, affective, social, memory and compensation strategies were incorporated as "broad focus" (Oxford, 1990). These items were translated into the subjects' native language to ensure the comprehension of the items by the subjects . The inventory consisted of 30 items following the general format "I do such and such" and the students responded on a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or almost never true of me) to 5 ( always or almost true of me)(See Appendix A). Of these 30 items, only ten strategies were related to the study-specific skills and the others represented general reading strategies. The reason for including items representing general reading strategies was to determine reading strategies used by Turkish EFL elementary reading students in general.

### 3.2.3 The Researcher-Prepared Reading Exam

This test was prepared by the researcher and designed especially to test the skills to be covered during the treatment sessions. In this test, a reading passage called "Human and Nature" was used. Students were asked to answer comprehension questions about the passage, and to guess the meaning of some unknown vocabularies from the passage, and to identify what some referring expressions refer to in the passage and to scan some ads and find answers to the questions about the ads. The scores were out of 100 and the distribution of the points according to the parts was 30,30,20,20 respectively (See Appendix B). The level of the passage in this test was above the subjects' initial reading proficiency level as otherwise it would have been difficult to assess a possible improvement. That is if the language level had been lower than the subjects' reading proficiency level, it would have been difficult to determine whether subjects progressed or not.

### **3.2.4 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL**

This test comprised of 60 questions, 30 vocabulary guessing and 30 reading comprehension. This test was administered for the following reasons: it tested the skills to be covered in the study, it is a standard test for EFL students, and a bit difficult for elementary level students. The researcher wanted to observe the differences between the achievements of students in a standard exam and researcher-prepared reading exam. Thus, the use of this test was motivated by two factors. First, as it is a standard test, it was used to check research prepared exam's validity. Secondly, as it is a test beyond the students' level, it would enable the researcher to determine a possible improvement in subjects' reading proficiency level.

### **3.2.5 Quizzes**

During the treatment sessions, the subjects were given regular quizzes after each skill was mastered. The quizzes were designed to test the skill taught the previous week. They were graded out of 20. A total of five quizzes were administered and the order of the quizzes were in the same order skills were taught; guessing difficult words, predicting, finding your way around the text, skimming and scanning and looking for detailed information.

### **3.2.6 Opinion Questionnaire**

This questionnaire was prepared by the researcher himself. It was administered in the subjects' native language since their level of English was not sufficient to comprehend complex structures. In this questionnaire there were 10 statements for the experimental group following the format "I learned such and such from this instruction and this instruction and modeling gave me clues about effective reading"(see Appendix C). For the control group, there were 9 statements. The ninth statement in this questionnaire, which was about modeling, was excluded for the control group since they did not receive such instruction. The students circled one of the five choices, which were "definitely no", "no", " I do not know", "yes", and "definitely yes". For the experimental group, these choices were for the first nine statements and for the control group for

the first eight statements. The last statement for each group were optional and the students were asked to write their own comments about the instruction types. In short, 9 statements for the control group and 10 statements for the experimental group were included in the analysis.

### **3.3.0 Materials**

Two types of materials were used in the study; coursebook and reading materials.

#### **3.3.1 Coursebook**

During the treatment, Penguin Elementary Reading Skills (Penguin Books, 1989) was used for both groups as the coursebook. This book was chosen by the reading teachers and it had been used for preceding two academic years in the Intensive English Program at Communication Sciences Faculty of Anadolu University. There are two sections in this book; Part A and Part B, and in each part there are seven units. The first six units of both part A and B include six skills; guessing difficult words, predicting, using monolingual dictionary, finding your way around the text, skimming and scanning and looking for detailed information. The last unit is the review unit. Part A is for elementary level and Part B is for intermediate level. Thus, only part A are used in this study. The skills covered during the treatment sessions were chosen from this book, which were the six skills mentioned above. The skill of using monolingual dictionary was not included in the analysis as assessing this skill through exams and quizzes is difficult and impractical.

#### **3.3.2 Reading Passages**

For each skill, three reading passages aside from the coursebook were used. The same reading passages were used in both groups. The passages were chosen according to the level of the students. With each reading passage, the given skill was practiced.

### 3.4 Procedure

The procedure lasted for one semester. It started at the beginning of the fall semester of 1997-98 academic year. Before the treatment session, the subjects were given the strategy inventory. This inventory had two purposes. The main purpose was to check whether the strategies related to the pre-decided skills (3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> strategies in the inventory see Appendix A) covered during the treatment sessions were used by the subjects before the treatment. The second purpose was to determine the general reading strategy uses of Turkish EFL students within the limited scope of the subjects in this study as there are no studies investigating the reading strategies of Turkish EFL students. The skills to be used in the study were decided before the treatment as the reading curriculum mandated the use of Penguin Elementary Reading Skills as the coursebook. Also these skills were thought to be the crucial ones for the reading instruction to elementary level students. After the diagnosis of the strategies, the researcher-prepared reading exam and the vocabulary and reading comprehension part of practice TOEFL were administered as pre-tests to determine the subjects' reading proficiency. Since both groups were found to be equal in terms of reading proficiency, treatment sessions started for both groups.

#### 3.4.1 Instruction: Experimental group

Experimental group received instruction on the basis of Pearson and Dole's (1987) explicit comprehension instruction model by recasting skills as strategies through teacher modeling. Pearson and Dole states that this type of instruction is different from others in three important ways. In Explicit comprehension instruction model,

"First, teachers do not only mention what strategy, or skill is. Instead, they model or provide direct explanation of what, why, how and when a comprehension strategy should be used. Second, students do not simply practice on their own. Instead, teachers provide guided practice in which they gradually and slowly release responsibility for the task completion to students until students are able to complete the task on their own. Finally, teachers do more than assess whether students can perform the skill or



strategy. Instead, teachers ask students to apply their strategies to new and different reading situations." (Pearson and Dole, 1987)

The most basic principle of this model is to explain mental reasoning involved in performing various reading tasks. In this study, following Pearson and Dole (1987), the instruction consisted of three steps during the treatment. In the first step the teacher, who was also the researcher, took the skill and recasted it as a strategy by modeling. He explicitly explained why, when and how he used this skill as a strategy to read more effectively in his real life reading situations. While he was doing this he made use of the isolated context exercises in the coursebook. Although it was not a good way to use isolated context exercise type in the modeling step, the researcher had to use them since the order of the treatment session procedures had to be the same for both groups to avoid the effect of using a different order. In short, for both groups the coursebook was used to introduce the skills and the difference for the experimental group was teacher modeling. Again in this step, a reading passage was also used to carry out this modeling in a real text. The teacher modeled how he used the skill by recasting it as a strategy. The modeling was carried out by dealing with the passage while explaining the procedures he usually follows in using this skill. In other words, he was a model for the students since he explained his mental reasoning as an experienced and knowledgeable person. Students were expected to internalize the skill as if it were his/her own strategy to be a successful reader. For example, when he encountered a word students were not expected to know, he modeled how he guessed the meaning by analyzing the context. He also explained why this guessing was very important and when it must be applied. During this step, students were only listeners, they did not participate in the lesson. Since this step includes mental reasoning, the teacher sometimes used the subjects' native language while explaining the mental reasoning.

In the second step, another reading passage was used. This step is very important because the basic aim of this step is to release the responsibility to students gradually. In order to achieve this, this time students and the teacher worked together on the passage. The teacher asked

questions such as "how did you guess the meaning of the unknown word?", "how did you use the title or pictures to comprehend the passage better?". With such questions, the teacher tried to get the students to model the comprehension process as similar as possible to his modeling. As opposed to the first step, students participated in the lesson by giving answers to the questions and by initiating the modeling process with the help of the teacher. Thus, students started to take responsibility for their own comprehension.

The third step was the "application" step in which the students tried to apply the recasted skills in the given reading passage for each skill. In this step, students were on their own. Students read the passage and answered questions. This step made up the quizzes of this study.

#### 3.4.2 Instruction: Control Group

Control group, on the other hand, received traditional reading skill instruction. In this instruction, the exercises in the textbook were used. This book introduces the skills through isolated exercise form. As opposed to the modeled version of this exercise mastering in the experimental group, the teacher and the students dealt with the exercises by finding only the correct answer without thinking about the mental reasoning leading to the correct answer, alternative answers were not discussed. Students were made aware of the skills through exercises. After completing the exercises in the book, the same reading passage used for the experimental group was covered. First two passages were covered through pre-reading questions, a guided reading based on content comprehension and traditional "who, what, where, and when" comprehension questions and vocabulary, referring expressions, true/false statements. In this teaching process, students were assumed to have learned how to use these skills in a passage. For example, they were asked to guess the unknown words or to find the referring expressions etc. but there were no detailed discussions about the process of reaching an answer since this instruction focused on isolated skill awareness and automatization. The third passage was used as a quiz.

At the end of the treatment sessions, the same tests given as pre-tests were administered as post-tests in this study to determine the reading proficiency improvement within groups and

between groups. Also the strategy inventory administered at the beginning was administered again to determine if there was an increase in the use of study-specific strategies by the subjects in both groups. Finally, in order to explore their opinions about the instruction types in terms of effectiveness and satisfaction, the opinion questionnaire was administered.

### 3.5 Data Analysis

The data obtained from the researcher prepared reading exam was subjected to a statistical analysis - t- test for independent samples, to determine if there were significant differences between the two groups in terms of reading comprehension and t-test for dependent samples, to determine the improvement within groups, was applied to compare the scores of pre-test with that of post-test. In this exam, t-test applied to post-test scores did not show a significant difference between the two groups in terms of reading proficiency level. However, since p value was not very so smaller than 0.05 and mean differences are quite different, the researcher thought that there might be a significant difference in the degree of improvement between the two groups. Therefore, another t-test was applied to the gain scores, that is the scores found by subtracting the scores the subjects got in the pre-test from the ones they got in the post-test. This type of t-test was referred as t-test for the changes in the scores in this study and was used only for this exam.

For the vocabulary and reading comprehension of practice TOEFL the same analysis was used except t-test for the chances in the scores.

Again before the treatment session, strategy inventory was administered to obtain data about subjects' strategy use. The results of this strategy inventory were analyzed in several ways. Firstly, the averages for each study-specific strategies (3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 9th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 17th, 23rd items in the strategy inventory) -the strategies which represent only the study-specific skills- were calculated to determine whether to include them in the study. Secondly, in the post-treatment administration of this questionnaire, the averages for the same items mentioned above were calculated again to determine if there were an increase in the use for both groups. Thirdly, in the pre-treatment administration of this questionnaire, the 30 items in the strategy-inventory were

classified into six strategy classes according to Oxford's (1990) classification model as affective, social, metacognitive, compensation, memory and cognitive strategies. And the overall averages for each item and for each class were calculated and later the results were interpreted in terms of the use of reading strategies by Turkish elementary EFL students in a general sense in addition to the use of study-specific strategies.

During the treatment, subjects were given regular quizzes to test whether they were able to use the strategy after each skill was mastered. These quizzes were graded out of 20 and the averages for each quiz for each group were calculated and t-test for independent samples was applied to see if there were significant differences between the groups

During the treatment session again, subjects were officially administered two reading midterms. These midterms were also included in the analyses, as both groups were administered the same midterms and these midterms tested subjects' reading comprehension. For both midterms the mean values were calculated for each group, and t-test for independent samples was applied to determine if there were significant differences between group in terms of reading proficiency for both the first and second midterm.

Finally, at the end of the treatment sessions the opinion questionnaire was administered to both groups. For each statement and for each choice, the number of students and the percentages were calculated for each group separately for the first 8 items. The statement about the modeling was for the experimental group. For this statement, the number of students and the percentages were calculated as well. In this questionnaire, the first two choices for each statement implied negative opinion, the third choice was for no opinion, and the last two choices implied positive opinion about the treatment. Finally, the overall average for these choices were calculated for each group and these results were interpreted. The last statement for each group included the subjects' comments about the instruction type. Since they were open-ended, only those which are related with the purpose of this study are discussed.

The results are given in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### 4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the results obtained from various instruments were analyzed through three types of t-tests for the pre and post-tests; t-test for dependent samples, t-test for independent samples and t-test for the differences in the scores between pre and post-tests at the 0.05 level of significance.

#### 4.1 Strategy Inventory

Since the aim of this inventory was to determine the general reading strategies as well as study-specific strategies, it was analyzed in two ways. To determine the general reading strategies students use, all 30 items were investigated. These 30 items were classified as cognitive, metacognitive, compensation, social and affective strategies. 11 of the 30 items were cognitive strategies. The means for cognitive strategies ranged from 2.45 to 3.75 for the experimental group and from 2.20 to 3.25 for the control group. The overall mean was 3.03 out of 5.00, therefore being in "sometimes used range" according to the five-point Likert scale . So the students used them sometimes.

There were 6 items related to metacognitive strategy class. The means for metacognitive strategies ranged from 2.65 to 4.10, for the experimental group and from 2.35 to 4.05 for the control group. The overall mean for metacognitive strategy use for all subjects was 3.41 out of 5.00, therefore being in "sometimes used range" according to the five-point Likert scale . So the students used them sometimes.

3 items were compensation strategies The means for compensation strategies ranged from 2.25 to 3.45 for the control group and from 2.35 to 3.35 for the experimental group. The overall mean for compensation strategy use across subjects was 2.96 out of 5.00, therefore being in "sometimes used range" according to the five-point Likert scale . So the students used them sometimes.

2 items were social strategies The means for social strategies ranged from 3.70 and 3.90 for the control group and 3.35 and 3.85 for the experimental group. The overall mean for social strategy use across subjects was 3.70 out of 5.00, therefore being in "generally used range".

The number of affective strategies was 3. The means for affective strategies ranged from 1.75 to 3.05 for the control group and from 1.85 to 3.40 for the experimental group. The overall mean for affective strategy use across subjects was 2.64 out of 5.00, meaning they are sometimes used.

Finally, 5 items were memory strategies. The means for memory strategies ranged from 1.90 to 3.10 for the control group and from 2.40 to 3.00 for the experimental group. The overall mean for memory strategy use across subjects was 2.68 out of 5.00, therefore being in "sometimes used range". The results are summarized in Table 1. ( See Appendix D for the relevant averages and classification of the strategies in this inventory). The following is the Likert scale:

- 1) Always or almost always used: 4.5 to 5.0
- 2) Generally used : 3.5 to 4.4
- 3) Sometimes used : 2.5 to 3.4
- 4) Generally not used : 1.5 to 2.4
- 5) Never or almost never used :1.0 to 1.4

Table 4.1

The frequency of general reading strategy use by Turkish elementary EFL students

Strategy Class	Number of items	Experimental Group	Control Group	Means
Cognitive	11	3.13	2.93	3.03
Metacognitive	6	3.38	3.45	3.41
Compensation	3	2.95	2.98	2.96
Social	2	3.60	3.80	3.70
Affective	3	2.73	2.55	2.64
Memory	5	2.75	2.62	2.68

The second purpose was to determine the frequency of study-specific strategy use. In the inventory there were 10 items related to the skills covered during the treatment. (The numbers of these items were 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 23 ). The averages for these items are given in table 4.2. Averages for the ten items ranged from 2.35 (item 12) to 3.35 (item 23 and 14) for the experimental group and from 2.25 (item 13) to 3.45 (item 12) for the control group. The overall mean for the experimental group was 3.05 and for the control group 2.98. Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 23 referred to cognitive strategies, 12, 13, 14 referred to compensation strategies and the item 17 referred to affective strategy.

Table 4.2

The average ranges for the study specific strategies  
in the pre treatment administration of the inventory

Items	Experimental group	Control group
	n=20	n=20
Cognitive		
3	2.90	2.80
4	3.25	3.05
5	2.95	2.80
6	3.05	3.15
9	3.25	3.05
23	3.35	2.95
mean	3.12	2.96
Compensation		
12	3.15	3.45
13	2.35	2.25
14	3.35	3.25
mean	2.95	2.98
Affective		
17	2.95	3.05
Overall mean	3.05	2.98

The averages range for each item were within the "sometimes used" range. The frequency of use for each item is comparable across groups except for item 23. For item 23, the mean was 3.35 for the experimental group, and 2.95 for the control group. However, both means fall into the "sometimes used" range. The results of study-specific strategies then suggest that students were not capable of using these strategies adequately all the time. Thus teaching the use of these study-specific strategies is necessary.

This inventory was also administered to both groups at the end of the treatment sessions to determine whether there was an increase in the frequency of study-specific strategy use. The results are given in Table 4.2. The overall mean for cognitive strategies increased to 3.79 for the experimental group with a range of 3.15 to 4.40 and for the control group, the overall mean for this class of strategies increased to 3.35 from 2.96 and ranged from 3.00 to 3.80 . The overall mean for



compensation strategies for the experimental group increased to 3.41 from 2.95 and ranged from 2.15 to 4.05. Although there was an increase in the overall mean for the item 13 there was a decrease in the mean. For the control group the overall mean for this class of strategies was 2.88 and ranged from 1.90 to 3.40. For this class of strategies there was a decrease in the overall mean in the control group, a decrease from 2.98 to 2.88. Also specifically for the items 12 and 13 there were decreases (from 3.45 to 3.35 and from 2.25 to 1.95 respectively). Finally the overall mean for affective strategy for the experimental group increased to 3.40 from 2.95 as opposed to the decrease for the control group from 3.05 to 2.90. The overall average for the experimental group for these 10 items was 3.64 and for the control group 3.16 (see table 4.2). For the experimental group, there was a 0.59 increase in the average in the use of study-specific strategies as opposed to 0.18 increase for the control group.

**Table 4.3**

The average ranges for the study specific strategies  
in the pre and post treatment administration of the inventory

Items	Experimental group n=20		Control group n=20	
	pre	post	pre	post
Cognitive				
3	2.90	4.40	2.80	3.80
4	3.25	4.00	3.05	3.60
5	2.95	3.15	2.80	3.25
6	3.05	3.90	3.15	3.30
9	3.25	3.65	3.05	3.15
23	3.35	3.65	2.95	3.00
mean	<b>3.12</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>3.35</b>
Compensation				
12	3.15	4.05	3.45	3.35
13	2.35	2.15	2.25	1.90
14	3.35	4.05	3.25	3.40
mean	<b>2.95</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.88</b>
Affective				
17	2.95	3.40	3.05	2.90
<b>Averages</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>3.16</b>

#### 4.2 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam as one of the Two Pre-tests

The researcher-prepared reading exam was administered to both groups as one of the pre-tests to determine the reading proficiencies of the subjects. The mean values for both groups are shown as seen in table 4.4. ( See Appendix E1 for the summary of the results for the experimental group and Appendix E2 for the summary of the results for the control group).

The results of the t-test for independent samples showed that there were no significant differences between the groups ( $t = -0.84$ ,  $p = 0.406$ ) since  $p > 0.05$  at the 0.05 level of significance. This suggests that the reading proficiency level of these two groups are similar.

Table 4.4

The researcher-prepared reading exam as pre-test

T-test for independent samples

	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
control group	20	34.1			
			2.9	-0.84	0.406
experimental group	20	31.2			

at 0.05 level of significance

#### 4.3 The Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL as the Second Pre-test

The second instrument to test the reading proficiency levels of the experimental and the control group was a standard test. Although this test was above the subjects' proficiency level, it was chosen as another instrument since it tests well the skills to be taught during the treatment sessions. In this test, out of 60 questions; there were 30 vocabulary and 30 reading comprehension questions. The means for both the control group and the experimental group are given in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

The vocabulary and reading comprehension part of Practice TOEFL as pre-test

T-test for independent samples

	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
control group	20	5.5			
			1.2	1.1	0.27
experimental group	20	6.7			

at 0.05 level of significance

The average number of correct answers for the control group was 5.5 and for the experimental group 6.7 out of 60. (See Appendix E1 for the summary of the results for the experimental group and Appendix E2 for the summary of the results for the control group). The results of t-test for independent samples did not show a significant difference between the groups ( $t = 1.1$  and  $p = 0.27$  ( $p > 0.05$ )).

The results of these two pre-tests indicate that these groups were equal in terms of reading proficiency before the treatment.

#### 4.4 The Researcher-prepared Reading Exam as the first Post-test

The same test used as the pre-test was administered as one of the two post-tests at the end of the treatment session to determine the improvement of the subjects in reading proficiency. The results of this test are shown in table 4.6.

Table 4.6

The researcher-prepared reading exam as post-test

T-test for independent samples

	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
control group	20	49			
			5.8	1.31	0.196
experimental group	20	54.8			

at 0.05 level of significance

The mean value for the control group was 49 and for the experimental group 54.8 with a 5.8 mean difference ( See Appendix E1 for the summary of the results for the experimental group and Appendix E2 for the summary of the results for the control group).

Although the mean score was higher for the experimental group compared to that of control group, the results of t-test for independent samples indicate that this difference is not significant. To determine whether there were significant differences between pre and post tests, t-test for dependent samples was done for each group. For the control group, the mean score was 34.1 for the pre-test and 49 for the post-test with a 14.9 mean difference. This difference suggests that the control group improved significantly. The results are shown in Table 4.7.

**Table 4.7**  
The researcher-prepared reading exam

T-test for dependent samples (Control Group)

Control group	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
pre-test	20	34.1			
			14.9	11.6	0.001
post-test	20	49			

at 0.05 level of significance

For the experimental group, the mean score was 31.2 for the pre-test and 54.8 for the post-test with a 23.55 mean difference. This difference indicates that the experimental group improved significantly as well. The results are given in Table 4.8

**Table 4.8**  
The researcher-prepared reading exam

T-test for dependent samples (Experimental Group)

experimental group	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
pre-test	20	31.2			
			23.55	8.7	0.001
post-test	20	54.8			

at 0.05 level of significance

Although both groups improved significantly, the experimental group showed a greater improvement. While the mean difference between pre and post test was 14.9 for the control group, it was 23.55 for the experimental group. Thus the degree of improvement for the two groups was different. A t-test for the differences in the scores gained from pre and post test was applied to determine if the degree of improvement was statistically different. In order to apply this type of t-test, the scores the subjects received from the post-test were subtracted from the scores of the pre-test and t-test was applied to these scores. This time it was observed that there was a significant difference between the groups since test t value was -2.5 and p value was 0.016 ( $p < 0.05$ ) (see table 4.8). In other words, although the groups seemed equal in the post test, the degree of improvement was quite different. This shows that experimental group improved more compared to the control group in terms of reading proficiency. The results are shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9

The researcher-prepared reading exam

T-test for independent samples for the changes in the scores between the pre and post test

	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
control	20		14.9		
				-2.5	0.016
experimental	20		23.55		

at 0.05 level of significance

#### 4.5 Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Part of Practice TOEFL as the Second

##### Post-test

Practice TOEFL given as one of the pre-tests before the treatment was administered as the second post-test. The results of this second post-tests are shown in table 4.10.

Table 4.10

The vocabulary and Reading comprehension part of Practice TOEFL

T-test for independent samples

	n	Mean	mean difference	t	p
control	20	9.3			
			5.0	3.42	0.001
experimental	20	14.3			

at 0.05 level of significance

The average number of correct answers out of 60 questions were 9.3 for the control group and 14.3 for the experimental group( See Appendix E1 for the summary of the results for the experimental group and see Appendix E2 for the summary of the results for the control group). Again to determine whether there was a significant improvement between pre and post test within groups, t-test for dependent samples was done. The results for the control group are shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11

The vocabulary and Reading comprehension part of Practice TOEFL

T-test for dependent samples (Control Group)

control group	n	Mean	mean difference	t	p
pre-Toefl	20	5.5			
			3.8	-2.94	0.083
post-Toefl	20	9.3			

at 0.05 level of significance

For the control group, mean difference was 3.8. The difference between pre and post tests was not statistically significant. The results for the experimental group are shown in Table 4.12. For this group, the mean score was 6.7 in the pre-test and it increased to 14.25 in the post test with 7.55 difference which suggests that the experimental group improved significantly.

Table 4.12

The vocabulary and Reading comprehension part of Practice TOEFL  
T-test for dependent samples (Experimental Group)

experimental group	n	Mean	mean difference	t	p
pre-Toefl	20	6.7			
			7.55	-7.14	0.001
post-Toefl	20	14.25			

at 0.05 level of significance

Thus, it can be said that experimental group achieved significant improvement but the control group did not. When the mean differences between pre and post tests for the two groups are compared, the improvement for the experimental group is much greater than that of the control group (7.55 vs 3.8 respectively).

In conclusion, then the researcher prepared reading exam and vocabulary and reading comprehension part of practice TOEFL showed that there was a significant difference between the groups in terms of reading proficiency. Although both groups improved to some extent, this improvement was greater for the experimental group. The results of the statistical analysis indicate that the difference between the two groups is significant.

#### 4.6 Quizzes

During the treatment sessions, five quizzes were administered to both groups. The purpose of these quizzes was to test the skills taught in the following week. Each skill was covered within two weeks and at the end of every two weeks, the same quiz testing the skill was given to both groups. In the first quiz, in which subjects were required to guess the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary items, there was no significant difference between the two groups as Table 4.13 shows. The mean score across subjects for the control group was 15 and for the experimental it was 14.2. The mean difference between the groups was 0.8

Table 4.13

## Quiz 1 (Guessing Vocabulary)

## T-test for independent samples

	n	mean	Mean difference	t	p
control group	20	15			
			0.8	-0.48	0.627
experimental group	20	14.2			

at 0.05 level of significance

The second quiz was about making predictions about the passage before reading or while reading. The results of t-test for independent samples did not show a significant difference between the groups as Table 4.14 indicates. The mean score for the control group was 11.93 and for the experimental group it was 12.15. The mean differences between the groups was 0.22.

Table 4.14

## Quiz 2 (Predicting)

## T-test for independent samples

	n	mean	Mean difference	t	p
control group	20	11.93			
			0.22	0.112	0.91
experimental group	20	12.15			

at 0.05 level of significance

Similarly the third quiz, which required the subjects to find what the words refer to in a given passage, did not show a significant difference between the groups as in Table 4.15. The mean score for the control group was 10.8 and for the experimental group it was 12.3 with a mean difference of 1.5.



Table 4.15

## Quiz 3 (Referring Expressions)

T-test for independent samples

	n	Mean	Mean difference	t	p
control group	20	10.8			
			1.5	1.76	0.86
experimental group	20	12.3			

at 0.05 level of significance

The only quiz which showed a statistical difference between the groups was the fourth quiz in which the subjects were required to answer scanning questions. As seen in Table 4.16, the mean for the control group was 11.7 and 14.53 for the experimental group and the mean difference between the groups was 2.85 ( $t = 2.47$  and  $p = 0.017$ ). The results show that in this quiz the experimental group was more successful.

Table 4.16

## Quiz 4 (Scanning)

T-test for independent samples

	n	Mean	mean difference	t	p
control group	20	11.67			
			2.85	2.473	0.017
experimental group	20	14.52			

at 0.05 level of significance

Finally, the fifth quiz, which is based on looking for detailed information, did not show a significant difference between the groups as seen in Table 4.17. The mean for the control group for this quiz was 17.27 and for the experimental group 15.65. The mean differences for the groups was 1.62. Interestingly, for this quiz the control group scored higher than the experimental group.

Table 4.17

Quiz 5 (Looking for details)

T-test for independent samples

	n	Mean	mean difference	t	p
control group	20	17.27			
			1.62	-0.48	0.627
experimental group	20	15.65			

at 0.05 level of significance

In summary, t-test for independent samples did not show any significant differences between the two groups except for the fourth quiz (See Appendix F1 for the summary of the results for the experimental group and see Appendix F2 for the summary of the results for the control group).

#### 4.7 Officially Administered First and Second Midterms

The results of the officially administered midterms at the Intensive English Program were more outstanding in giving clues about the differences in degree of reading proficiency improvement between the groups. The average of the first midterm was 75.7 for the control group and 70.9 for the experimental group the control group scoring higher than the experimental group (mean difference = 4.8). This difference however was not significant suggesting that these two groups were similar in terms of reading proficiency ( see Table 4 18) at the time of the 1<sup>st</sup> midterm - 1.5 months after the treatment began.

**Table 4.18**  
 Officially Administered First Midterms  
 T-test for independent samples

	n	Mean	mean difference	t	p
control group	20	75.7			
			4.8	-0.812	0.421
experimental group	20	70.9			

at 0.05 level of significance

In the second midterm, -3.5 months after the treatment began, the mean score for the control group was 56.2 and for the experimental group 69.3 with a mean difference of 13.1. T-test for independent samples showed that this time these two groups were significantly different in terms of reading proficiency as seen in Table 4.19.

**Table 4.19**  
 Officially Administered Second Midterms  
 T-test for independent samples

	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
control group	20	56.2			
			13.1	3.53	0.01
experimental group	20	69.3			

at 0.05 level of significance

When the mean values of first and second midterms are compared, a decrease in the mean values are seen, suggesting that students did worse in the second midterm.. As seen in Table 4.20, there was a 19.5 decrease for the control group and this difference is statistically significant. Although there was a decrease for the experimental group as well, this difference was not

significant. As seen in Table 4.21, as a matter of fact, the mean difference was only 1.6 points. Thus for the experimental group, the subjects' performance on the midterms remained same.

In addition to the analysis of reading midterms administered to both groups, their other midterms; such as grammar, listening, writing and speaking midterms were also analyzed. The purpose was to check whether the control group and the experimental group experienced the same amount of decrease in these courses as well. After the analysis, it was observed that this situation was true for both experimental and control group. As mentioned before, with reading, the amount of this decrease was quite different across the groups. This finding may suggest that reading instruction applied to the experimental group was effective in reducing the amount of decrease for this group.

**Table 4.20**

Officially Administered First and Second Midterms

T-test for dependent samples (Control Group)

control group	n	mean	mean difference	T	p
First midterm	20	75.7			
			-19.5	-8.42	0.001
Second midterm	20	56.2			

at 0.05 level of significance

**Table 4.21**

Officially Administered First and Second Midterms

T-test for dependent samples

Experimental group	n	mean	mean difference	t	p
First midterm	20	70.9			
			-1.6	0.37	0.714
Second midterm	20	69.3			

at 0.05 level of significance

#### 4.8 Opinion Questionnaire

An opinion questionnaire was given to determine the subjects' opinions about the treatment sessions and if they really benefited from the instruction types and if modeling had a psychological effect on the experimental group. Since the control group was not exposed to modeling this statement was excluded for this group. In the five choice questionnaire, the first two choices indicate a negative opinion about the instruction type ("definitely no" and "no"), third choice ("I do not know") indicates that students did not have a clear idea if the instruction was beneficial or not and fourth and fifth choices (yes, definitely yes) indicate a positive opinion about the instruction type. According to this classification the results for each statement were analyzed in the following way:

For statement A, which was about the instruction given to teach guessing difficult words in a passage, in the experimental group 16 subjects or 80% circled "yes" and 4 subjects or 20% circled "definitely yes", which implied all the subjects had a positive opinion about the treatment. However in the control group, only 8 subjects or 40% had a positive idea (7 for "yes and 1 for "definitely yes") about this "guessing vocabulary from context" instruction. The remaining 8 subjects (40%) circled "I do not know" and 4 subjects (20%) circled "no"

For statement B, which was about making predictions before you read, in the experimental group 19 subjects (95%) had a positive opinion about the instruction (13 for "yes" and 6 for "definitely yes") and only one subject (5%) circled "I do not know". In the control group, 11 subjects (55%) expressed positive opinion (9 for "yes" and two for "definitely yes") 6 subjects (30%) expressed no opinion and 4 subjects had negative opinion about prediction instruction.

For statement C, which was about selective reading, in the experimental group 16 subjects (80%) circled positive choices (13 for "yes" and 3 for "definitely yes"), 3 subjects (15%) circled "I do not know" and 1 subject (5%) circled "no". In the control group, only 9 subjects (45%) circled "yes" no subject circled "definitely yes", 6 subjects (30%) circled "I do not know" and 5 subjects (25%) had negative opinion (4 for "no" and 1 for "definitely no").

For statement D, which was about selective reading, in the experimental group 16 subjects (80%) circled "yes", 3 subjects (15%) circled "I do not know" and 1 subject (5%) circled "no". In the control group, only 8 subjects (40%) had positive opinion about the instruction (6 for "yes" and 2 for "definitely yes"), 7 subjects (35%) circled "I do not know" and 5 subjects (25%) circled "no".

For statement E, which was about referring expressions, in the experimental group 12 subjects (60%) circled positive choices (11 for "yes" and 1 for "definitely yes"), 7 subjects (35%) circled "I do not know" and 1 subject (5%) circled "no". In the control group, 7 subjects (35%) had positive opinion (6 for "yes" and 1 for "definitely yes"), 9 subjects (45%) circled "I do not know" and 4 subjects (20%) expressed negativity (3 for "no" and 1 for "definitely no")

For statement F, which was about skimming and scanning, in the experimental group 16 subjects (80%) circled positive choices (12 for "yes" and 4 for "definitely yes"), 3 subjects (15%) circled "I do not know" and 1 subject (5%) circled "definitely no". In the control group, 10 subjects (50%) had positive opinion (8 for "yes" and 2 for "definitely yes"), 5 subjects (25%) circled "I do not know" and 5 subjects (25%) had negative opinion (4 for "no" and 1 for "definitely no")

For statement G, which was about using monolingual (English - English) dictionary, in the experimental group 15 subjects (75%) circled positive choices (10 for "yes" and 5 for "definitely yes"), 5 subjects (25%) circled "I do not know". In the control group, 13 subjects (65%) had positive opinion (8 for "yes" and 5 for "definitely yes"), 3 subjects (15%) circled "I do not know" and 4 subjects (20%) circled "no".

For statement H, which was about the general effect of the instruction, in the experimental group 18 subjects (90%) had a positive opinion (12 for "yes" and 6 for "definitely yes"), 1 subject (5%) circled "I do not know" and 1 subject (5%) circled "no".

Statement I was about the effect of modeling. Therefore this statement was only for the experimental group. 19 subjects (95%) had a positive opinion about modeling (10 for "yes" and 9 for "definitely yes"), only 1 subject (5%) circled "definitely no".

If we look at the average percentages of each choice for all statements, for the experimental group, the average percentage for the first choice "definitely no" was 1.11%, for the second choice

"no" 2.22%, for the third choice "I do not know" 12.78%, for the fourth choice "yes" 62.78% and for the fifth choice "definitely yes" 21.11%. In other words, the subjects having a negative opinion about the instruction, here modeling, consists of 3.33% of the whole experimental group population. The subjects having no opinion was 12.78% of this population and the subjects having positive opinion 83.89%.

For the control group, the average percentage for the first choice "definitely no" was 1.88%, for the second choice "no" 20.63%, for the third choice "I do not know" %30, for the fourth choice "yes" %37,50 and for the fifth choice "definitely yes" 10%. In other words, the subjects having a negative opinion about the instruction, here traditional reading skill instruction, consists of %22.51 of the whole experimental group population. The subjects having no opinion was 30% of this population and the subjects having positive opinion 47.50%. (See table 4.22 for the summary of the results for both experimental group and control group)

In the next chapter the discussion of the results and conclusions and some suggestions for further studies will be mentioned.

**Table 4.22**  
~~Attitude~~ <sup>Opinion</sup> Questionnaire

(The number of the subjects for each item in the attitude questionnaire  
and the percentages in the group population)

Opinions about the instruction for	Control Group and Experimental Group									
	Choices									
	definitely no		no		I don't know		yes		definitely yes	
	control	experimental	control	experimental	control	experimental	control	experimental	control	experimental
a(guessing words)	0 (0%)	0(0%)	4 (20%)	0(0%)	8 (40%)	0(0%)	7 (35%)	16 (80%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)
b(predictions)	0 (0%)	0(0%)	4 (20%)	0(0%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)	9 (45%)	13 (65%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)
c(reading styles)	1 (5%)	0(0%)	4 (20%)	1 (5%)	6 (30%)	3 (15%)	9 (45%)	13 (65%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)
d(reading styles)	0 (0%)	0(0%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)	7 (35%)	3 (15%)	6 (30%)	16 (80%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)
e(references)	1 (5%)	0(0%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	9 (45%)	7 (35%)	6 (30%)	11 (55%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
f(scanning)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)	0(0%)	5 (25%)	3 (15%)	8 (40%)	12 (60%)	2 (10%)	4 (20%)
g(dictionary use)	0 (0%)	0(0%)	4 (20%)	0(0%)	3 (15%)	5 (25%)	8 (40%)	10 (50%)	5 (25%)	5 (25%)
h(general idea))	0 (0%)	0(0%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)	7 (35%)	12 (60%)	3 (15%)	6 (30%)
i(modeling)		1 (5%)		0(0%)		0(0%)		10 (50%)		9 (45%)
<b>Average</b>	<b>1.88%</b>	<b>1.11%</b>	<b>20.63%</b>	<b>2.22%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>12.78%</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>62.78%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>21.11%</b>



## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

#### 5.1 Summary

The aim of this study was to determine whether there were differences in terms of reading proficiency improvement between the control group which was exposed to traditional reading instruction and the experimental group which received explicit comprehension instruction in which the researcher recasted skills as strategies through modeling based on Pearson and Dole's explicit instruction model.

The results showed a significant difference between the groups in terms of reading proficiency improvement except for the results of the quizzes. Although the groups were equal in terms of reading proficiency before the treatment, the post-tests, strategy inventory and the questionnaire implied that the experimental group benefited from the instruction more than the control group. The improvement observed in the experimental group had three dimensions.

The first dimension was the numerical dimension. When pre and post administrations of the instruments used in this study, the experimental group subjects got higher points compared to

the control group and the degree of improvement in reading comprehension was higher. As a result it can be said that the treatment applied to the experimental group was more effective than the one applied to the control group in terms of reading proficiency improvement.

Quizzes administered during the treatment sessions did not show any significant differences between the groups except the fourth quiz, which was about scanning.

The second dimension was the strategy dimension. The strategy inventory administered before the treatment session to identify if the subjects apply the study-specific strategies was also administered at the end of the treatment. The purpose of this second administration was to check if there was an increase in applying these specific strategies after the treatment. The results showed that the increase in the experimental group (0.59 out of 5.00) was higher than the control group (0.18 out of 5.00). This result implies that the instruction applied to the experimental group also creates more improvement in strategy use.

Coming to the other purpose of this questionnaire, which was to determine the general reading strategies of elementary Turkish EFL students in Turkey within the limited scope of the subjects in this study, it can be said that the mostly applied strategy class is social strategies (3.65 out of 5.00) (generally used). The next class was metacognitive strategies (3.37 out of 5.00) (sometimes used). The overall average for cognitive strategy class was 3.03 out of 5.00 (sometimes used). Other classes were compensation strategies (2.96 sometimes used), memory strategies (2.68 sometimes used) and affective strategies (2.64 sometimes used).

The third dimension, may be the most important one, was the psychological dimension. In order to assess this psychological dimension, in this study an opinion questionnaire was given to both groups. According to the results of this questionnaire, it can be said that the experimental group was more satisfied and have gained more self confidence than the subjects in the control group.

In summary the success achieved by the experimental group in this study can be summarized as follows:

a) Recasting skills as strategies through teacher modeling in real contexts are more effective in learning skills as opposed to learning them in isolated context as in the traditional reading skill instruction. In fact, in real life, readers do not encounter multiple choices while reading a material.

b) That the teacher is a model to show the mental reasoning process in reading comprehension increases self-confidence of the students and therefore facilitates learning, since students feel comfortable and sure about the instruction.

c) Discussing possible answers in detail and the evidences for the answers as opposed to giving the correct answer and then passing on to other questions, can prepare students for other difficulties they may face in other reading materials. Here, students learn how to learn by discussing every situation. In the traditional skill instruction, on the other hand, the students are required to give only the correct answer, not the whys of the answers.

## 5.2. Discussion

Since the aim of this study was to determine the effects of instruction on improving EFL students' reading proficiency, a number of instruments were used to achieve this purpose. The first instrument used was the researcher prepared reading exam. In this exam, the experimental group showed a 23.55 point increase as opposed to the 14.9 points increase for the control group. The experimental group achieved more improvement in terms of reading comprehension. T-test applied to the differences in the scores they got in the pre and post administration of this test showed significant difference between the groups. This may mean that recasting skills as strategies through teacher modeling is an effective way to improve students' reading comprehension. This result is supported by a considerable number of studies (Barnett 1988, Duffy et.al 1986; Day 1980 and Kern 1989). Palincsar and Brown (1983) (cited in Pearson and Gallagher 1983) reported that the students can indeed, through explicit instruction, be taught to acquire and independently apply reading strategies which enhances reading comprehension. Baker and Brown (1984) (cited in Carrell 1983) point out that "knowing that" is different from "knowing how". Readers who

enhance their awareness of the nature of reading and of their reading strategies are better readers than those who do not.

The results of the vocabulary and reading comprehension part of Practice TOEFL also showed a significant difference between groups. In this test, the mean difference observed between pre and post treatment administration was 3.8 for the control group and 7.55 for the experimental group. Both groups improved but the level of improvement was different. T test applied to pre and post administration of this test also showed these differences from a statistical point of view. In other studies, researchers found similar results about standard tests ( Brown and Palincsar 1985 and Mason 1984) (cited in Pearson and Dole 1987). However, this finding is not consistent with the results of the studies done by Paris et.al (1984) and Duffy et.al (1986). They found that students improved on some dependent measures after explicit comprehension instruction, but not on standardized tests. Their argument is that these standardized tests are based on a different theoretical and instructional paradigm.

The other instrument, quizzes which were administered during the treatment session, did not show any significant differences between groups except for the fourth quiz, which was about scanning. One reason may be that in the quizzes, the number of questions was much smaller than the other tests and the point range was narrow (out of 20). Another reason may be that quizzes focused on only one skill and subjects did not have to combine the skills for more difficult tasks. That may be why, in the long term, the experimental group was more successful in other tests, which required the total use of these skills since they learnt how to combine and apply these skills to reading situations O'Malley 1984 reported that there were no differences between groups in daily quizzes.

Other instrument, two midterms officially administered during the treatment session, also showed that both groups are different in terms of reading comprehension, experimental group being more successful. In the first midterm, t-test for independent samples showed no difference between groups, however in the second midterm, t-test for independent samples showed that groups were significantly different in terms of reading proficiency. In the second midterm questions

and the level of the passage was higher than of the first midterm, experimental group's performance did not change but the control group's performance decreased significantly. In the literature, studies did not include such an official exam in the analysis, thus there are no comparable results.

The purpose of the strategy inventory was to determine whether subjects applied study specific strategies before the treatment and, through a second administration after the treatment, to determine whether the frequency of these study specific strategies increased. The results showed that the increase in the experimental group subjects (0.59 out of 5.00) were higher than in the control group subjects (0.18 out of 5.00). This result implies that the instruction applied to the experimental group also results in more strategy use. The reason may be "awareness"- teacher's modeling a given strategy quite explicitly may have resulted in students' internalizing this strategy as if it were their own strategy. Thus, students who receive explicit instruction on given strategies will use these strategies more frequently. This result is also supported by Clark (1979) (cited in Kern 1989) and by Pressley and Johnson et.al 1989) (cited in Dole et.al 1991). They argue that when instruction emphasize strategy use explicitly, students may adapt these strategies consciously to any text or reading. Clark (1980) also suggests that explicit instruction and practice in using strategies increase the use of strategies.

With this inventory, it was intended to determine the general reading strategies of elementary Turkish EFL students in Turkey within the limited scope of the subjects in this study. It is found that the mostly applied strategy class is social strategies (3.70 out of 5.00) (generally used). The next class was metacognitive strategies (3.41 out of 5.00) (sometimes used). The overall average for cognitive strategy class was 3.03 out of 5.00 (sometimes used). Other classes were compensation strategies (2.96 sometimes used), memory strategies (2.68 sometimes used) and affective strategies (2.64 sometimes used). Since these findings have very limited scope, they may not have a significant contribution to the field. However, because there are not adequate studies on this aspect of reading, the inclusion of this purpose may initiate new and serious studies in the field.

That is, if detailed research is done on this issue, serious, comprehensive and useful data can be achieved.

The final results to be discussed here belong to the opinion questionnaire administered to the subjects of both groups. The basic principle of the instruction applied to the experimental group is to explain the mental reasoning of reading comprehension. This is accomplished through teacher modeling. The teacher explicitly explains how he/she carries out the reading process through recasting skill as strategies through modeling. Since the teacher is explicitly modeling, it is expected that the students can understand and internalize the process more easily and that they apply these skills more effectively to other reading situations in the long term. In addition, it is expected that the students feel more comfortable since they receive the knowledge from an experienced and knowledgeable person. Another important principle of this instruction is that it must be flexible, which means all the alternatives for the answers are discussed, not just giving the correct answer as in the traditional reading skill instruction. This makes it possible to emphasize the mental reasoning more. This discussion part is carried out in the guiding step. This step is very crucial in this model since "gradual release of responsibility" will occur here. The students will also start to explain their reasoning process about the reading. This explanation is very important for self-confidence and motivation. As Brown and Campione (1986) (cited in Stevens, Slavin and Farnish 1991) state: "Understanding is more likely to occur when a student is required to explain, elaborate and defend his/her ideas to others. Also Peterson and Janiki (1979) and Webb (1982) reported that students who give and receive elaborate explanations learn better. In this way instruction is more effective. These procedures result in keeping this mental reasoning in the students' mind for a long time and in a more effective learning. When they encounter a difficulty, they can apply this reasoning. In other words, they learn how to learn and they are aware that they have learnt something.

In order to determine whether these above mentioned principles were true of Turkish students, in this study an attitude questionnaire was given. The results of this questionnaire showed that most of the subjects in the experimental group (%83.89) had a positive opinion about the instruction which suggests that they really benefited from the instruction. Moreover they wrote

positive comments about the instruction in the optional item (the last item) in this questionnaire such as "I learned how to think while reading" "I learned the necessary details" "I can make use of this information in the long term" "I trusted you and thank you for trusting us" "now I can make use of clues while reading" "these reading classes were very interesting and different" "I liked reading after these lessons" etc., which was a valuable data for the study.

On the other hand, the results of the control group implied that they were not satisfied with the traditional reading skill instruction. The subjects who thought that they really benefited from the instruction only consisted 47.5% of the whole population. 30% of the subjects in this group were not sure if this was an effective instruction or not. Since having no opinion also implies a negative attitude, it can be said that majority of the subjects in the control group did not benefit from this instruction. Also most of the students in this group did not write any positive comments about the instruction in the last item of the questionnaire.

In short we can say that the subjects in the experimental group were more satisfied and also felt more confident than the subjects in the control group. In the literature, most studies did not include such a questionnaire to determine how the subjects feel and what they think about the instruction type. But, it is necessary to have these opinions since we can find out what students think about the efficiency of instructions and their long term effects. Unlike in this study, this type of data in two other studies was collected mostly through think alouds (Block 1986) or through recordings (Duffy et.al 1987). The results of these studies support the findings of this study.

### **5.3 Difficulties Observed During the Treatment and Some Suggestions to the Future**

#### **Researchers**

Although this modeling is an effective instruction type, there were also some difficulties that were encountered during the treatment session.

First of all, this instruction required a longer preparation time and a more careful preparation compared to other instruction types because in order to emphasize a certain skill, the passages and the materials had to be appropriate especially in the modeling stage. For example for

"guessing difficult words" instruction, the researcher had to find a passage in which there were words students were not expected to know and the context gave enough clues to guess the unknown word because here the purpose was make students aware of the applicability of the skill to the passage. Again for "using monolingual dictionary" instruction the passage had to serve just the opposite purpose. In the "gradual release of responsibility" session the passage selection were more flexible since there were discussions about the possible answers. In the modeling stage, the passage had to be more clear and easier to apply modeling since students did not participate in the lesson at this stage.

If a teacher wants to apply this method in his/her classroom, first of all he/she has to be aware of his/her mental process in reading comprehension and has to analyze it well so that he/she can transfer this logic to students effectively. The teacher must be ready for every situation that is possible to encounter. During the guiding step teacher must be very flexible and patient since there may come very illogical answers from the students. This analysis and preparation requires time and energy, and teachers must be ready for these demands.

At the beginning of instruction, the purpose of this instruction should be stated clearly and explicitly to the students, since it can be a new and unusual instruction type for them. In other words, students should be prepared for the instruction psychologically. Otherwise, teacher modeling can be considered as the show off of the teacher and the students may feel inferior to the teacher. Students should believe that they will benefit from this instruction. Moreover, since there is no student participation in the modeling stage, the passages should be interesting and the instruction should be carried out actively. In this type of instruction, the most important part is the "gradual release of responsibility". In this stage, students should be encouraged to give answers and express comments about the answers and the evidences. This can also increase self-confidence if it is applied effectively.

#### **5.4 Conclusions**

In this study, the following research questions were answered in the following ways:



- 1- Which reading strategies do the elementary Turkish EFL students use while reading an English passage? (This question is limited to the subjects in this study and it was included in research questions thinking that this limited number of subjects can give an idea about the whole)

The reading strategies used by elementary Turkish EFL students in Turkey followed this order from the mostly used to the least used: social strategies, metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, memory strategies, and affective strategies. These findings must be supported by some future research on this aspect.

- 2- Is there a difference between Pearson and Dole's (1987) Explicit Comprehension Instruction model and Traditional reading skill instruction in terms of improving students' reading comprehension? If there is, then which type of instruction helps improve students' reading comprehension?

Both groups improved to some extent. However the improvement in the experimental group considerably higher compared to that of the control group in terms of reading comprehension. In other words, prescribed skills should be presented as strategies, not as automatized procedures (Palincsar and Brown 1984, Paris and Jacobs 1984). This conclusion was also observed by Brown and Palincsar (1985). In their study, they concluded, "what is necessary in today's reading instruction is teacher modeling of specific strategies for learning how to comprehend, teacher guidance that helps students learn these strategies over a period of time and student practice in transferring the strategies to new learning situations". In short, reading is not the unconscious use of set of skills. Instead good readers are strategic (Anderson and Pearson 1984, Mason 1984, and Paris, Lipson and Winson 1983) (cited in Duffy and Roehler 1987) and knowledge about the process, not just the product of reading is needed, if we want to move from head stretching to designing programs which truly meet the need of our students (Block 1986)

- 3- Does Pearson and Dole's (1987) Explicit Comprehension Instruction model improve the use of study- specific strategies?

The increase in using study-specific strategies were higher in the experimental group than in the control group.

- 4- What are the opinions of the subjects towards the instruction type applied to them? Will they be satisfied with the instruction type or not?

The experimental group subjects had quite positive attitude towards Explicit Comprehension Instruction Model (Pearson and Dole 1987). They declared that they were satisfied with the instruction and that they really benefited from it and that this instruction increased their self-confidence. However control group subjects stated that they did not find traditional reading skill instruction beneficial and they did not state positive comments.

### 5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

In this study, elementary level EFL students were used. Further studies can be conducted with intermediate, upper intermediate and advanced level students to see if there will be differences in the results in terms of the effects of modeling.

In further studies other reading skills which were not included in this study can be dealt with.

This study can be applied to other language skills, for example to listening and writing.

Finally, in this study, it was found that the quizzes did not show significant differences across the subjects in terms of improvement. This may be because the quizzes tested only one skill and short-term memory at one time. When the skills were tested altogether in a passage later on, the results showed significant differences among the groups. There may be further research on long term effects of this type of instruction applied to experimental group, for example two or three years' research.

## APPENDIX A

### READING STRATEGY INVENTORY

Bu anket, İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin okuma becerisinde yararlandıkları yolları belirlemek için düzenlenmiştir ve okuma becerisi ile ilgili 30 cümleden oluşmaktadır. Bu ankette doğru veya yanlış cevap yoktur. Cevaplar, nasıl olunması gerektiği veya başkalarının yaptıkları düşünülerek değil, cümlelerin kişiyi ne kadar iyi tanımladığı göz önüne alınarak verilmelidir. Lütfen her cümleyi okuyunuz ve cümlenin size ne kadar uygun olduğunu gösteren rakamı (1, 2, 3, 4 veya 5) size verilecek cevap kağıdı üzerine yazınız.

- |                       |                      |                   |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Hiç yapmam         | 2. Genellikle yapmam | 3. Az çok yaparım |
| 4. Genellikle yaparım | 5. Her zaman yaparım |                   |

Cevapları mümkün olduğunca çabuk veriniz ve lütfen bu sayfalar üzerine herhangi bir işaretleme yapmayınız. Sorularınız varsa lütfen öğretmeninize sorunuz.

- 1) Herhangi bir İngilizce parçayı okumadan önce hafif müzik dinleme, derin nefes alma v.b. yöntemlerle kendimi rahatlatmaya çalışırım.
- 2) İngilizce bir parçayı okumaya başlamadan önce ilk okumada anlamayabileceğim kısımlar olabileceği ihtimalini düşünerek tekrar okumaya hazırlıklı olurum.
- 3) İngilizce bir parçayı okumadan önce dilsel ve görsel ipuçlarını kullanıp parçanın içeriğini tahmin etmeye çalışırım (Başlık, grafik, tablo v.b.)
- 4) İngilizce birşey okurken ilk önce ana fikri anlamak için okuma metnini çabucak bir gözden geçiririm, daha sonra başa dönüp daha dikkatli bir şekilde okurum.
- 5) Okuduğum şeylerde ayrıntılı bilgileri bulmaya çalışırım.
- 6) Parçayı okurken, konu hakkında önceden bildiğim şeylerle yeni öğrendiklerim arasındaki bağlantıları düşünürüm.
- 7) Okuduğum parçada önemli yerleri ve kelimeleri işaretlerim (Altını çizerim, fosforlu kalem kullanırım, yuvarlak içine alırım v.b.).
- 8) Parçayı okurken küçük notlar alırım.
- 9) Parçadaki cümleler ve paragraflar arasındaki bağlantılara dikkat ederek parçanın organizasyonunu anlamaya çalışırım (örnekleme, sebep-sonuç ilişkisi, kronolojik sıra, karşılaştırma v.b.).
- 10) İngilizce'de okurken okuduğum metni kelime kelime Türkçe'ye çevirmeden anlamaya çalışırım.

11) İngilizce'de okurken yeni karşılaştığım kelimelerin kendi dilimdeki benzerlerini bulmaya çalışırım (democracy-demokrasî, inflation-enflasyon v.b.).

Okurken anlamını bilmediğim bir kelime ile karşılaşırsam; bu kelimenin anlamını;

12) İçinde bulunduğu cümle veya etrafındaki cümle ve kelimelerden yararlanarak bulmaya çalışırım.

13) Bu kelimeyi bildiğim kök ve eklere ayırarak bulmaya çalışırım.

14) Bir sözlük yardımı ile bulmaya çalışırım.

15) Arkadaşlarıma sorarım.

16) Öğretmene ya da etrafımda iyi İngilizce bilen birine sorarım.

17) Bilememe riskini göze alarak da olsa tahmin etmeye çalışmak için kendimi cesaretlendiririm.

Öğrendiğim yeni kelimeyi sonradan hatırlayabilmek için

18) Ona bir şekilde benzerlik gösteren başka kelimelerin oluşturduğu bir gruba yerleştiririm (örneğin "snake" "yılan" kelimesini "animals" "hayvanlar" grubuna olduğu gibi).

19) Kelimeyi cümle içinde kullanırım.

20) Kelimeyi kartlara yazıp en kolay ulaşabileceğim yerlerde tutarak arasına bakarım (Evde duvara asmak, yanında taşımak v.b.).

21) Kelimeleri alfabetik sıraya göre listeleyip kendi sözlüğümü oluştururum.

22) Kelimeyi zihnimde görüntüsünü canlandırarak veya resmini çizerek aklımda tutmaya çalışırım.

23) Okuduğum parçadan çeşitli çıkarımlar yaparak konu ve içerik hakkında yorumlar yapmaya çalışırım.

24) İngilizce'de okuduğum bilginin özetini çıkarırım.

25) İngilizce bir metin okumak için fırsatlar yaratmaya çalışırım.

26) Zevk için İngilizce dergi, kitap ve gazete okurum.

27) Okumadaki amacımı baştan açıkca belirlerim.

28) Okumada nasıl daha başarılı olunabileceğini bulmaya ve öğrenmeye çalışırım, gerekirse kendimi sorgularım.

29) Okumada gelişip gelişmediğimi ve aktivitelerde, alıştırmalarda başarılı olup olmadığımı kendi kendime değerlendirmeye çalışırım.

30) Başarılı olduğumda kendimi ödüllendiririm.

Katıldığınız için teşekkür ederim.

## CEVAP KAĞIDI

İsim:

Grup:

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_

5. \_\_\_\_\_

6. \_\_\_\_\_

7. \_\_\_\_\_

8. \_\_\_\_\_

9. \_\_\_\_\_

10. \_\_\_\_\_

11. \_\_\_\_\_

12. \_\_\_\_\_

13. \_\_\_\_\_

14. \_\_\_\_\_

15. \_\_\_\_\_

16. \_\_\_\_\_

17. \_\_\_\_\_

18. \_\_\_\_\_

19. \_\_\_\_\_

20. \_\_\_\_\_

21. \_\_\_\_\_

22. \_\_\_\_\_

23. \_\_\_\_\_

24. \_\_\_\_\_

25. \_\_\_\_\_

26. \_\_\_\_\_

27. \_\_\_\_\_

28. \_\_\_\_\_

29. \_\_\_\_\_

30. \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B

THE RESEARCHER-PREPARED READING EXAM

Human And Environment



We humans have been able to live on this planet for millions of years because there has been an environment that we could live in, composed of air with oxygen that we could breathe, a temperature that did not kill us (neither too hot nor too cold), shelter from the weather, food that we could eat, water that we could drink, bacteria that broke down the food in our stomachs and so on.

The environment on Earth has changed from time to time; for example, during the Ice Age, the Earth became much colder. It is possible that such changes led to the disappearance of some of the animals that we humans shared our world with.

Originally, humans were not powerful or clever enough to affect their environment much. But they learnt various skills; to use fire, so they were able to burn down areas of dry grass and trees, and to cultivate the soil, so they were able to turn wild bush or even woodland into fields. Later they learnt how to bring water to their land by controlling rivers or digging ditches, and this made it possible for them to change deserts into green land.

But the more science advanced, the worse the effect of humans on the surface of the Earth grew. They made metal axes to cut down large areas of forest for building warships, or for getting wood to cook with, and as a result, they turned green land into deserts, since trees attract rain, and the fewer trees there are, the less rain falls.

This destruction of nature has increased enormously during the past hundred years. Immense areas of enormous rain forests are being cut down every year, so that a time may come when the loss of these will change the climate of our world permanently and disastrously.

Another great danger is from the pollution from our chemicals and fuels, like coal, with which we fill the atmosphere. The longer we go on using aerosols and producing smoke, the more damage they will do to the layer that protects our world from the sun's radiation, until it no longer provides an environment in which we, and most of the animals and plants we share it with, can live.

Radiation from our use of atomic energy could also do disastrous damage to our precious environment.

Why, then, do we continue to do these things that may soon lead to our being destroyed? Is it because we are mad? No, it is because humans are greedy. They are not willing to sacrifice anything now for the sake of the future. The richer they get and the easier their lives become, the more willing they seem to be to risk destroying their future environment for the sake of becoming even richer and more comfortable now.



9. What does the passage trying to tell us? (5 pts)

**Part II- Vocabulary:** Write down the meanings of the words below into the blanks. (Each 2.5 pts)

- 1. planet: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. shelter: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. disappearance: \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. affect: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. burn down: \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. desert: \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. axes: \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. enormously: \_\_\_\_\_
- 9. climate: \_\_\_\_\_
- 10. precious: \_\_\_\_\_
- 11. greedy: \_\_\_\_\_
- 12. layer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part III- Referring Expressions:** Find what the following words refer to in the passage. (Each 2.5 pts)

- 1. we (line 2) \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. their (line 13) \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. this (line 18) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. these (line 29) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. they (line 34) \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. it (line 35) \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. it (line 37) \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. they (line 42) \_\_\_\_\_



Part 4- Scanning- Answer the following questions according to the ads below. (Total 20 pts)

1.

TRAVELOG FILMS "Valley of Light" (Yosemite), "Simpatico Means Venezuela," "People of the Amazon" and "Assignment Yellowbird" (Florida and the Bahamas) are presented Saturday, October 15, 2:30 p.m. at the Santa Monica Public Library, 1343 Sixth St., Santa Monica. 451-5751.

3.

POET ROBERT Mezey reads from his works Wednesday, October 19, 4-6 p.m. in CalArts Langley Hall. 805-255-1050.

5.

SINGLE PARENTING—A one-day workshop for divorced single parents experiencing difficulties balancing the delicate and difficult act of being single and being a parent. Saturday, October 29, 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. at AID-WEST. Call Dr. Wilma Awerbuch at 824-0211 to register. t1

7.

DR. ALAN H. Pressman discusses "Designing Your Diet" Friday, October 14, 7 p.m. at 845 N. Highland Ave. 871-2222.

9.

"STARTING AND Managing Your Own Business" is offered Friday, October 14, 1-6 p.m. at USC. 743-2098.

11.

BACH TO BLUES trio. Free concert Wednesday, October 19, 2 p.m. at Fairfax Library, 161 S. Gardner near Third.

13.

"COPING WITH Stress: Basic Relaxation Methods" is discussed Wednesday, October 19,

2.

WANTED: FRIENDLY people to join me on all day stiling excursions, weekdays and weekends. No experience required, will teach. Leave message at 473-8550.

4.

WEST VALLEY Jewish Singles, ages 18-28, attend Friday Night Services Friday, October 14, 8 p.m. at Temple Akiyah. Socializing and desert afterwards at a nearby coffee shop. Call Gregg, 703-0033, for details.

6.

"WALKIN' SINGLES" takes semi-strenuous stroll through Marina del Rey Saturday, October 15, 1:30 p.m. meeting at 4754 Admiralty Way (in Boys Market parking lot). Historical narration. Age range 29-45 only. No smoking. Potluck picnic follows. To be included, phone 789-1035. t52

8.

ROOKERY READINGS present poets Lance Jendis and Gerald Locklin, folksinger Michael Gleason and artist Debra Williams Tuesday, October 18, 8:30 p.m. at the Upstart Crow and Company, South Coast Village, Santa Ana. \$2. 714-826-3094.

10.

SAVE THE ANIMALS Fund is presenting The Animal Film, a comprehensive survey of the injustices committed against animals in the western society. Free showing Saturday, October 15, 12:30 p.m. at The Orange Room Cafeteria, Dept. of Water and Power, 111 N. Hope St. opposite the Music Center. Free parking Gate 6. 484-8766.

12.

GAVIN DILLARD reads from his book "Notes From a Marriage: Love Poems" Sunday, October 16, 3 p.m. at A Different Light Bookstore, 4014 Santa Monica Blvd. 668-0629.

1. Match the social events in the newspaper section to the following interests. Write the numbers of events on the lines.

\_\_\_\_\_ animal life  
 \_\_\_\_\_ travel around the world  
 \_\_\_\_\_ classical and jazz music  
 \_\_\_\_\_ being a better single (unmarried or divorced) parent  
 \_\_\_\_\_ business  
 \_\_\_\_\_ learning ways to relax  
 \_\_\_\_\_ a healthy diet  
 \_\_\_\_\_ social life for single Jewish people  
 \_\_\_\_\_ poetry  
 \_\_\_\_\_ sailing (traveling on a boat)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ walking for health

2. Where might you meet people who share your interest in animals? \_\_\_\_\_

What will you do in this place? \_\_\_\_\_

How much do tickets cost to this event? \_\_\_\_\_

3. If you want to meet single people—and you like exercise and history—what phone number can you call for information? \_\_\_\_\_

How old will the people at this event be? \_\_\_\_\_

Can you smoke at this event? \_\_\_\_\_

4. When can you hear a concert of classical and jazz music?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

5. Which event or events from page 148 interests you? Why?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX C**  
**OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE**

Class:

Geçen dönem almış olduğumuz Reading (Okuma) eğitimi sonucunda

a) Bir İngilizce metinde karşılaştığım bilinmeyen kelimeleri tahmin etmenin önemli olduğunu ve bunun için gerekli olan bazı ipuçlarını öğrendim.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- öğrendim 5- kesinlikle öğrendim

b) Bir İngilizce metni okumadan önce parçayı anlamama yardımcı olabilecek ipuçlarını değerlendirmeyi öğrendim.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- öğrendim 5- kesinlikle öğrendim

c) Değişik amaçlar için yazılmış yazı türlerini farklı yöntemlerle okumayı öğrendim.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- öğrendim 5- kesinlikle öğrendim

d) Bir metnin ihtiyaç duyulan bilgiyi elde edebilmek amacıyla farklı yöntemlerle okumayı öğrendim.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- öğrendim 5- kesinlikle öğrendim

e) İngilizce bir metinde bazı kelimelerin (zamir ve kelime grupları) metnin diğer bölümleriyle bağlantılı olduğunu farkedip bu bağlantıları en verimli şekilde kullanmayı öğrendim.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- evet 5- kesinlikle evet

f) İngilizce bir metni detaylı bir analiz öncesinde genel konusunu ve bazı detayları bulabilmek için gerekli olan ipuçlarını öğrendim.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- evet 5- kesinlikle evet

g) Sözlük kullanmam gerektiğinde onu en etkili biçimde kullanmayı öğrendim.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- evet 5- kesinlikle evet

h) Bu eğitim bana İngilizce bir metnin nasıl okunması gerektiği konusunda ipuçları verdi.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- evet 5- kesinlikle evet

i) Öğretmenimizin bize kendi okuma yöntemlerini anlatması kendimize olan güvenimizi arttırdı ve uzun vadede bize başarının yollarını gösterdi.

1- kesinlikle hayır 2- hayır 3- kararsızım 4- evet 5- kesinlikle evet

j) Yukarıda belirtilen noktalara ek olarak bu eğitimin olumlu/olumsuz olarak aşağıdaki nitelikleri de vardır.

---



---



---



---



---

Strategies	Classifications	Experimental group pre -post administration	Control group pre -post administration
1	Affective- lowering anxiety- using music	1.85 - 1.85	1.75 - 1.90
2	Metacognitive- arranging and planning your learning- planning for a language task	4.10 - 4.10	4.05 - 4.55
3	Cognitive- receiving and sending messages- using resources for receiving and sending mess	2.90 - 4.40	2.80 - 3.80
4	Cognitive- receiving and sending messages- getting the idea quickly	3.25 - 4.00	3.05 - 3.60
5	Cognitive- receiving and sending messages- using resources for receiving and sending mess	2.95 - 3.15	2.80 - 3.25
6	Cognitive- centering your learning- overviewing and linking with already known material	3.05 - 3.90	3.15 - 3.30
7	Cognitive- creating structure for input and output- highlighting	3.75 - 4.25	3.25 - 3.15
8	Cognitive- creating structure for input and output- taking notes	3.00 - 3.60	2.55 - 2.20
9	Cognitive- analysing and reasoning- analysing expressions	3.25 - 3.65	3.05 - 3.15
10	Cognitive- analysing and reasoning- translation	3.30 - 3.80	3.25 - 3.40
11	Cognitive- analysing and reasoning- analysing contrastively (across languages)	3.25 - 3.95	3.20 - 3.95
12	Compensation- guessing intelligently- using linguistic clues	3.15 - 4.05	3.45 - 3.35
13	Compensation- guessing intelligently- using linguistic clues	2.35 - 2.15	2.25 - 1.90
14	Compensation- guessing intelligently- using other clues	3.35 - 4.05	3.25 - 3.40
15	Social- cooperating with others- cooperating with peers	3.35 - 3.35	3.70 - 3.75
16	Social- cooperating with others- cooperating with proficient users of the new language	3.85 - 3.70	3.90 - 3.90
17	Affective- encouraging yourself- taking risks wisely	2.95 - 3.40	3.05 - 2.90
18	Memory- creating mental linkages- grouping	2.50 - 2.85	2.85 - 2.40
19	Memory- creating mental linkages- placing the new word in a context	2.85 - 3.10	2.70 - 2.30
20	Memory- employing action- using mechanical techniques	3.00 - 2.95	2.55 - 1.90
21	Memory- employing action- using mechanical techniques	2.40 - 2.20	1.90 - 1.75
22	Memory- applying images and sounds- using imagery	3.00 - 3.30	3.10 - 3.05
23	Cognitive- analysing and reasoning- reasoning deductively	3.35 - 3.65	2.95 - 3.00
24	Cognitive- creating structure for input and output- summarising	2.45 - 2.50	2.20 - 2.00
25	Metacognitive- arranging and planning your learning- seeking for opportunities	2.75 - 2.90	3.00 - 2.50
26	Metacognitive- arranging and planning your learning- seeking for opportunities	2.65 - 3.25	2.95 - 2.30
27	Metacognitive- arranging and planning your learning- setting goals and objectives	3.70 - 3.40	3.55 - 3.75
28	Metacognitive- arranging and planning your learning- finding about language learning	3.55 - 3.55	3.40 - 3.15
29	Metacognitive- evaluating yourself- self evaluating	3.55 - 3.75	3.80 - 3.45
30	Affective- encouraging yourself- rewarding yourself	3.40 - 3.35	2.85 - 2.80
	<b>Key to the Averages</b>		
	Always or almost always used: 4.5 to 5.0		
	Generally used: 3.5 to 4.4		
	Sometimes used: 2.5 to 3.4		
	Generally not used: 1.5 to 2.4		
	Never or almost never used: 1.0 to 1.4		

## Appendix E1 The Results of the Tests Administered to the Subjects (Experimental Group)

Tests »»	Placement	Pretest	Posttest	Toeflpre	Toeflpost	Vise1	Vise2
Subjects							
1	22	47	67	8	16	93	71
2	23	53	75	11	17	85	79
3	30	57	81	6	15	97	90
4	25	30	44	13	15	79	71
5	29	14	41	4	14	27	48
6	27	27	43	7	8	59	73
7	21	21	48	4	19	51	61
8	31	27	65	5	17	86	59
9	24	18	43	10	14	61	45
10	26	32	68	7	15	91	74
11	23	27	36	1	10	74	73
12	30	23	55	0	7	83	78
13	26	24	48	1	8	57	64
14	27	42	62	5	15	69	73
15	27	25	45	17	13	79	69
16	29	22	32	11	16	0	62
17	22	27	44	7	14	60	53
18	29	23	64	8	24	89	78
19	31	40	60	2	8	92	76
20	31	45	74	7	20	86	89
Average	26,7	31,2	54,8	6,7	14,3	70,9	69,3

## Appendix E2 The Results of the Tests Administered to the Subjects (Control Group)

Tests »»	Placement	Pretest	Posttest	Toeflpre	Toeflpost	Vise1	Vise2
Subjects							
1	12	38	44	4	8	60	58
2	14	52	64	2	13	86	69
3	13	44	40	3	11	73	57
4	20	34	43	4	5	82	54
5	19	18	42	5	4	70	54
6	11	23	47	6	16	48	42
7	12	31	65	8	10	95	74
8	11	21	25	7	2	78	36
9	20	36	52	6	9	75	53
10	18	56	78	5	22	88	82
11	18	42	40	5	9	83	63
12	20	31	39	4	9	75	50
13	12	22	53	8	9	74	54
14	13	35	74	11	8	73	70
15	14	30	36	9	3	89	58
16	15	28	34	5	16	75	50
17	15	35	48	4	8	70	61
18	16	30	45	4	6	67	41
19	12	38	59	3	11	78	51
20	17	38	52	7	7	75	47
Average	15,1	34,1	49,0	5,5	9,3	75,7	56,2

Appendix F1 The Results of the Quizzes Applied to the Subjects (Experimental Group)

Quizzes »»	Quiz1	Quiz2	Quiz3	Quiz4	Quiz5
<b>Subjects</b>					
1	20	18,5	16	18,5	20
2	17,5	17	18	15	20
3	20	20	17	18,5	20
4	15	8	11,5	9,5	18
5	2,5	0	8,5	15	7
6	10	4,5	13,5	15	18
7	5	15,5	4,5	10	15
8	19	7,5	15,5	9	12
9	0	1	6	9	9
10	12,5	18,5	14,5	18	19
11	17,5	10,5	15	13	11
12	20	17	16,5	20	17
13	12,5	14	8	12	17
14	12,5	10,5	14	16,5	19
15	12,5	14	9	14,5	16
16	17,5	14	6	15,5	17
17	12,5	2	6	11,5	9
18	17,5	20	14	18	12
19	20	15,5	16,5	18	18
20	20	15	16	14	19
<b>Average</b>	<b>14,20</b>	<b>12,15</b>	<b>12,30</b>	<b>14,53</b>	<b>15,65</b>

Appendix F2 The Results of the Quizzes Applied to the Subjects (Control Group)

Quizzes »»»	Quiz1	Quiz2	Quiz3	Quiz4	Quiz5
<b>Subjects</b>					
1	10	12	4,5	9,0	16,0
2	17,5	20	10,0	13,5	20,0
3	12,5	20	10,5	10	16
4	20	13	8,0	9,5	19
5	15	10,5	10	12,5	17
6	7,5	6	7	9	15
7	20	18,5	13	18	20
8	15	10,5	11	5	18
9	17,5	10,5	11,5	13	18
10	20	0	15,6	20	20
11	15	20	13	8	17
12	12,5	8	5	9	17
13	15	16,5	13,5	10,5	18
14	15	15,5	13	17,5	18,5
15	17,5	17	14	8	15
16	20	0	7	11	18
17	12,5	12	13,5	16	17
18	17,5	2,5	3	10,5	18
19	15	15,5	8	13	16
20	5	10,5	10,5	11	12
<b>Average</b>	<b>15,00</b>	<b>11,93</b>	<b>10,08</b>	<b>11,70</b>	<b>17,28</b>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alderson, C.J, and Urganhart, A. H. **Reading in a Foreign Language.** London: Longman.(1984).
- Alderson C. J. " Reading in a Foreign Language: A Reading Problem or A Language Problem", in (eds) Alderson and Urganhart **Reading in a Foreign Language.** London: Longman (1984).
- Afflerbach, Peter, P. "The Influence of Prior Knowledge on Expert Readers' Main Idea Construction Strategies". **Reading Research Quarterly.** Vol 26 No:4 Winter (1990).
- Barnett, Marva A. " Teaching Reading Strategies: How Methodology Affects Language Course Articulation". **Foreign Language Annals** Vol 21 No 2. (1988).
- Baumann, James F. "Effect of Think-Aloud Instruction on Elementary Students' Comprehension Monitoring Abilities" **Journal of Reading Behavior.** Vol 24 No: 2 (1992)
- Bernhardt, B. Elizabeth "Toward an Information Processing Perspective In Foreign Language Reading". **The Modern Language Journal.** Vol 68 No 4.(1984).
- Block, Ellen "The Comprehension Strategies of Second Language Learners". **TESOL Quarterly** Vol 20 No 3. (1986).
- Carrell, Patricia L. "Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Reading". **The Modern Language Journal.** Vol 73 No 2. (1989).



- Carrell, Patricia L. et.al "Metacognitive Strategy Training for ESL Reading". *Tesol Quarterly* Vol 23 No:4 (1989)
- Chamot, A. U and Kupper,L " Learning Strategies In Foreign Language Instruction". *Foreign Language Annals* Vol 22 No 1(1989).
- Dole, Janice A. et al. "Moving from Old to New: Research on Reading Comprehension Instruction" *Review of Educational Research* Vol 61. (1991).
- Duffy, Gerald G. et al. "The Relationship Between Explicit Verbal Explanations During Reading Skill Instruction and Student Awareness and Achievement" *Reading Research Quarterly*. Vol 21 No:3 (1986)
- Duffy, Gerald G. et al. "Effects of Explaining the Reasoning Associated with Using Reading Strategies" *Reading Research Quarterly* Vol 22 No 3.(1987).
- Duffy, G. Gerald and Roehler, L. "Teaching Reading Skills as Strategies" *The Reading Teacher*. January, 1987.
- Grant, Rachel "Comprehension Strategy Instruction: Basic Considerations for Instructing At-risk College Students" *Journal of Reading*, Vol 38, No 1.(1994).
- Hamp-Lyon, L. "Two Approaches to Teaching Reading: A Classroom-Based Study" *Reading in a Foreign Language* Vol 3 (1985).
- Johnston, P. *Reading Comprehension Assessment: A Cognitive Basis*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.(1983).

- Kern , Richard G. "Second Language Reading Strategy Instruction: Its Effects on Comprehension and Word Inference Ability" *The Modern Language Journal* Vol 73 No 2.(1989).
- Paran, Amos. "Reading In EFL: Facts and Fictions". *ELT Journal* Vol 50, No 1. (1996).
- Paris, Scott et al "Becoming a Strategic Reader". *Contemporary Educational Psychology* Vol 8 (1983).
- Pearson, D. And Callagher M. C. " The Instruction of Reading Comprehension" *Contemporary Educational Psychology* Vol 8 (1983).
- Pearson, D and Dole J. "Explicit Comprehension Instruction: A review of Research and a New Conceptualization of Instruction" *The Elementary School Journal* Vol 88 No 2.(1987).
- Pearson, David P. and Fielding G. Linda "Reading Comprehension: What Works" *Educational Leadership*. Vol No 1. (1994).
- Pressley, M. "The Relevance of the Good Strategy Use Model to the Teaching of Mathematics". *Educational Psychology* Vol 8. (1986).
- Ridgeway, G. Victoria et al. "A Methodological Analysis Of Teaching and Learning Strategy Research at the Secondary Level" *Reading Research Quarterly*. Vol 28 No 4.(1993).
- Ruscioelli, J. "Student Responses to Reading Strategy Instruction" *Foreign Language Annals*. Vol 28 No: 2 (1995).

Stevens, J. Robert et al. "The Effects of Cooperative Learning and Direct Instruction in Reading Strategies on Main Idea Identification"

**Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol 3 No 1. (1991).**

Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. **Learner Strategies In Language Learning. Great Britain:**

**Prentice Hall (1987)..**

