

To my parents

SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL READERS' USE OF
READING STRATEGIES

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
of
Bilkent University

by

PINAR UZUNÇAKMAK

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

JULY 2005

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MA THESIS
EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

JUNE 29, 2005

The examining committee appointed by the Institute of Economics and Social
Sciences for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Pınar Uzunçakmak

has read the thesis and has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Title: Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Use of Reading
Strategies

Thesis Supervisor: Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Dr. Susan Johnston
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Assoc. Prof. Engin Sezer
Bilkent University, Department of Turkish Literature

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers)

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Dr. Susan Johnston)

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

(Assoc. Prof. Engin Sezer)

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

(Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel)

Director

ABSTRACT

SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL READERS' USE OF READING STRATEGIES

Uzunçakmak, Pınar

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Susan Johnston

July 2005

This study was designed to investigate (a) generic reading strategy use as reported by the students and (b) the extent to which successful and unsuccessful readers differ in their use of reading strategies. The study was conducted with 112 upper-intermediate level students at Middle East Technical University (METU), Department of Basic English (DBE) in the spring semester of 2005.

Data were collected through two questionnaires and two stimulated recall tasks. The first questionnaire was given to 112 students to investigate generic strategy use as reported by the students. The second questionnaire, administered to 17 successful and 17 unsuccessful readers, chosen from among the 112 students, provided data about how much previous strategy instruction successful and unsuccessful readers recalled. Stimulated recall tasks done with two successful and

two unsuccessful readers provided insight into the reading strategies these students reported using while performing the reading tasks.

To analyze the data, means, frequencies, and standard deviations were calculated. In addition, *t*-tests were run to explore the possible differences between the responses given by successful and unsuccessful readers.

The results indicate that the students overall made frequent use of 12 reading strategies. However, successful and unsuccessful readers did not differ significantly in their reported use of reading strategies and recall of strategy instruction. In the stimulated recall of reading task performance, however, successful and unsuccessful readers differed in their strategy use. Successful readers reported using more strategies, more top-down strategies and more DBE-instructed strategies than did unsuccessful readers.

Keywords: Strategies, reading strategies, reading strategy instruction, successful readers, unsuccessful readers, top-down reading strategies, bottom-up reading strategies, and scaffolding.

ÖZET

BAŞARILI VE BAŞARISIZ OKUYUCULARIN OKUMA STRATEJİLERİNİ KULLANIMI

Uzunçakmak, Pınar

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Susan Johnston

Temmuz 2005

Bu çalışma, (a) öğrenciler tarafından rapor edilen okuma stratejilerinin genel kullanımını ve (b) başarılı ve başarısız okuyucuların okuma stratejilerini kullanımında gösterdikleri farklılıkları incelemiştir. Çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Temel İngilizce Bölümü'nde ileri seviye sınıflarında öğrenim gören 112 öğrencinin katılımıyla, 2005 yılı bahar döneminde gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Veri toplama aşamasında iki anket ve öğrencilerin okurken kullandıkları stratejileri rapor ettikleri iki farklı okuma çalışması uygulanmıştır. İlk anket, 112 öğrenciye verilmiş ve öğrencilerin rapor ettikleri genel strateji kullanımını araştırmıştır. İkinci anket, bu 112 öğrenci arasından seçilen 17 başarılı ve 17 başarısız okuyucuya verilmiştir. İkinci anket, bu öğrencilerin ilk dönem aldıkları strateji eğitimini ne kadar hatırladıkları hakkında veri sağlamıştır. Çalışmanın son

kısımında uygulanan iki farklı okuma çalışması ise iki başarılı ve iki başarısız okuyucunun okurken kullandıklarını söyledikleri stratejiler hakkında daha derin bilgi edinilmesine katkıda bulunmuştur.

Toplanan verinin analizi için ortalamalar, frekanslar ve standart sapmalar hesaplanmıştır. Ayrıca, başarılı ve başarısız okuyucuların cevapları arasındaki olası farklılıkları belirlemek için *t*-test uygulanmıştır.

Sonuçlar, öğrencilerin genel olarak 12 okuma stratejisini sıklıkla kullandığını ortaya koymuştur. Ancak, başarılı ve başarısız okuyucular arasında kullandıklarını rapor ettikleri okuma stratejileri ve strateji eğitimini hatırlama konularında bir farklılık görülmemiştir. Çalışmanın son kısmında uygulanan okuma alıştırmalarında ise, başarılı ve başarısız okuyucuların okuma stratejilerini kullanımı konusunda farklılık gösterdikleri belirlenmiştir. Başarılı okuyucular başarısız okuyuculardan daha fazla okuma stratejisi kullandıklarını rapor etmişlerdir. Ayrıca, başarılı okuyucular ‘top-down’ stratejilerini ve Temel İngilizce Bölümü’nde öğretilen stratejileri başarısız okuyuculara oranla daha sık kullandıklarını söylemişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Stratejiler, okuma stratejileri, okuma strateji eğitimi, başarılı okuyucular, başarısız okuyucular, ‘top-down’ stratejiler, ‘bottom-up’ stratejiler, yapılandırılmış öğretim (scaffolding).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers for his on-going support, invaluable feedback, and patience throughout the study. Prof. Rodgers provided me with incessant guidance and encouragement, which turned this demanding process into a smooth and enjoyable one.

I would also like to thank to Dr. Susan Johnston for her kindness, assistance, constant encouragement, and contribution to the study.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Bill Snyder for making many helpful suggestions and giving continuous encouragement.

I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. Engin Sezer for revising my thesis and providing me with constructive feedback.

I am gratefully indebted to Prof. Hüsnu Enginarlar, Director of the School of Foreign Languages and Ayçe Barışık, Head of the Department of Basic English at Middle East Technical University for allowing me to attend the MA TEFL Program.

I owe special thanks to my colleagues at the Department of Basic English, Middle East Technical University Meltem Bilikmen, Patricia Bilikmen, Emine Kortan, Emine Yetgin, Burcu Baba, Sezi Özentürk, Esra İyidoğan, Tansu Topçu and their students for willingly accepting to participate in my study and for being helpful throughout the study.

Special thanks to my colleague Emine Yetgin for helping me at the initial stage of choosing ways to collect data.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the members of MA TEFL Program, Dr. Susan Johnston, Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers, Michael Johnston, Ian Richardson, Engin Sezer, and Ayşe Yumuk Şengül, for sharing their profound knowledge throughout the courses they have given and helping us during the process.

Special thanks to the MA TEFL Class of 2005 and to Selin Alperer, Asuman Türkkorur, Ebru Ezberci, and Semra Sadık in particular, for their help, support, and encouragement throughout the year.

I am also grateful to my friends who never hesitated to help me and to my boyfriend for his continuous encouragement, understanding and patience throughout the whole process.

Last but not the least I would like to thank my mother, my father, and my brother for being motivating and patient throughout the study. Without their support, love and affection, I would not have been able to complete the program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Research Questions	6
Significance of the Study	7
Key Terminology	8
Conclusion	9
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Introduction	10

Reading	10
Models of the Reading Processes	11
Characteristics and Components of Fluent Reading	13
Reading in a Second Language	16
Reading Strategies	18
Classification of Reading Strategies	20
Reading Strategy Instruction	24
Instructional Models in Reading Strategy Training	26
Implementation of Strategic Reading Instruction	28
Benefits of Strategic Reading Instruction	29
Challenges of Implementing Reading Strategy Instruction	30
Successful and Unsuccessful Readers	32
Methods Used to Identify the Processes in Reading	36
Conclusion	40
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	41
Introduction	41
Participants	42
Instruments	43
Reading Strategy Questionnaire	44

Recall of Instruction Questionnaire	45
Reading Tasks	47
Data Collection Procedures	48
Data Analysis	50
Conclusion	51
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS	52
Introduction	52
Analyses of Reading Strategy Questionnaire	54
The Classification of the Items in the Questionnaire	55
Generic Reading Strategy Use in the DBE	57
Generic Strategy Use as Reported by the Students who had Strategy Training	60
Reported Strategy Use of Successful Readers as compared to Unsuccessful Readers	61
Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Use of Top-down Strategies.....	62
Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Use of Bottom-up Strategies.....	63
Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Use of Instructed Strategies.....	63

Analyses of Recall of Strategy Instruction Questionnaire	65
Successful Readers' Recall of Instruction	65
Unsuccessful Readers' Recall of Instruction	67
Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Recall of Instruction	68
Analyses of Stimulated Recall Reports	69
Conclusion	77
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS	78
Introduction	78
Findings and Discussion	79
Pedagogical Implications	84
Limitations of the Study	86
Further Research	87
Conclusion	89
REFERENCES	90
APPENDICES	95
Appendix A. Reading Strategy Questionnaire	95
Appendix B. Okuma Stratejileri Anketi.....	99
Appendix C. Informed Consent Form	101
Appendix D. Bilgi ve Kabul Formu	102

Appendix E. Reading Strategy Questionnaire (Addendum).....	103
Appendix F. Okuma Stratejileri Anketi (Ek).....	104
Appendix G. Recall of Strategy Instruction Questionnaire	105
Appendix H. Okuma Strateji Eğitimi Hatırlama Anketi	107
Appendix I. Reading Task 1	109
Appendix J. Reading Task 2	112
Appendix K. Sample Transcriptions	114
Appendix L. Ranking of the frequency of the use of 45 strategies as reported by all participants based on averaged mean scores.....	118

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. The Distribution of the Students who Responded to the Reading Strategy Questionnaire.....	43
2. Reading Strategies that are Explicitly Explained and Practiced in the DBE Semester One Course Book.....	46
3. The Classification of the Items according to What Stage in Reading They are Used, What Type of Strategies They are, and Whether They are Taught in the DBE.....	56
4. The Most Frequently Used Reading Strategies as Reported by the Students in the DBE	58
5. The Least Frequently Used Reading Strategies as Reported by the Students in the DBE.....	59
6. Mean Values for Responses Given by Successful and Unsuccessful Readers to All Items in the Questionnaire.....	61
7. Mean Values for Responses Given by Successful and Unsuccessful Readers on the Top-down Strategies	62
8. Mean Values for Responses Given by Successful and Unsuccessful Readers on the Bottom-up Strategies	63
9. Mean Values for Responses Given by Successful and Unsuccessful Readers on the Strategies Taught in the DBE.....	64
10. Ranking of Successful Readers' Recall of the Strategies Taught in the DBE	66
11. Ranking of Unsuccessful Readers' Recall of the Strategies Taught in the DBE.....	68
12. The Difference in Recall of Instruction between Successful and Unsuccessful Readers.....	69

13.	Strategy Use Reported in Stimulated Recall by Successful and Unsuccessful Readers.....	70
14.	Strategies that Successful and Unsuccessful Readers used While Reading as Reported through Stimulated Recall.....	71

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Foreign Language Reading Strategy Research with Categories of Reading Strategies.....	23

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Reading strategies are the tactics used by readers to comprehend texts better (Paris, Wasik & Turner, 1991). The appropriate use of reading strategies leads to effective reading. Thus, the goal of academic reading instruction should be to develop strategic reading abilities in order to make each student a strategic reader (Carrell & Carson, 1997; Grabe & Stoller, 2002). Being a strategic reader, however, requires more than simply knowledge of reading strategies. Readers should also be able to apply the strategies consciously, effectively, and in combination (Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

The purpose of this study is to investigate generic strategy use in reading as reported by the students at Middle East Technical University (METU), Department of Basic English (DBE). The study also aims to determine the possible differences between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of reported strategy use and recall of strategy instruction.

Background of the Study

Reading is one of the most important academic language skills for students learning English as a second (ESL) and foreign language (EFL). Reading is thought to be the primary means for gaining access to various sources of information, providing the basis for “synthesis and critical evaluation skills” (Celce-Murcia, 2001,

p. 187). In addition, it contributes to independent learning regardless of the purpose of the reader (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

Being an important language skill, reading and the processes involved in reading have been commonly explored research areas in both L1 and L2 contexts. From this research have emerged three different models of reading – bottom-up, top-down, and interactive approaches – which attempt to explain how learners read and comprehend written texts.

Bottom-up models see reading as a process wherein the reader reconstructs the messages in a text by first recognizing the smallest textual components such as letters or words. Then, the reader moves to larger parts of the text such as phrases or sentences in order to comprehend the written work (Carrell, Devine & Eskey, 1988).

Top-down models view reading as a process in which the reader's background knowledge plays a critical role. The reader is an active participant in this process, bringing hypotheses about the text, making predictions, and using the information in the text to confirm or disconfirm these predictions (Carrell et al., 1988; Urquhart & Weir, 1998).

According to interactive approaches, reading involves the interaction of the top-down and bottom-up processing of the text. It also includes an interaction between the reader who uses his/her prior knowledge and the text (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1983).

Because reading is a complex process, reading in any language is demanding (Czicko, Favreau, McLaughlin, Oller & Tullius as cited in Kern, 1989). Reading in a second or foreign language can place even greater demands on the processes involved in reading due to the reader's incomplete linguistic or cultural knowledge

(Bouvet, 2000). However, there is evidence that second or foreign language readers can “compensate for a lack of English proficiency by invoking interactive strategies, utilizing prior knowledge, and becoming aware of their strategy choices” (Hudson as cited in Auerbach & Paxton, 1997, p. 238).

Although reading strategies have been defined by several researchers, a common definition does not exist in the literature. However, they are usually referred to as techniques used by readers to comprehend texts better (Duffy, 2001; Paris et al., 1991). Going beyond this definition, researchers have determined various types of reading strategies that successful readers use (e.g., cognitive, metacognitive, social, affective, compensation, text-level, word-level strategies) (Anderson, 1991; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Paris et al., 1991; Pressley, 2002).

First and second language reading research has indicated that reading strategies can be taught to students (Carrell, 1985; Carrell, Pharis & Liberto, 1989). Carrell et al. (1989) propose that less successful readers can improve their comprehension in reading through training in strategies evidenced by readers that are more successful.

Successful readers do not read mechanically but utilize top-down processing strategies (Block, 1986). They interact with the text, calling upon their knowledge and experience to interpret the new information. They use strategies more frequently than less successful readers do. In addition, they coordinate and shift those strategies when appropriate. Successful readers are more aware of the strategies that they use. They can also distinguish between important information and details as they read (Duffy, 1993; Farrell, 2001).

In contrast, less successful readers either do not know about strategies or mainly engage in bottom-up strategies (Salatacı & Akyel, 2002). They usually process texts in word-for-word reading (Auerbach & Paxton, 1997). Moreover, less successful readers use fewer strategies and use them less effectively in their reading comprehension (Garner, Nist & Mealey, Padron & Waxman as cited in Grabe, 1991).

Identifying the possible differences between how successful and less successful readers comprehend a text and what strategies they use while reading has received considerable attention in reading research. Researchers have attempted to identify reader strategies and the processes that readers use while reading through verbal reports in which students verbalize what they did while reading (Gass & Mackey, 2000).

Verbal reports, which are divided into three categories – self report, self observation, and self revelation – have been used in L2 research to understand the cognitive processes involved in reading (Afflerbach & Johnston, Ericsson & Simon, Pressley & Afflerbach, Wade as cited in Singhal, 2001) and to compare the performance of successful and less successful readers (Hosenfeld, Kavale & Schreiner, Olshavsky as cited in Block, 1986). Stimulated recall, a form of self-observation, is also used to explore strategies used while reading. In stimulated recall, readers are asked, after executing a task, to report what they did or thought about while reading a text or performing a task. “To prompt participants to recall thoughts they had while performing a task”, the readers can be given the reading text they have read or they can be videotaped while reading a text and watch the videotapes after performing the tasks (Gass & Mackey, 2000, p.17).

Research conducted to identify what successful and unsuccessful readers do while reading provides insight into the nature of L2 reading and contributes to the development of effective reading comprehension instruction (Carrell et al., 1988).

Statement of the Problem

Ways to improve reading comprehension have been a widely explored research area (Auerbach & Paxton, 1997; Carrell, 1998). A great deal of research has been conducted on the strategies used in second and foreign language reading to improve comprehension (Block, 1986; Davis & Bistodeau, Kern, Li & Munby, Menzoda de Hopkins & Mackay as cited in Janzen & Stoller, 1998), the strategies that are most worth teaching (Dole, Duffy, Johnson, McGoldrick & Kurita, Pressley, Roehler & Pearson, Symons as cited in Duffy, 1993), and the reading strategies and their relationships to successful and unsuccessful second language reading (Block, Devine, Hauptman, Hosenfeld, Knight, Padron & Waxman, Sarig as cited in Carrell et al., 1989). However, little research has been done to investigate the strategies used and recalled by successful and unsuccessful readers. The purpose of this study is to determine the possible differences between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of the use of reading strategies and recall of strategy instruction.

In the Department of Basic English (DBE), at Middle East Technical University (METU), strategy training in reading is promoted in the content and exercises in the intermediate-level reading course book entitled *www.dbe.off-line.readings2*. Students are given reading pop-quizzes approximately once every two weeks, mid-term exams -including a reading component- six times a year and a proficiency exam at the end of the academic year. In these exams, students are

expected to employ the strategies that they have been taught. However, some teachers in the DBE have reported that many students do not seem to use the strategies that the students have been taught. Previous studies conducted in the DBE evaluated the reading course book in terms of its attention to reading strategies and determined intermediate-level teachers' perceptions of the "strategy instruction exercises included in the book" (Yetgin, 2003, p. 4). The aim of the present study is to analyze the reading strategies students report using and the extent to which the strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers differ. In addition, this study intends to investigate how much successful and unsuccessful readers remember previous strategy instruction given through the reading course book.

Research Questions

The study will address the following research questions:

1. What reading strategies do upper-intermediate level students at Middle East Technical University, Department of Basic English report that they use?
2. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers report that they use?
 - 2.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in their reported strategy use?
3. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers remember being taught in reading classes?
 - 3.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of recall of strategy instruction in reading classes?
4. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?

4.1. What is the difference between the strategies that successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?

Significance of the Study

Since strategy training is important in second and foreign language reading, recent studies have focused on reading strategy instruction. However, there is a lack of research on how students approach strategy training and to what extent they report using strategies in reading. Therefore, this study will contribute to the literature by investigating students' awareness of strategy instruction and the use of the reading strategies that they have been taught. The results of this study may encourage more explicit strategy training. In addition, the study may highlight the importance of teaching certain reading strategies by identifying the possible differences between the strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers.

The study may also contribute to the development of academic reading instruction in the DBE, METU. Strategy training, which was provided through the use of the reading course book studied at the intermediate level in the DBE, is intended to promote students' success in reading because students at METU are exposed to a considerable amount of authentic reading materials in their academic studies. Therefore, this study may indicate the significance of strategy instruction by identifying the strategies recalled and used by upper-intermediate level students in the department. The aim of the study is to reveal whether students are aware of the strategy training given in the DBE and which instructed strategies are used consciously by the students. The study will provide teachers with information showing how much of the strategy instruction the students are actually aware of, possibly leading to some changes in reading instruction at the department.

Investigation into the strategies that students report using may also be useful for the curricular team because, in light of the data, they may want to redesign the reading materials.

Key Terminology

Below are the terms used throughout this study:

Strategies: Actions learners take consciously to achieve desired goals (Anderson, 1999).

Reading Strategies: Tactics used by readers to comprehend texts better (Duffy, 1993; Paris et al., 1991).

Reading Strategy Instruction: Instruction informed by theory and research to develop self-regulated and strategic readers (Duke & Pearson; Janzen & Stoller; Pressley; Vacca; Williams as cited in Yetgin, 2003).

Successful Readers: For the purposes of this study, successful readers are accepted as those with a class quiz score mean value above 73.5.

Unsuccessful Readers: For the purposes of this study, unsuccessful readers are accepted as those with a class quiz score mean value below 60.

Top-down Reading Strategies: Strategies related to the reading text as a whole or to larger parts of the text. Top-down reading strategies include using background knowledge, predicting, using titles and illustrations to help comprehension, skimming, and scanning (Barnett, 1988).

Bottom-up Reading Strategies: Strategies related to smaller parts of the reading passage. Bottom-up strategies involve identifying grammatical category of words, recognizing meaning through word families and formation, and paying attention to reference words (Barnett, 1988).

Scaffolding: A process that “enables a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts” (Cotterall, 1991, p. 616). In scaffolded instruction, an expert (teacher) gradually reduces the amount of assistance that s/he provides until it is no longer needed (Brown, 1999-2000; Cotterall, 1991).

Conclusion

In this chapter, the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study and key terminology that will frequently be used throughout the thesis have been presented. The next chapter is the literature review which will present the relevant literature in more detail. The third chapter is the methodology chapter which explains the participants, materials, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures of the study. The fourth chapter is the data analysis chapter which demonstrates the data analysis, the tests that were run, and the results of the analyses. The last chapter is the conclusion chapter which discusses the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate generic strategy use in reading as reported by upper-intermediate level students and the extent to which successful and unsuccessful readers differ in terms of (a) reported strategy use (obtained through questionnaire 1), (b) recall of strategy instruction (obtained through questionnaire 2), and (c) the strategies they use while performing a reading task (obtained through stimulated recall).

In this chapter, the literature relevant to this study will be reviewed. First, ‘reading’ in general will be reviewed, with elaboration on models of the reading processes, components of fluent reading, and reading in a second language. Second, reading strategies and their classification will be explored. Third, reading strategy instruction will be examined. As part of this topic, sections on instructional models, implementation, benefits, and challenges of reading strategy instruction are presented. This section will be followed by a discussion of successful and unsuccessful readers. The last section will be allocated to reviewing the methods used to identify the processes in reading.

Reading

‘Reading’ has been described in a variety of ways to explain the process of what happens when one reads and how one comprehends a text. However, a widely

accepted explanation of reading is not found in the literature (Dubin, Eskey & Grabe, 1986).

Mitchell (as cited in Dubin et al., 1986), for instance, defines ‘reading’ as the ability to make sense of written messages. Smith (as cited in Dubin et al., 1986, p. 28), on the other hand, sees reading as “an anticipatory, selective, purposeful, and comprehending process” wherein the reader interprets the text based on the questions formulated about the text. Widdowson (as cited in Dubin et al., 1986) views reading as an interaction between the text and the reader. He adds that reading is a process of relating information presented in a text to the reader’s existing knowledge about the topic.

Prior to a further discussion of how readers comprehend the written words and what the necessary conditions are to maximize comprehension, a broad analysis of the models of the reading processes proposed in reading research would be helpful in giving deeper insight into the nature of reading comprehension.

Models of the Reading Processes

Reading researchers have sought to identify how reading comprehension works and what processes are involved in comprehension. From this research have emerged models of how readers extract meaning from a text (Casanave, 1988; Thompson, 1988). Three models have been mentioned in L1 reading research: bottom-up, top-down, and interactive models.

The bottom-up, or text-based model, distinguishes decoding from comprehension. According to this model, the reader’s attention is primarily on decoding in the early stages of reading. In other words, the reader focuses mainly on the text, analyzing it starting from smaller textual units and building up a meaning

for a text from these small units at the bottom (letters to sounds and to words) to larger units at the top (phrases- clauses, intersentential linkages) (Brown, 1998; Carrell et al., 1988; Thompson, 1988; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Since the reader's attention is on decoding, "little time remains for comprehension" (Thompson, 1988, p. 618). At later stages, more attention can be paid to comprehension as decoding is automatized through practice (Thompson, 1988).

The top-down, or reader-based model, does not assume a reverse process to the bottom-up model as the name 'top-down' suggests. That is, top-down models do not suggest information processing that begins with the largest units and proceeds to smaller units of the text. Rather, in top-down models, the reader's background knowledge of the content area (content schemata) and rhetorical structure of the text (formal schemata) play an important role in the processing of the text (Carrell et al., 1988). The reader, thus, is viewed as an active participant in the reading process, extracting meaning from the text, making predictions, and confirming or disconfirming those predictions (Carrell et al., 1988; Carter & Nunan, 2001; Thompson, 1988; Urquhart & Weir, 1998). An example of a top-down approach to reading comprehension is the 'psycholinguistic model of reading' proposed by Goodman (as cited in Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

Goodman (as cited in Carrell et al., 1988) has described reading as a "psycholinguistic guessing game" wherein the reader reconstructs meaning by using the "graphophonic, syntactic, and semantic systems of the language" (pp. 2-3). This act of constructing meaning is a continuous process of sampling the text, predicting, sampling the text to test predictions, confirming or disconfirming those guesses and sampling again (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1983). Goodman's psycholinguistic theory had

an impact on both first or native language reading and later on second or foreign language reading, in the sense that the reader was seen as an active participant in the reading process, making and confirming predictions based on background knowledge and command of various linguistic levels (graphophonic, syntactic, semantic) (Carrell et al., 1988; Thompson, 1988).

The interactive, or balanced model, proposed by Rumelhart (as cited in Brown, 1998), refers to two levels of interaction. First, it refers to an interaction between the reader and the text. This interaction includes a negotiation with meaning by the reader who comprehends the text by utilizing the information in the text and what is brought to the text. Second, it refers to an interaction of bottom-up and top-down processes. That is, readers process reading by (1) interpreting the linguistic items in the text (bottom-up processing) and (2) relating this information to what is already known about the world (top-down processing) (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1983).

From bottom-up and top-down approaches to the more recent interactive approaches to reading, research has attempted to explain the processes involved in reading comprehension. However, simple definitions of reading and comprehension have failed to explicate the complex nature of the reading process.

Characteristics and Components of Fluent Reading

Grabe (1991) claims that a description of reading comprehension has to “account for the notions that fluent reading is rapid, interactive, comprehending, flexible, purposeful, and gradually developing” (p. 378). Fluent reading is rapid in the sense that the reader reads a text at a sufficient rate so that it becomes easier to make connections and inferences that are necessary for comprehension. Reading is interactive since the reader uses both his/her background knowledge and the

information in the text to comprehend the written work. Reading is comprehending in that the reader expects to understand the message in the text. In addition, reading is flexible because the reader uses a number of strategies to read efficiently. Reading is purposeful since the reader reads for a purpose. Finally, reading develops gradually because a reader cannot become fluent in a short time. Being a fluent reader requires long-term effort and commitment.

Within the context of fluent reading in L1 and L2, Grabe (1991) proposes 6 components of reading skills: “(1) automatic recognition skills, (2) vocabulary and structural knowledge, (3) formal discourse structure knowledge, (4) content/world background knowledge, (5) synthesis and evaluation skills/strategies, and (6) metacognitive knowledge and skills monitoring” (p. 379).

Automaticity is a state “when the reader is unaware of the process, not consciously controlling the process, and using little processing capacity” (Adams, Just & Carpenter, Stanovich as cited in Grabe, 1991, pp. 379-380). The development of automaticity in reading, especially in word identification skills, plays an important role in fluent reading (Adams, Beck & McKeown, Gough & Juel, Perfetti, Stanovich as cited in Grabe, 1991). Fluent readers, as Grabe (1991) points out, have the automatic lexical access skills developed at feature, letter, and word levels whereas “many less-skilled readers lack automaticity in lower-level processing” (p. 380).

Knowledge of vocabulary, structure, discourse, and content plays a key role for reading fluently. A large recognition vocabulary and a good knowledge of language structures enable readers to comprehend a text more easily. Knowledge of formal discourse structure (formal schemata), which is concerned with knowing how a text is written, makes readers aware of the organization of the text. Similarly,

content and background knowledge (content schemata) increases comprehension. Readers who are familiar with the content can understand the text better by relating the information in the text to what they know about text content (Anderson & Pearson; Bransford, Stein & Shelton; Kintsch & van Dijk; Wilson & Anderson as cited in Grabe, 1991).

Synthesis and evaluation skills and strategies are related to the reader's ability to evaluate the information in the text and synthesize it in conjunction with other sources of information. Grabe (1991) argues that fluent readers not only try to comprehend what is written in the text but also seek to evaluate this information.

Metacognitive knowledge is identified as "knowledge about cognition and self-regulation of cognition" (Baker & Brown; Brown, Armbruster & Baker as cited in Grabe, 1991, p. 382). Knowledge about cognition is related to recognizing structural and organizational patterns and employing appropriate strategies in order to achieve particular objectives. Self-regulation of cognition involves self-regulatory mechanisms such as planning, monitoring comprehension, testing effectiveness of strategies, identifying and remediating the failures in comprehension (Collins, Dickens, Simmons & Kameenui, 1996; Nolan, 1991).

Because reading comprehension is complex and involves the coordination of various processes such as metacognition, attention, memory, and comprehension, reading in any language is believed to be cognitively demanding (Flavell, Miller & Miller; Garner & Taylor; Paris & Myers as cited in Brand-Gruwel, Aarnoutse & Boss, 1998; Kern, 1989). Recent research suggests that reading in a second or foreign language can place even greater demands on these processes, making reading less efficient (Kern, 1989).

Reading in a Second Language

Most of the current views of L2 reading are shaped by research in L1 reading. However, reading in L2 is affected by factors which are not considered in L1 reading setting. Differences between L1 and L2 reading contexts and readers can be grouped under three headings: (1) “L2 acquisition and training background differences, (2) language processing differences, and (3) social context differences” (Grabe, 1991, p. 386).

L2 acquisition and training background differences account for the fact that L2 readers begin the reading process with knowledge that is very different from L1 readers. While L1 learners already have storage of “5,000 to 7,000 words” (Grabe, 1991, p. 386) as well as a complete sense of grammar before they begin reading instruction, L2 learners have limited vocabulary and structural knowledge of the language (Czicko; Hatch; Henning; Kern; McLeod & McLaughlin; Muchisky as cited in Kern, 1989; Singer as cited in Grabe, 1991).

Language processing differences refer to transfer effects from L1 to L2 reading contexts. That is, students’ L1 syntactic knowledge can interfere with their L2 learning. For example, differences in word order variation and other syntactic structures between L1 and L2 can cause interference in L2 learning because the readers process the two languages differently (Cohen, 1990; Grabe, 1991).

Social context differences are related to the “L1 socialization to literacy practices that L2 students bring from their L1 cultural backgrounds” (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 59). In some communities, literacy is not common while other cultures use literacy extensively. Students coming from cultures with limited literacy might not recognize the importance of literacy skills. In contrast, students from

communities where a large amount of print information is present have distinct expectations about reading (Grabe, 1991). In addition, differences occur among cultures in terms of how they use text resources. Grabe and Stoller (2002) assert that some social groups view texts as unchanging. Students from these cultures might “tend not to challenge or reinterpret texts in light of other texts” (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 60). In contrast, other cultures see texts as “alternative interpretations of realities and facts that can be disputed” (Grabe, 1991, p. 389). Students from these cultures tend to look for information in different sources. In that sense, “the social context of students’ uses of reading in their first languages, and their access to texts, may have a profound effect on their abilities to develop academic reading skills in English” (Grabe, 1991, p. 389). These differences between reading in L1 and L2 result in difficulties in second language academic reading.

Academic reading is a demanding and complex process, requiring in-depth comprehension. University language learners are usually required to perform “identifiable cognitive and procedural tasks such as taking a test, writing a paper or giving a speech” (Shih as cited in Li & Munby, 1996, p. 200). For these students, there is not a smooth transitional step between short modified expository texts presented in the early stages of language learning and complex academic texts read in university classes (Bouvet, 2000). Consequently, adult academic second language readers, even those with sufficient knowledge of the language, “suffer from deficiencies at the level of identification which interfere, despite all of their higher-level skill, with their attempts to comprehend the texts they must read” (Eskey as cited in Li & Munby, 1996, p. 200).

There is evidence that academic second or foreign language learners can compensate for a lack of knowledge and abilities in L2 reading by “invoking interactive strategies, utilizing prior knowledge, and becoming aware of their strategy choices” (Devine; Hudson as cited in Auerbach & Paxton, 1997, p. 238). Thus, second language readers need to be taught how to utilize these skills and prior knowledge, develop vocabulary skills, and improve reading comprehension through the use of reading strategies (Anderson, 1999; Li & Munby, 1996).

Reading Strategies

In the literature, reading strategies are linked with various terms such as comprehension strategies (Block, 1986; Pressley, 2001; Williams, 2002), reading processing strategies (Pritchard, 1990) and literacy strategies (Whitehead, 1994). Among these terms, reading strategies will be used in this study.

Due to the difficulty of defining reading strategies, researchers have not yet agreed upon a common definition. Thus, a concise definition of strategies does not exist in the literature. Paris et al. (1991) relate this lack of consensus to four problems encountered in defining reading strategies.

First, reading strategies are difficult to differentiate from other cognitive processes related to thinking, reasoning, studying or motivational strategies. Although the strategies related to these processes may influence reading, they are not described as reading strategies by all researchers (Paris et al., 1991).

The second problem is concerned with the scope of reading strategies. It is not clear whether these strategies are global or specific. While Levin (as cited in Paris et al., 1991) claims that strategies include numerous components that need careful analyses, Derry and Murphy (as cited in Paris et al., 1991) “distinguish

strategies as general learning plans that are implemented through specific tactics” (p. 610).

The third problem is related to intentionality and consciousness. Some researchers argue that strategies are more effective when implemented deliberately and with some awareness (Wellman as cited in Paris et al., 1991), whereas others assert that strategies function best when they are used without deliberation (Pressley, Forrest-Pressley & Elliot-Faust as cited in Paris et al., 1991).

Finally, although the terms strategies and skills are sometimes used interchangeably, it is agreed that a distinction between reading skills and strategies exist. Alexander, Graham and Harris (1998) highlight two differences between strategies and skills: (a) “automaticity of performance” and (b) “learner awareness or intentionality” (p. 135).

Based on this distinction, skills are defined as automatic or routinized information-processing techniques that are applied to a text unconsciously because of expertise, repeated practice, luck, and naive use (Alexander et al., 1998). Thus, they are performed the same way every time used (Duffy, 1993). Strategies, on the other hand, are referred to as tactics that readers use deliberately when routine techniques are inadequate to resolve a given interpretation (Anderson, 1991; Carrell, 1998; Paris et al., 1991). Strategies are, thus, employed differently because the unique nature of each text requires readers to modify strategies to fit the demands of the text (Duffy, 1993). If strategies are conscious actions that can be controlled by readers, they are used selectively and in combination (Carrell, 1998; Paris et al., 1991). In this sense, a skill can become a strategy if it is employed deliberately. Similarly, a strategy can become a skill when it is used automatically.

Grabe and Stoller (2002, p. 5), however, present a different approach to the definition of the terms “strategy” and “skill” by opposing the idea that strategies are employed “under conscious control of the reader”. They further support this statement with the assertion that:

many abilities that are commonly identified as strategies are relatively automatic in their use by fluent readers (e.g. skipping an unknown word while reading, rereading to establish text meaning). Thus, the distinction between skills and strategies is not entirely clear precisely because that is part of the nature of reading (and not a definitional problem) (p.15).

Since different approaches to strategies and skills as well as various definitions exist in the literature, it is important to specify that in this study, reading strategies are defined as a range of tactics or actions that readers employ consciously in order to comprehend texts better, as defined broadly by Paris et al. (1991).

Classification of Reading Strategies

A standard, consistent classification of reading strategies is not found in the literature. Oxford (1990), for example, divides strategies into six categories: memory, cognitive, metacognitive, compensation, social, and affective strategies. Cohen (1998), on the other hand, proposes four groups of strategies: cognitive, metacognitive, social, and affective. Despite the inconsistencies existing across taxonomies related to the classification of reading strategies, the most frequently mentioned strategies in the literature fall within the categories of cognitive, metacognitive, text-level, and word-level strategies (Yetgin, 2003).

Cognitive strategies are defined as “mental steps or operations that learners use to process both linguistic and sociolinguistic content” (Wenden & Rubin, 1987, p. 19). These strategies are used to strengthen associations between new and existing knowledge of the learners, and they operate on incoming information to facilitate

learning (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). The cognitive strategies used in reading include guessing from context, analyzing, skimming, taking notes, and summarizing (Oxford, 2001).

Metacognitive strategies are higher order skills that help readers gain awareness of whether they comprehend a reading text or not. These strategies help readers observe their reading process and themselves as learners. Through the use of these strategies, learners identify available resources, decide which of these resources are important for the specific task they perform, and set goals for comprehension. Metacognitive strategies used in reading include monitoring, evaluating, planning, and arranging (Oxford, 2001).

Text-level and word-level division of reading strategies parallel classifications in other studies. Text-level strategies are referred to as “top-down” (Carrell, 1989), “general comprehension” (Block, 1986), “global” (Barnard as cited in Barnett, 1988), “main meaning line” (Hosenfeld as cited in Barnett, 1988), and “text processing strategies” (Fisher & Smith as cited in Barnett, 1988). These strategies are used when the reader approaches a reading text as a whole, from a holistic perspective. Text-level strategies involve strategies such as relating the text to one's background knowledge, predicting, using titles and illustrations to help comprehension, reading with a purpose, skimming, and scanning (Barnett, 1988).

Word-level strategies, on the other hand, are referred to as “bottom-up” (Carrell, 1989), “local linguistic” (Block, 1986), “word-solving strategies” (Hosenfeld as cited in Barnett, 1988), and “word-processing strategies” (Fisher & Smith as cited in Barnett, 1988). Unlike text-level strategies, word-level strategies are used to comprehend smaller parts of the reading text to interpret the text

analytically rather than holistically. Word-level strategies include guessing from the context, identifying grammatical category of words, using word families and word formation to understand the meaning of unknown words (Barnett, 1988).

Several categories of reading strategies have been documented in the literature with different names and classifications. In accordance with the focus of this study, only the literature on the classification of top-down and bottom-up strategies will be reviewed in detail below. A brief summary of the studies wherein those reading strategies are classified and named are presented in Figure 1.

Author	Coding Scheme	Example strategies under each category
Hosenfeld, 1977	a. main-meaning line b. word-solving	
Block, 1986	a. general b. local	a. anticipating content, recognizing text structure, integrating information, questioning information, distinguishing main ideas, interpreting the text, using general knowledge and associations to background, commenting on behavior or process, monitoring comprehension, correcting behavior, focusing on textual meaning as a whole and reacting to the text. b. paraphrasing, rereading, questioning meaning of a clause or sentence, questioning meaning of a word, solving a vocabulary problem.
Barnett, 1988	a. text-level (global or top-down strategies) b. word-level (local or bottom-up strategies)	a. utilizing background knowledge, predicting, reading the title, skimming and scanning b. identifying grammatical categories of words, using reference words, identifying word families
Carrell, 1989	a. global or top-down b. local or bottom-up	
Cohen, 1990	a. global b. specific	a. guessing new words from context b. performing interparagraph analysis to guess words
Block, 1992	a. meaning based b. word-level	
Janzen, 1996	a. comprehensive b. fix-up	a. summarizing, relating what is being read to the reader's background knowledge b. looking up an unknown word in the dictionary, rereading difficult segments,
Alexander, Murphy, Woods, Duhan & Parker, 1997	a. deeper level b. lower level	a. summarizing, activating prior knowledge, elaborating on main ideas b. rereading, changing reading speed
Young and Oxford, 1997	a. global b. local	a. integrating information, recognizing text structure, using background knowledge, anticipating content b. translating a word or a phrase, paraphrasing, breaking lexical items into parts
Brantmeier, 2000	a. global b. local	

Figure 1 – Foreign language reading strategy research with categories of reading strategies (Adapted from: Brantmeier, 2002, p. 2)

The effectiveness of the use of those strategies is not dependent on the strategy itself (Kern as cited in Farrell, 2001; Carrell, 1998). Rather, what makes a strategy effective depends on (a) who is employing it, (b) how consciously it is employed, (c) what kind of text is being read, (d) when it is being employed, and (e) why it is being used (Carrell, 1998; Cohen, 1990; Farrell, 2001). What works for one reader may not work for another. Similarly, while a strategy can work for a reader with a particular text, it may not be a useful tool with another text when the reader's purpose is different. Many studies conducted in both L1 and L2 settings indicate that effective strategies can be taught and reading comprehension can be improved through instruction (Carrell, 1998; Cohen, 1990; Farrell, 2001).

Reading Strategy Instruction

Strategic reading instruction, which is one of the instructional innovations in reading research, has received considerable attention over the last twenty years. The rationale behind strategy instruction is that reading comprehension can be improved through explicit teaching of effective reading strategies to students, especially to low comprehenders (Duke & Pearson, 2002; Vacca, 2002). In this sense, the short-term goal of strategy instruction is to enable students to make sense of what they read. The ultimate aim of strategy instruction, on the other hand, is to help students become competent, self-aware, and strategic readers (Brown, Pressley, Van Meter & Schuder as cited in Janzen & Stoller, 1998).

Paris et al. (1991) assert that there are six main reasons why it is important to develop strategic readers in educational settings. First, through the use of strategies, students can “elaborate, organize, and evaluate the information in the text” (Paris et al., 1991, p. 609). Second, knowledge of reading strategies helps learners to improve

the cognitive strategies that are used to increase attention, memory, and learning. Third, strategies are individual cognitive tools that the students can control and use selectively to aid comprehension. Fourth, “strategic reading reflects metacognition and motivation because readers need to have both the knowledge and disposition to use strategies” (Paris et al., 1991, p. 609). Fifth, strategies can be taught directly by means of which students develop critical reading and thinking skills. Finally, strategic reading facilitates learning throughout the curriculum by encouraging independent and autonomous learning (Paris et al., 1991).

Reading strategy instruction has two main components: direct explanation and scaffolding (Harris & Pressley as cited in Sinatra, Brown & Reynolds, 2001). The first component, direct explanation, requires teachers to (a) describe the strategies, (b) motivate and inform students about the benefits of using strategies, (c) provide students with a step-by-step explanation of how to use the strategies through modeling, think-alouds or talk-alouds, (d) create different contexts to help students understand how to vary their strategy use in accordance with changing purposes, and (e) help students evaluate their strategy use (Sinatra, Brown & Reynolds, 2001).

The second component of strategy instruction, scaffolding, includes shifting responsibility for strategy use from teachers to students (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, Pearson, 1991; Paris et al., 1991). In other words, scaffolding means assisting students to employ the strategies when they have difficulty and at later stages gradually decreasing this support through guidance, practice, and feedback to help students use the strategies independently. Although direct explanation and scaffolding are the two typical components of strategy instruction, each instructional model mentioned in the literature uses different combinations of these components.

Instructional Models in Reading Strategy Training

The literature offers a wide range of instructional models that attempt to define quality strategy instruction. Each of these models has its own implementation plan. The most commonly mentioned instructional models are Reciprocal Teaching (RT), Transactional Strategies Instruction (TSI), Direct Explanation (DE), and Questioning the Author (QtA) (Yetgin, 2003).

Reciprocal Teaching is an instructional method which is based on the studies of the Russian psychologist Vygotsky and was developed by Palincsar and Brown (Brown & Palincsar as cited in Bimmel, 2001). This instructional model focuses on four reading strategies: predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. In a typical RT session, these strategies are first explained and modeled by the teacher. Then, in small groups, the students read one part of a text silently which is followed by a discussion. A student who is assigned to act as a teacher leads the discussion and guides the use of the strategies. The teacher and the students switch roles in leading the discussion while employing the strategies. During the exchange of roles, the teacher gradually lets students take over the role of discussion leader and take the responsibility for applying the strategy. The teacher, meanwhile, gives feedback on the strategy use and scaffolds strategy use where necessary (Bimmel, 2001; Brand-Gruwel et al., 1998; Corte, Verschaffel & Ven, 2001). Although typically implemented in small groups, RT has also been conducted in individual and whole class formats (Duke & Pearson, 2002). Used with both good and poor readers, RT has been found effective in fostering strategy use and improving reading comprehension. The results of the pioneering study conducted by Palincsar and Brown (as cited in Corte et al., 2001) showed that the students trained according to

RT method improved in their use of the four strategies. Another review of research reported by Rosenshine and Meister (as cited in Vacca, 2002) showed that RT improved students' comprehension in experimenter-designed comprehension tests as well as standardized tests of comprehension.

In another form of strategy instruction, Transactional Strategy Instruction, the teacher guides students to use strategies during mini lessons. In these lessons, the teacher and the students model the use of strategies by reading and thinking aloud. The benefits of using strategies are emphasized and students are reminded to use strategies. The teacher continually praises students as they use the strategies. Moreover, the students are encouraged to help each other in the process of becoming strategic readers (Beckman, 2002). TSI has also been found to be an effective instructional model in a variety of studies (Brown & Pressley; Brown et al. as cited in Corte et al., 2001).

TSI and RT have three common characteristics. First, in both forms of instruction, learning occurs in small groups. Second, the teacher acts as a model by using the strategies and guiding students' use of the strategies. Finally, in these instructional models, strategies are used as a means for organizing discussions about texts. Despite these similarities, TSI and RT differ from one another in terms of theoretical backgrounds. While TSI is based more on direct instruction, RT is more socially oriented (Corte et al., 2001).

In Direct Explanation, the teacher regards the reading task as a problem solving activity and helps students solve the problems that occur while reading by thinking strategically. In this model of instruction, the teacher first introduces the reading task. Then, instead of immediately starting reading, the teacher makes an

explicit explanation about what strategy needs to be learned and when and how it should be applied. After this explanation, the teacher models how to think when using the strategy and provides students with scaffolded practice in which students practice using the strategy with gradually decreasing amounts of assistance from the teacher. At the end of the lesson, the teacher and the students explicitly discuss the implementation and benefits of using the strategy (Duffy, 2001).

Questioning the Author aims to help students practice and internalize reading strategies through discussions about texts and what these texts mean. This approach focuses on reading for meaning as well as on strategies used in reading. The teacher asks questions that help students comprehend the text and recognize the author's message instead of teaching specific strategies. The QtA approach enables students to think critically about the components of the text during reading. Students interact with the text and the author by asking and answering questions (Sinatra et al., 2001; Vacca, 2001).

Implementation of Strategic Reading Instruction

Before integrating any strategy instruction model in L2 reading classrooms, four general principles should be considered, and the instruction should be planned accordingly. First, the materials to be used in strategy instruction should be adapted by the teachers. While selecting texts, community mandates, institutional goals, the purpose of the instruction, text suitability for students' proficiency level in terms of vocabulary and grammatical complexity, students' interests, and background knowledge should be considered (Janzen & Stoller, 1998). In addition, the texts to be used in strategy instruction should be "well-suited to application of the specific strategy being learned" (Duke & Pearson, 2002, p. 211).

Second, teachers need to decide the strategies to be taught and emphasized in the classroom according to students' purposes, background knowledge, objectives of instruction, and the demands of the text. A wide range of strategies has been identified through research as effective in reading comprehension. However, "it is not feasible to expose learners to expert reading behavior all at once or even to all the strategies that have been validated by pedagogical research" (Janzen & Stoller, 1998, p. 255) Thus, the strategies selected for targeted instruction should account for the goals of that specific instruction and the needs of its particular students (Janzen & Stoller, 1998; Sinatra et al., 2001).

Third, teachers should carefully plan the lessons in advance to clarify what strategies to teach and how, when, and where readers can use these strategies. Finally, after starting the instruction, teachers need to be flexible and willing to adapt the instruction and make strategic decisions to evaluate the instruction (Janzen & Stoller, 1998).

Benefits of Strategic Reading Instruction

Research in L1 and L2 fields that have evaluated the effectiveness of strategy instruction reveals that explicit teaching of reading strategies helps students improve reading comprehension (Janzen & Stoller, 1998; Barnett; Carrell; Diptoadi; Hamp-Lyons; Lee; Mustafa; Rusciolelli; Spinelli & Siskin; Swaffar; Zhicheng as cited in Mustafa, 1998; Sinatra et al., 2001; Al-Rufai; Barnett; Hamp-Lyons; Hosenfeld; Kern as cited in Young, 1991).

Research documents the advantages of strategy instruction. Besides its contribution to the development of reading comprehension, strategy instruction has three important benefits. Firstly, it increases students' awareness about the processes

involved in reading since students actively engage in meaning-making through the use of strategies. For instance, in a study conducted in an ESL setting wherein a version of the transactional teaching model was examined, the participants reported that strategy instruction “helped them understand their reading process better, both in their L1 and L2” (Janzen, 1996, p. 9).

Secondly, the students who learn to apply the strategies become autonomous and self-regulated readers (Janzen & Stoller, 1998). Therefore, the strategic reading abilities that students develop through instruction help them cope with the reading difficulties that they encounter in their future academic endeavors. In this sense, strategy instruction contributes to “lifelong education and personal satisfaction” (Paris et al., 1991, p. 635).

Finally, strategic reading instruction increases students’ motivation to participate in activities and encourages them to experience how to learn (Janzen & Stoller, 1998). Overall, research on the effectiveness of reading strategy instruction has been favorable. However, empirical evidence has also indicated that such positive effects were not always easy to determine (Sinatra et al., 2001).

Challenges of Implementing Reading Strategy Instruction

Helping students develop the use of effective reading strategies has proven to be challenging due to several reasons (Grabe & Stoller, 2002). First, comprehension is a complex process which includes more than “just listening to the words decoded” (Duke & Pearson, 2002, p. 232). It consists of various processes requiring the use of different strategies in different contexts to meet the demands of the text. Thus, observing how students comprehend a text and preparing a training program accordingly is challenging.

Second, individual differences have a great effect on strategy instruction. That is, a strategy that works well for a group of particular students may not be effective for others due to different experiences in reading, age, or proficiency level.

Third, there is no agreed upon priority of strategy sequencing or application in L2 settings. Research has documented a number of effective strategies. However, “the optimal numbers and kinds of strategies to teach” has not been supported by empirical research (Duke & Pearson, 2002, p. 233).

Fourth, being a strategic reader does not mean knowing and employing a single strategy for a particular task. Nor does it mean using all the instructed strategies at once. Rather, strategic reading requires students to orchestrate the use of various strategies in accordance with changing texts, purposes, and goals (Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

Fifth, effective strategy use does not always involve conscious decisions. Readers may not always be able to verbalize consciously what strategies they use when asked to report. This may be because the readers “usually do not think consciously of their strategic choices” (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 82) or they have already automatized the use of the strategies (Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

Finally, effective strategy instruction takes a considerable amount of time for both the students and the teachers. It requires a great deal time to become a strategic reader because students need to internalize the reading strategies through practice and evaluation (Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Pressley, 2002). For teachers, developing strategic readers requires a long time commitment (Pressley, Goodchild, Fleet, Zajchowski & Evans as cited in Sinatra et al., 2001). Duffy (as cited in Sinatra et al., 2001, p. 65) points out that “it took years for teachers to acquire expertise in

strategies instruction” because teaching reading strategies requires “deep understanding of the cognitive processes involved in comprehension and an ability to scaffold students through an apprenticeship in executing those processes successfully”. Thus, not all teachers can become adept at teaching reading strategies (Sinatra et al., 2001).

Successful and Unsuccessful Readers

Readers have usually been characterized based on their results on reading comprehension tests. However, these results do not provide sufficient information about what processes readers have gone through during reading. Spiro & Myers (as cited in Anderson, 1991, p. 461) have emphasized that “every psychological component of reading or every aspect of a theory of reading is a possible source of differences among individuals”. Thus, rather than focus on the product of reading (such as a score on a reading comprehension test), recent research has paid more attention to determining the strategies that different readers use (Anderson, 1991).

Knight, Padron, and Waxman (as cited in Singhal, 2001) conducted a study to investigate whether there were differences in the type or frequency of cognitive strategies ESL and monolingual students reported using. It was found that the two groups used different strategies. In addition, English-speaking subjects reported using more strategies than ESL students. Anderson (as cited in Singhal, 2001) also examined the differences in strategy use between adult second language learners while performing two reading tasks. The participants were Spanish-speaking students, whose English proficiency level ranged from beginning to advanced level, studying in a university level intensive ESL program in the Southwestern United States. Analysis of data revealed that both high and low scoring readers seemed to be

using the same kinds of strategies while engaging in the tasks. However, high scoring students appeared to be employing strategies more effectively and appropriately than low scoring readers.

Research in L1 and L2 reading have also drawn attention to reading strategies used by readers at different proficiency levels. Research in L1 reading suggests that expert readers use “rapid decoding, large vocabulary, phonemic awareness, knowledge about text features, and a variety of strategies to aid comprehension and memory” (Carrell, 1998, p. 2). Expert readers know and use a variety of strategies. They predict, paraphrase, reread, make inferences to fill in the gaps in comprehension, engage in arguments with themselves about what they are reading, summarize, self-question, and reflect. Novice readers, on the other hand, do not use as many strategies as expert readers do. They focus on decoding single words, do not adjust their reading for different purposes, do not monitor or reread to help comprehension (Carrell, 1998).

As in L1 research, empirical investigations done in L2 research into reading strategies actually used by successful and unsuccessful readers identified relationships between the use of certain reading strategies and successful and unsuccessful reading (Block, 1986; Barnett; Hauptman; Hosenfeld; Knight, Padron, & Waxman; Sarig as cited in Carrell, 1989). Using think-aloud techniques, Hosenfeld (as cited in Carrell, 1989) conducted a study with high school students in the U.S. Hosenfeld’s successful reader in that study did several things:

- (1) kept the meaning of the passage in mind during reading,
- (2) read in broad phrases,
- (3) skipped words viewed as unimportant to total phrase meaning, and
- (4) had a positive self concept as a reader (p. 121).

Unlike the successful reader, the unsuccessful reader:

- (1) lost the meaning of sentences as soon as they were decoded,
- (2) read in short phrases,
- (3) seldom skipped words as unimportant, viewing words as equal in terms of their contribution to total phrase meaning, and
- (4) had a negative self concept as a reader (p. 121).

Block (as cited in Carrell, 1989) conducted a similar study in 1986 with native and nonnative English speakers enrolled in freshman remedial courses in the U.S. Focusing on generally non-proficient readers, Block found four characteristics that appeared to differentiate the more successful from the less successful of the non-proficient readers in the study:

- (1) integration,
- (2) recognition of aspects of text structure,
- (3) use of general knowledge, personal experiences, and associations,
- (4) response in extensive versus reflexive modes (p. 121).

According to Block, in the reflexive mode, readers relate the text to their own lives and experiences, directing their attention away from the text. In the extensive mode, on the other hand, readers try to understand the author's message and ideas.

Several other case studies showing relationships between reading strategies and successful or unsuccessful second and foreign language reading have listed the strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers (Devine; Hauptman; Knight, et al.; Sarig as cited in Carrell et al., 1989). Successful readers use a variety of strategies to accomplish different reading tasks to comprehend texts better during reading. They predict the content of a passage by looking at the title and illustrations, guess the meaning of unknown words and phrases by using contextual clues, establish a connection between the contents of the passage and their own background knowledge to make sense of the text, follow the ideas in the passage, reread passages with different purposes, ask questions to evaluate their reading, summarize the

information presented in the passage, and are able to verbalize consciously what strategies they use during reading (Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Stoller, 2002; Vacca, 2002).

In contrast to successful readers, unsuccessful readers have limited knowledge about how to use strategies effectively and spontaneously while reading (Borkowski, Carr & Pressley; Swicegood & Parsons as cited in Nolan, 1991). They cannot vary their reading for different texts or purposes. They rarely monitor and evaluate their comprehension while reading. In addition, unsuccessful readers may have drawbacks related to motivation. They may have anxiety about reading, be unwilling to read or may have difficulty concentrating on what they read (Carrell, 1998).

Although research indicates that there is a difference in strategy use between successful and unsuccessful readers, the relationships between strategies and comprehension are not simple and straightforward. Use of certain reading strategies may not always result in successful reading comprehension, while failure to use these strategies or use of different strategies does not always result in unsuccessful reading comprehension. Research conducted by Anderson (1991) indicates that there are no straightforward correlations between certain strategies and successful or unsuccessful reading comprehension. His research with native Spanish-speaking university level ESL students who self-reported their strategy use suggests “wide individual variation in successful or unsuccessful use of the exact same reading strategies” (Carrell, 1998, p. 4). Rather than a single set of strategies that significantly contributed to successful reading comprehension, the same kinds of strategies were reported as used by both high and low comprehending readers. However, “those readers reporting the use of a

higher number of different strategies tended to score higher on Anderson's comprehension measures" (Carrell, 1998, p. 4).

Some of the first language studies have also found that "there is a lack of correlation between what readers report they do and what they actually do while reading" (Singhal, 2001). A reader sometimes does not describe how to use a particular strategy but in fact uses it while reading. To explain this, Baker & Brown (as cited in Carrell, 1989, p. 122) point out that "knowing that" (declarative knowledge) is different from "knowing how" (procedural knowledge), and that knowledge that a particular strategy is useful (awareness) precedes its routine use, which in turn precedes the ability to describe how it is used.

Since strategic reading requires more than knowing strategies and strategic readers do not necessarily differ from unsuccessful readers on the bases of the number of strategies they use, it is necessary that readers are observed during reading. Through such observation, it is possible to determine the strategies successful and unsuccessful readers use as well as how and when these strategies are employed.

Methods Used to Identify the Processes in Reading

Identifying the mental processes that readers go through while reading has been a challenge because of the unobservable nature of these processes. The thoughts in readers' minds, "the searches and struggles for meaning, the reflections and associations" are not directly observable to the outsider (Block, 1986, p. 463). What is observable is what the learner produces as a result of reading the printed words (Gass & Mackey, 2000). However, the reader's search for meaning is the core of

reading comprehension. Thus, the knowledge about the process of reading as well as the product is necessary.

The need for “process-oriented research” in reading has forced researchers to gather data on what second language learners actually do while reading (Block, 1986, p. 464). Various methodological tools have been used to identify the mental processes that readers use to comprehend written work (Anderson, 1991). One such methodological tool is verbal reports, implemented increasingly in investigations of reading for a variety of purposes. Verbal reports have been used in L2 research to investigate the reading strategies and to understand the cognitive processes during reading (Afflerbach & Johnston; Ericsson & Simon; Pressley & Afflerbach; Wade as cited in Singhal, 2001). They have also been implemented to compare the performance of good and poor readers (Hosenfeld; Kavale & Schreiner; Olshavsky as cited in Block, 1986).

Verbal reports include collecting data by asking participants to verbalize what they are thinking as they are performing a task (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Verbal reporting provides researchers with information about how individuals may differ in their approach to certain problems or tasks. Cohen (1998) has subcategorized verbal reports as (1) self-report, (2) self-observation that can take the form of introspective or retrospective data, (3) self-revelation that is also referred to as think-aloud.

Self-reports include general statements about or approaches to what the reader does while reading. Learners say what they usually do or think during reading. For example, statements like “I tend to be a speed listener” (Cohen, 1998, p. 34) or “I am a systematic learner when it comes to learning a second language” (Gass & Mackey, 2000, p. 12) are self-reports. Self-report data appears frequently on

questionnaires that require learners to describe the way they usually learn or read (Cohen, 1998). In questionnaire format, however, the statements are removed from the event that the researcher aims to observe (Gass & Mackey, 2000).

Self-observation requires readers to vocalize what they have done or thought while reading. Statements like “what I just did was the skim through the incoming oral text as listened, picking out key words and phrases” can serve as examples of self-observation data (Cohen, 1998, p. 34). Self-observation reports provide data on the descriptions of the reading processes in two ways: (a) retrospective reports and (b) introspective reports. Retrospective reports analyze the verbalized behaviors after they are performed. Cohen (1990) states that retrospection can be immediate (i.e. within an hour of the performance of the task) or delayed (i.e. a few hours, days, or weeks after the performance of the task). Introspective reports, in contrast, include the analysis of the behaviors as soon as they are performed while the learner can still recall the process and the information is still short-term memory (Cohen, 1990). One type of introspective method is stimulated recall.

Stimulated recall is primarily used to explore learners’ processes or strategies by asking learners to report their thoughts after completing a task. It is administered with a certain degree of support for the recall. To stimulate recall of the mental processes that the learner has used during an event, any tool such as audiotapes, videotapes, an essay written by the learner, or a reading passage that the learner has read and took notes on might serve as the reminder of the event. In a stimulated recall of oral interaction, for instance, participant responses can be recorded during the performance and the learners may listen to the audiotapes after the execution of the task. In a stimulated recall of writing, the learner may be shown the essay that

s/he wrote as a reminder of how the learner has performed the task (Gass & Mackey, 2000).

Self-revelation was defined by Cohen (1990, p. 95) as “the learner’s ongoing report that, unlike self-observation, is not based on inspection of specific reading behaviors. Rather, it consists of ‘think-aloud’, stream of consciousness disclosure of thought processes while the information is being attended to”. The think-aloud method, developed by Newell and Simon (as cited in Block, 1986), requires a reader to stop at regular intervals while reading, vocalize how the text is being processed and comprehended, and say aloud everything thought while performing the task (Garner as cited in Singhal, 2001).

Using verbal reports has both its advantages and limitations. The primary advantage of the use of verbal reporting is that it enables the researcher to gain access to certain processes that may not be directly observable by other means (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Another advantage of using verbal reports is that they help learners to develop greater awareness of thought processes and strategies they use while reading (Padron as cited in Padron & Waxman, 1988).

One limitation of using verbal reporting, especially self-observation and self-revelation, is that these research tools may not provide accurate data (Gass & Mackey, 2000). In other words, “the novice L1 and L2 readers – and the fully competent L1 reader as well–, may not be able to articulate clearly, accurately, or reliably what is going on inside their head due to lack of verbal ability or lack of awareness” (Gambrell & Heathington; Markman as cited in Casanave, 1988, p. 289). In this respect, self-reports have advantages over other verbal reporting tools since the learner does not have to verbalize the strategies or the processes used during

reading (Padron as cited in Padron & Waxman, 1988). However, as Ericsson and Simon (as cited in Singhal, 2001) note, since most of the comprehension, attention, and memory processes may become automatic, and thereby unconscious, what the reader can report is merely the final products that are left in memory (Singhal, 2001).

Memory failure is another limitation of using verbal report data. It has been argued that if reports are taken much later than the actual performance, the data reveals little about how the text has been comprehended or what strategies have been used. Thus, it has been suggested that with self-report and self-observational data, the shorter the time lapse between the reported event and the reporting itself, the more likely it is that the reporting will be accurate (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Think-alouds, in that sense, have advantages over self-report and self-observational data in the sense that the readers “report their thoughts without theorizing about these behaviors” (Block, 1986, p. 464).

Conclusion

In this chapter, a review of the literature on the nature of reading, reading strategies, reading strategy instruction, successful and unsuccessful reader strategies, and methods used to determine the strategy use were presented. In the next chapter, information about the methodology of this study will be presented.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study aims to identify overall strategy use in reading as reported by students. The study was also designed to determine the extent to which successful and unsuccessful readers differ in the strategies they reported using (obtained through a questionnaire) and appear to use while performing a reading task (obtained through stimulated recall). Finally, the study investigates the degree to which successful and unsuccessful readers recall previous strategy instruction.

The research addressed the following questions:

1. What reading strategies do upper-intermediate level students at Middle East Technical University, Department of Basic English report that they use?
2. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers report that they use?
 - 2.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in their reported strategy use?
3. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers remember being taught in reading classes?
 - 3.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of recall of strategy instruction in reading classes?
4. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?

4.1. What is the difference between the strategies that successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?

In this chapter, information about the participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis is given.

Participants

The participants are six classes of upper-intermediate level students at Middle East Technical University (METU), Department of Basic English (DBE). Each class consists of 21 students. Thus, approximately 120 students participated in the study.

The reason why only upper-intermediate level students were involved in the study was that most of these students were in intermediate level classes in the first term. In their intermediate-level classes, those students had strategy training. The strategy instruction was provided via the use of the reading course book entitled *www.dbe.off-line.readings2*, which is used as the core intermediate-level reading textbook in the DBE.

In the first part of the study, 112 students participated by responding to the first questionnaire, 'Reading Strategy Questionnaire' (Oxford, Chao, Leung & Kim, 2004). In the first term, some of those 112 students were in elementary and some were in intermediate-level classes. The rest were those who could not pass the proficiency exam given in January and stayed in their upper-intermediate classes. Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents with their previous classes.

Table 1

The distribution of the students who responded to the Reading Strategy Questionnaire

	Total number of students who responded to the questionnaire	Students from elementary classes	Students from intermediate classes	Students from upper-intermediate classes
Class 1	18	1	14	3
Class 2	17	1	12	4
Class 3	18	1	15	2
Class 4	21	1	17	3
Class 5	19	1	12	6
Class 6	19	1	15	3
TOTAL	112	6	85	21

Among this population, two groups of 17 students identified as ‘successful’ and ‘unsuccessful’ readers participated in the second part of the study by responding to the second questionnaire, ‘Recall of Instruction Questionnaire’. These 34 successful and unsuccessful readers were chosen based on the mean scores of their reading grades obtained from six in-class reading pop-quizzes. Four of the pop-quizzes were given in the first semester and two were given in the second semester.

In the last part of the study, two successful and two unsuccessful readers were involved in a stimulated recall exercise in which they performed two reading tasks and reported on the strategies they used. These four students were randomly selected from amongst the 34 students who participated in the second part of the study.

Instruments

Instruments used in this study included the ‘Reading Strategy Questionnaire’ (Oxford et al., 2004) with an ‘addendum’, a second questionnaire used to examine recall of instruction, and two reading tasks.

Reading Strategy Questionnaire

The first questionnaire, Oxford et al.'s (2004) "Reading Strategy Questionnaire" (see Appendix A), was given to 112 students. It was used to determine the reading strategies that upper-intermediate level students reported employing and examine the extent to which the strategies taught in the DBE were employed as reported by the students.

The questionnaire consisted of 35 items that were grouped under three categories: strategies used (a) before, (b) while, and (c) after reading. Items 1, 2, and 3 were concerned with the strategies used before reading. Items from 4 to 34 were related to the strategies used while reading. Finally, item 35 was a strategy appropriate to be used after reading.

Information about the students' reported use of reading strategies was gathered through the use of a Likert scale (Brown & Rodgers, 2002). The questionnaire, which uses a 6-point Likert scale, provided the students with 6 possible answers that range from '0' (almost never) to '5' (almost always).

The questionnaire, written in English, was translated into Turkish through a back translation process (see Appendix B) since this procedure is found to be more reliable than direct translation (Kim & Lim, 1999). I translated the questionnaire into Turkish first. Then, a colleague in the DBE, who has been teaching for eight years, translated the Turkish version into English. By comparing the back translation and the original version, necessary changes were made in the Turkish version.

A consent form (see Appendix C) which informed students about the questionnaire's being voluntary and their responses being confidential was also translated into Turkish (see Appendix D) and included in the questionnaire.

Because Oxford et al.'s (2004) questionnaire did not include all the strategies taught in the DBE, I designed an 'addendum' (see Appendix E) to be able to assess students' reported use of the strategies taught in the DBE as well as their generic strategy use. Since the Reading Strategy Questionnaire was translated into Turkish, the addendum was also designed in Turkish (see Appendix F).

The addendum was given to the 112 students who responded to the Reading Strategy Questionnaire. It was in the same form as the first questionnaire. It used a 6-point Likert scale ranging from '0' (almost never) to '5' (almost always).

The addendum consisted of 10 items that were grouped under three headings – strategies used before, during, and after reading – based on Oxford et al.'s grouping. Items 1 and 2 were the strategies used before reading. Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 addressed the strategies used during reading. Item 10 was a reading strategy used after reading. These 10 items in the addendum were added to the 35 items in the first questionnaire in data analysis. The first questionnaire with the addendum was regarded as a 45-item single questionnaire.

Recall of Instruction Questionnaire

The second questionnaire (see Appendix G) was administered to two groups of 17 successful and unsuccessful readers. It was designed in Turkish (see Appendix H) and aimed to measure the extent to which these 34 successful and unsuccessful readers recalled reading strategy instruction that they received in the 2004-2005 academic year fall semester.

Since the questionnaire was based on strategy instruction given in the DBE, I included all the strategies taught in the department. To determine the instructed strategies, I made use of the data Emine Yetgin (2003), who is an instructor at METU, DBE, collected and analyzed for her master's thesis at Bilkent University, MA TEFL program. In her thesis, she evaluated the reading course book entitled *www.dbe.off-line.readings2* and identified 18 strategies that were explicitly explained and practiced in the textbook as part of strategy training. Table 2 displays the 18 strategies that were taught in the DBE through the use of the textbook and that were included in the questionnaire.

Table 2

Reading strategies that are explicitly explained and practiced in the DBE semester one course book

Reading Strategies
Paying attention to text structure and organization
Identifying main ideas
Drawing inferences
Analyzing
Critiquing the text and the author
Making predictions
Paraphrasing
Generating questions
Confirming/disconfirming predictions, guesses, or inferences
Highlighting
Using prior knowledge
Guessing meaning of unknown words and phrases
Using visual representations of text
Previewing text before reading
Skimming
Taking notes
Consulting an outside source
Scanning

Adapted from Yetgin, 2003

The students were asked through the 18-item questionnaire what they remembered from their previous strategy training. The items were designed in a four-

point Likert scale, with '1' (a lot), '2' (some), '3' (not much), and '4' (not at all) options.

The questionnaire, designed in Turkish, provided the students with statements explaining the strategies. In addition, to help students understand what strategy each statement referred to, the name of each strategy was written in English in parentheses.

Reading Tasks

Two reading tasks were administered to two successful and two unsuccessful readers to identify the reading strategies that these students reported using after executing the tasks.

The reading passages were taken from upper-intermediate level reading pop-quizzes given in previous years. The first passage (see Appendix I) is 731 and the second passage (see Appendix J) is 846 words in length.

The passages were not followed by any comprehension questions because the aim was not to examine students' performance on post-text reading comprehension tests but to identify the strategies used while reading. Students' reports of the strategy use were obtained through stimulated recall.

Each student was given two reading tasks one after another. After reading each of the passages, the participant was asked to report the strategies used while reading and interpreting the passage. To stimulate students' recall of the task performance, the reading passages that the participant read and took notes on served as the reminder of the event.

No time limits were imposed on the participants during the reading tasks. Participants were allowed to produce stimulated recall in their L1 (Turkish) or in

English. All responses given by the participants were in Turkish. Participant responses were audio-recorded for analysis. Since all stimulated recall reports were given in Turkish, the parts that were used in the analysis were translated into English.

Data Collection Procedures

On February 18, 2005, I received permission from Middle East Technical University, Department of Basic English to conduct the study. On February 22, 2005, I contacted two instructors to ask if I could pilot the questionnaires with their students. In addition, I asked six other teachers whether I could give their students the actual questionnaires. All the instructors agreed that I could conduct the study with the participation of their students. Since the participants used in the pilot and the actual study needed to be similar, (Best & Khan, 1998), the questionnaires and the tasks were administered to upper-intermediate level students in both the pilot and the actual studies.

The pilot study of the first questionnaire, 'Reading Strategy Questionnaire' (Oxford et al., 2004) was done on February 28, 2005. Two classes, one consisting of 16 and the other of 17 students, were given the first draft of the questionnaire to ensure that the items in the questionnaire were clear enough for the participants to understand. The students were also asked to indicate the items they had difficulty in responding to. Since the students stated that all of the items were clear, there was no need to change any of the items.

The actual questionnaire was administrated on March 3-4, 2005 with the participation of six classes of students. In the second week of March, I entered the data using the Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 11.5).

On April 8, 2005, the addendum was piloted with the same two classes of students with whom the first questionnaire was piloted. Since all the items were found to be clear, they were not changed. On April 12, 2005, the actual addendum was given to the 112 students who responded to the first questionnaire.

The second questionnaire, 'Recall of Instruction Questionnaire', focused on strategy instruction given in the DBE. Thus, the participants for this part of the study were selected from among the 85 students who were in intermediate level classes and had strategy training in the first term. To select two groups of successful and unsuccessful readers, the mean scores of six reading pop-quiz grades from these 85 students were calculated. Then, these mean scores were ordered to rank the students from the most successful to the least successful, based on their quiz scores. The students with a mean score above 73.5 (top 17) were designated as "successful readers" and below 60 (bottom 17) were designated as "unsuccessful readers". The students whose mean scores on the pop-quiz grades were between 73.5 and 60 were not included in the second and third parts of the study.

After the participants for the second questionnaire were determined, the questionnaire was piloted on April 28, 2005 with one class of upper-intermediate level students, who were otherwise not involved in the actual study. The students were asked to mark the items they had difficulty in understanding. Since the students did not indicate any items as problematic, no changes were made in the questionnaire.

On May 3-4, 2005, the second questionnaire was given to the 34 successful and unsuccessful readers. SPSS 11.5 was used in entering and analyzing the data obtained from the second questionnaire. Data entry was completed by May 7, 2005.

The last part of the study started on May 11, 2005. The reading tasks were piloted with two students. The students stated that they found it difficult to verbalize their behavior since there were not accompanying questions to the passages. Thus, the participants of the actual administration were provided with clear purposes for reading and more detailed explanation about what they were expected to do.

The actual administration of the reading tasks was done on May 16-18, 2005. Two reading tasks were given to two successful and two unsuccessful readers chosen randomly from among the 34 students who participated in the second part of the study. Tapes of the stimulated recall protocols were transcribed (see Appendix K for translated versions of sample transcriptions). To describe the responses of the participants, strategy categories (paralleling the original questionnaires) were developed and student responses were coded accordingly. I finished analyzing data by the end of May.

Data Analysis

The data for this study was composed of both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data was gathered from the questionnaires. Qualitative data was gathered through stimulated recall reports.

In order to analyze the quantitative data, student responses to the first and second questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS 11.5. The frequencies, standard deviations, and mean scores of the results were calculated. To investigate the possible differences between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of reported strategy use and recall of instruction, four *t*-tests were run.

For qualitative data analyses, reports obtained from stimulated recall were transcribed. The strategies students reported using were identified and coded

separately for each participant. Then, the strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers were analyzed to compare the two groups of readers. Finally, to discuss the results obtained from the qualitative data analyses, related sections in the transcriptions were translated into English.

Conclusion

This chapter on methodology gives general information about the purpose of the study with the research questions addressed in the study. It also provides information about the participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis. In the next chapter, the data analysis done using the above-mentioned statistical and qualitative methods will be presented.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate generic reading strategy use and the extent to which successful and unsuccessful readers differ in their reported strategy use, recall of strategy instruction, and the strategies they use while performing a reading task.

This chapter presents the results of the data collected and analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. What reading strategies do upper-intermediate level students at Middle East Technical University, Department of Basic English report that they use?
2. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers report that they use?
 - 2.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in their reported strategy use?
3. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers remember being taught in reading classes?
 - 3.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of recall of strategy instruction in reading classes?
4. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?

4.1. What is the difference between the strategies that successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?

This study consisted of three parts. The aim of the first part of the study was to identify the overall strategy use in the DBE, METU as reported by the students. One hundred and twelve students participated in the first part of the study by responding to a 45-item questionnaire, based on Oxford's 'Reading Strategy Questionnaire' (Oxford et al., 2004). The reliability of the questionnaire was found to be .81 using Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency.

The second part of the study investigated the extent to which successful and unsuccessful readers recalled reading strategy instruction given in the EFL reading course book used in the DBE, METU. The participants were two groups of 17 successful and unsuccessful readers who responded to an 18-item questionnaire. The reliability of the questionnaire was found to be .69 using Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency.

The last part of the study determined the reading strategies that successful and unsuccessful readers reported using while performing a specific reading task. The research format comprised in-depth interviews with four students selected from the previous analysis of 34 students. Data about the strategies two successful and two unsuccessful readers used while performing the reading tasks were gathered through in-depth stimulated recall procedures.

The results of the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively using the SPSS, Version 11.5. The frequencies, means, percentages, and standard deviations were calculated. Additionally, five *t*-tests were run to explore the possible differences

between successful and unsuccessful readers' use of reading strategies. The results of the stimulated recall reports were analyzed qualitatively.

The analyses of data obtained from the two questionnaires and stimulated recall reports will be discussed in detail under three broad sections below. In the first section, the analysis of the first questionnaire results is discussed, elaborating on generic strategy use and the possible differences between the reported strategy use of successful and unsuccessful readers who were previously determined based on in-class quiz scores. In the second section, the results of the second questionnaire are analyzed to explore recall of strategy instruction by successful and unsuccessful readers. In the third section, stimulated recall results are shown and discussed.

Analyses of Reading Strategy Questionnaire

The data collected through the Reading Strategy Questionnaire were analyzed in four ways. First, the items in the questionnaire were classified based on three criteria: (a) what stage in reading those strategies are thought to be used – before, during, or after reading strategies, (b) what type of strategies they are as classified in the broad categorization of reading strategies – top-down versus bottom-up strategies (see Chapter 2 for details), (c) whether they are instructed strategies – strategies that were taught in the DBE as part of previous strategy instruction.

Second, the results of all the participants' responses to individual items in the questionnaire were analyzed to find the reported generic strategy use in the DBE.

Third, the responses given by the 85 students who had strategy training in the first term were analyzed to investigate the frequency of reported strategy use as well as reported use of the instructed strategies.

Finally, to explore the possible differences in the reported strategy use of successful and unsuccessful readers, the answers given by the 17 successful and 17 unsuccessful readers were analyzed.

The Classification of the Items in the Questionnaire

As a result of the categorization of the items in the questionnaire, it was found that the questionnaire includes five strategies employed ‘before reading’, 38 strategies used ‘while reading’, and two strategies employed ‘after reading’. The strategies used before, during, and after reading represented in the questionnaire were distributed unevenly among the questionnaire items. Therefore, they were not included in the data analysis although displayed in the tables.

As for strategy type, the questionnaire consisted of 27 top-down and 18 bottom-up strategies. For this classification, where questionnaire item strategies are discussed in the literature as “top down” or “bottom up” strategies, the designations cited in the literature are used (see Chapter 2, Figure 1). However, not all the strategy statements in the questionnaire appear in the literature under the discussion of top-down and bottom-up strategies. In this case, I classified these impressionistically using similar criteria as those found in the literature.

Finally, out of 45 items in the questionnaire, 21 items were taught in the DBE. These 21 instructed strategies were determined based on previous research results (Yetgin, 2003) (see Chapter 3, Table 2). Table 3 shows how the 45 items in the questionnaire were grouped based on the three criteria discussed above.

Table 3

The classification of the items according to what stage in reading they are used, what type of strategies they are, and whether they are taught in the DBE.

IN	Reading Strategies	SU	Type	M
1	Using the title to help predict the contents	B	T	M
2	Considering what type of text it is	B	T	M
3	Skimming	B	T	M
4	Paying attention to parts of sentences	W	Bt	
5	Paying attention to the beginning and end of paragraphs	W	T	M
6	Focusing on the tense of a verb	W	Bt	
7	Trying to understand the meaning of every word	W	Bt	
8	Translating each sentence into Turkish	W	Bt	
9	Starting from the 1 st paragraph and reading all the way through the last paragraph	W	Bt	
10	Paying attention to sentence structure	W	Bt	
11	Continuing reading despite difficulties	W	T	
12	Changing reading speed depending on the difficulty of a text	W	Bt	
13	Reading aloud the difficult parts	W	Bt	
14	Skipping unknown words	W	T	
15	Linking content with background knowledge	W	T	M
16	Trying to understand the meaning of a word by dividing it into parts	W	Bt	M
17	Guessing meaning using clues from the text	W	T	M
18	Guessing meaning using background knowledge	W	T	M
19	Checking what each pronoun refers to	W	Bt	
20	Underlining important parts	W	T	M
21	Marking important parts, using colored pens or drawing stars	W	T	
22	Going over difficult parts	W	Bt	
23	Reading aloud the entire text	W	Bt	
24	Making a picture in the mind about what the text is saying	W	T	
25	Using non-target language to understand the text	W	T	
26	Going back to previous sentences when faced difficulty	W	T	
27	Following the lines read with pen or finger	W	Bt	
28	Using slashes to divide a sentence grammatically	W	Bt	
29	Skipping sentences that are not understood	W	T	
30	Predicting what will come next	W	T	M
31	Paying attention to linking words	W	Bt	M
32	Writing down key words	W	T	M
33	Trying to figure out the main idea of each paragraph	W	T	M
34	Reading the comprehension questions before reading the text	W	T	
35	Summarizing the text	A	T	
36	Scanning to locate specific information	B	T	M
37	Paying attention to visuals such as graphs, pictures, or tables	B	T	M
38	Asking questions related to the text	W	T	M
39	Confirming/disconfirming the predictions, guesses, or inferences	W	T	M
40	Consulting an outside source to help comprehension	W	Bt	M
41	Translating the text into Turkish to help comprehension	W	Bt	
42	Paraphrasing	W	Bt	M
43	Making inferences	W	T	M
44	Trying to connect information within the text	W	T	
45	Evaluating the text and the writer's viewpoint	A	T	M

Note. IN = item number; SU = stages of use; B = before reading; W = while reading; A = after reading; T = top-down strategies; Bt = bottom-up strategies; M = strategies that were taught at METU, DBE

Generic Reading Strategy Use in the Department of Basic English

To investigate the overall strategy use as reported by the students, the frequencies and means of the responses given by 112 students to individual items were computed. Based on the responses given to the items that were designed on the 6-point Likert scale ranging from '0' (almost never) to '5' (almost always), the mean score of the means of all the participant responses was found to be 2.74.

In order to explore the ordering of the strategies according to the frequency of reported use, the participants' responses were rank ordered by averaged mean scores. Consequently, the ranking of reported strategies from the most used to the least used one was determined (see Appendix L).

To identify the frequent, moderate, and infrequent use of these strategies, the scale was divided into three segments. Since the questionnaire used a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from '0' to '5', 1.66 was accepted as the mean spread dividing the ranking into three parts. For the purpose of this analysis, the strategies whose means are between 0 and 1.66 were designated as being infrequently used, between 1.67 and 3.33 as moderately used, and between 3.34 and 5.00 as frequently used strategies as reported by the students. In the analysis, the mean values of 1.66 and 3.33 were regarded as cut-off points for categorizing frequency of use. In this sense, a mean score of 2.74 implies that the students in the DBE used reading strategies that, on average, fell within the range of moderate frequency of use.

For a more focused analysis and interpretation of the results, only the top 12 (the most frequently reported) strategies with a mean score above 3.34 and the bottom 8 (the least frequently reported) strategies with a mean score below 1.66 will

be presented and analyzed in this chapter. Table 4 displays in detail the most frequently reported strategies along with the strategy types and stages of use.

Table 4

The most frequently used reading strategies as reported by the students in the DBE

Item No	Reading Strategies	N	M	Type	Stage
12	Changing reading speed depending on the difficulty of a text	112	4.10	Bt	W
44	Connecting information within and/or across text	112	3.90	T	W
26	Going back to previous sentences if faced with a trouble	112	3.84	T	W
37	Using visual representations of text	112	3.84	T	B
22	Going over difficult parts several times	112	3.79	Bt	W
17	Guessing meaning of unknown words using clues from the text	112	3.72	T	W
1	Using the title to help predict the contents	112	3.56	T	B
11	Continuing reading despite having difficulty	112	3.56	T	W
31	Paying attention to linking words	112	3.56	Bt	W
34	Reading the comprehension questions first and then reading the text	112	3.56	T	W
15	Linking the content with prior knowledge	112	3.42	T	W
24	Making a picture in the mind about the text	112	3.40	T	W

Note. N = number of participants; M = mean; T = top-down strategies; Bt = bottom-up strategies; B = before reading strategies; W = while reading strategies

Table 4 demonstrates that of the 12 highest ranking strategies, three strategies (12, 22, and 31) are bottom-up while the rest are all top-down strategies. This implies that the students in the DBE seem to use more top-down strategies than bottom-up strategies.

Compared to the 12 most frequently reported strategies, the students reported least frequent use of eight out of 45 strategies. These are the strategies whose means

are less than 1.66 as previously explained. Table 5 shows in detail, with strategy types and stages of use, the least frequently used strategies as reported by all the participants.

Table 5

The least frequently used reading strategies as reported by the students in the DBE

Item No	Reading Strategies	N	M	Type	Stage
35	Summarizing	112	1.63	T	A
21	Marking important parts using colored pens or drawing stars	112	1.60	T	W
8	Translating/using non-target language	112	1.54	Bt	W
13	Reading aloud the difficult parts	112	1.54	Bt	W
32	Writing down key words/note-taking	112	1.54	T	W
29	Skipping the sentence that is difficult to understand	112	1.49	T	W
23	Reading aloud the entire text	112	0.72	Bt	W
28	Using slashes to divide a sentence grammatically	112	0.62	Bt	W

Note. N = number of participants; M = mean; T = top-down strategies; Bt = bottom-up strategies; W = while reading strategies, A = after reading strategies

As can be seen in Table 5, among the eight lowest ranking strategies, there is an even distribution between the two strategy types. That is, half of the eight strategies are top-down strategies (35, 21, 32, and 29) and half of them are bottom-up strategies (8, 13, 23, and 28).

Overall, the results reveal that the students in the DBE use reading strategies but not necessarily with high frequency. When the reported strategies are analyzed according to their type, the students seem to use top-down strategies more frequently than bottom-up strategies.

The answers given by all the participants to the items related to instructed strategies were not analyzed in this part of the study. Among the 112 participants, 85

students had strategy training given in the first term in the reading textbook *www.dbe.off-line.readings2*, whereas 27 did not have that instruction. Therefore, the analysis of all the participant responses to instructed strategy items do not yield information about the ratio of the reported use of the strategies taught as part of strategy instruction. This analysis conducted with 85 students will be presented in the following section.

Generic Strategy Use as Reported by the Students who had Strategy Training

Eighty-five students of the whole population of 112 students had had strategy training in the first semester of the year. The analysis of these 85 student responses to the items in the questionnaire was made to investigate how often these students reported using reading strategies in general. The means of the responses given by these students were calculated. Then, to determine their generic strategy use, the overall mean of students' responses was computed. The overall mean value of reported strategy use was found to be 2.76. This implies, considering the cut-off points of the scale, 1.66 and 3.33, that the 85 students who had strategy training reported moderate use of the strategies sampled in the questionnaire.

The results of the responses given by these 85 students were also analyzed to explore the degree that these students who had strategy instruction used the strategies that were taught in the first semester. The means of the responses to 21 items, which were determined previously as "instructed strategies", were calculated. Then, the overall of mean of individual responses was computed. The mean value for the use of the instructed strategies was found to be 2.89. When previously determined cut-off points of the scale are taken into consideration, the mean value of 2.89 assumes that the students who had strategy training use instructed strategies in the questionnaire

with moderate frequency. They reported using specifically taught strategies with slightly higher frequency (non-significant) than they reported all strategies sampled in the questionnaire.

Reported Strategy Use of Successful Readers as compared to Unsuccessful Readers

In order to explore the possible differences in the strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers, the responses given by these students were analyzed in terms of reported frequency of (a) strategy use in general, (b) top-down versus bottom-up strategy use, (c) instructed strategy use.

To compare the reported frequency of strategy use in general, the answers given by 17 successful and 17 unsuccessful readers, who were determined based on in-class reading quiz scores, were analyzed. The responses to individual items in the questionnaire were averaged for all participants. Based on the averaged scores, the collected means for each item from successful and unsuccessful readers were computed separately. Using the averaged mean scores, the strategies used by successful readers and unsuccessful readers were rank ordered from the most frequently used strategy to the least frequently used one. To investigate the possible differences between responses given by these two groups, a *t*-test was run, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Mean values for responses given by successful and unsuccessful readers to all items in the questionnaire

Group	N	M	sd	t
Successful	17	2.78	0.35	0.59
Unsuccessful	17	2.69	0.52	

Note. N = number of participants; M = mean; sd = standard deviation; t = *t*-value

The *t*-test analysis of differences between the two groups in terms of reported frequency of strategy use as presented in Table 6 yielded a *t* value of 0.59. Although this result is not significant at the $p < .05$ level, the results obtained from the mean values calculated for the two groups separately indicate that successful readers reported using more strategies than unsuccessful readers.

To find whether these two groups of readers differ in their reported use of top-down and bottom-up strategies, the answers successful and unsuccessful readers gave to 27 top-down and 18 bottom-up strategies were analyzed.

Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Use of Top-down Strategies

The responses to 27 individual ("top-down") items in the questionnaire were averaged for each participant. Then, the means for each item over the two groups of readers were computed separately. In order to see the possible differences in the responses given on the top-down strategies by the successful and unsuccessful readers, a *t*-test was run as shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Mean values for responses given by successful and unsuccessful readers on the top-down strategies

Group	N	M	sd	t
Successful	17	2.88	0.40	0.89
Unsuccessful	17	2.73	0.57	

Note. N = number of participants; M = mean; sd = standard deviation; t = *t*-value

As can be seen in Table 7, the *t*-test results indicate that the two groups of readers do not significantly differ from one another in terms of their reported use of top-down strategies. However, when the mean values are considered, successful readers seem to use more top-down strategies than unsuccessful readers do.

Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Use of Bottom-up Strategies

The possible differences in the reported use of 18 bottom-up strategies by successful and unsuccessful readers were investigated by averaging the responses to the items. Using these averaged scores, the means of the given responses were calculated separately for the two groups of readers. To identify the potential differences in the responses given on the bottom-up strategies by the two groups, a *t*-test was run as demonstrated in Table 8.

Table 8

Mean values for responses given by successful and unsuccessful readers on the bottom-up strategies

Group	N	M	sd	t
Successful	17	2.59	0.47	-0.10
Unsuccessful	17	2.61	0.54	

Note. N = number of participants; M = mean; sd = standard deviation; t = *t*-value

The results in Table 8 show that the responses given to the 18 bottom-up strategies by the two groups did not show a significant difference. However, the overall mean scores of the responses reveal that unsuccessful readers tended to use more bottom-up strategies than successful readers.

Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Use of Instructed Strategies

In order to discover whether these two groups of readers differ in their reported use of the 21 strategies that were taught in the DBE, participant responses to the questionnaire involving items on the strategies taught in the DBE were selected and the means of the given responses to each item were computed. The potential differences in the two groups' reported use of these strategies were analyzed by a *t*-test. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Mean values for responses given by successful and unsuccessful readers on the strategies taught in the DBE

Group	N	M	sd	t
Successful	17	2.85	0.48	0.30
Unsuccessful	17	2.79	0.67	

Note. N = number of participants; M = mean; sd = standard deviation; t = *t*-value

The *t*-test results shown in the table above indicate that there are not significant differences between the two groups in terms of their reported use of instructed strategies. However, the mean values obtained from the responses show a tendency towards slightly more frequent use of these 21 strategies on the part of the successful readers, but this correlation is not significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Overall, considering the results of the *t*-tests that were run to compare successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of their reported use of all the strategies in the first questionnaire, top-down and bottom-up strategies, and instructed strategies, the two groups did not differ significantly as shown in tables 6, 7, 8, and 9. However, successful readers appear to use strategies more frequently. In addition, successful readers tend to use top-down and instructed strategies more often than unsuccessful readers do.

The reason for the moderate use of reading strategies among 85 students who had strategy training and the slight difference between the two groups of ‘successful’ and ‘unsuccessful’ readers, chosen from the previous population of 85 students, might have stemmed from the participants’ awareness or unawareness of strategy instruction. Thus, in the second part of this study, the ‘Recall of Instruction Questionnaire’ was administered. The questionnaire aimed to compare the previously

identified 17 successful and 17 unsuccessful readers according to whether they recalled being taught the strategies focused in the DBE, METU.

Analyses of Recall of Strategy Instruction Questionnaire

The data collected from the second questionnaire were analyzed in three ways. First, successful and unsuccessful readers' responses to the items in the questionnaire were analyzed separately by calculating means and frequencies. Second, the means of the responses given by successful and unsuccessful readers were rank ordered to explore the most and the least remembered strategies for both groups. Third, the overall means of the responses given by the students in both groups were compared by a *t*-test.

The questionnaire consisted of 18 strategy items, determined on the basis of previous research conducted in the department (see Chapter 3, Table 2), and the respondents chose answers to the question 'How much do you remember about studying each strategy described and labeled below?'. They responded on a 1-4 scale with 1 = a lot, 2 = some, 3 = not much, 4 = not at all. The mid-point of the scale, which is 2.5, was accepted as the cut-off point separating the strategies that are remembered and not remembered as reported by the students. The strategies with a mean score below 2.50 were considered as those remembered by the students and above 2.50 as the strategies not remembered.

Successful Readers' Recall of Instruction

In order to determine how much of the strategy instruction given in the DBE successful readers recall, the frequencies and means of the responses given by 17 successful readers were calculated. The overall mean score of all the responses was

found to be 2.15. Considering the fact that the mid-point of the scale is 2.50 and the strategies with a mean score lower than this value are accepted as remembered by the students, the mean value of 2.15 implies that the successful readers had moderate recall of instructed strategies.

Successful readers' responses were also analyzed by ranking the strategies based on the mean scores of the responses given by the students. Table 10 displays the ranking of the strategies, from the most remembered to the least remembered, that successful readers reported remembering.

Table 10

Ranking of successful readers' recall of the strategies taught in the DBE

R	Item No	Strategies	M	N
1	5	Using visual representations of text	1.53	17
2	10	Guessing meaning of unknown words and phrases	1.71	17
3	3	Skimming	1.88	17
4	9	Highlighting	1.94	17
5	12	Identifying main ideas	2.06	17
6	6	Making predictions	2.06	17
7	17	Using prior knowledge	2.12	17
8	2	Previewing text before reading	2.12	17
9	4	Scanning	2.18	17
10	16	Consulting an outside source	2.24	17
11	13	Drawing inferences	2.24	17
12	1	Paying attention to text structure and organization	2.24	17
13	14	Analyzing	2.35	17
14	8	Confirming /disconfirming predictions, guesses, or inferences	2.59	17
15	18	Critiquing the text and the author	2.76	17
16	15	Paraphrasing	2.76	17
17	7	Generating questions	2.94	17
18	11	Taking notes	3.18	17

Note. R = ranking of the strategies; M = mean; N = number of participants

Since the cut-off point of the Likert scale used in the questionnaire was previously determined as 2.50, Table 10 reveals that successful readers reported remembering best studying 13 strategies (5, 10, 3, 9, 12, 6, 17, 2, 4, 16, 13, 1, and 14) taught in the DBE. However, the readers seemed not to remember the lowest ranking five strategies (8, 18, 15, 7, and 11) as much as the other strategies.

Unsuccessful Readers' Recall of Instruction

In order to explore how much of the strategy instruction unsuccessful readers remember, the frequencies and means of the responses given by the 17 unsuccessful students were calculated. The mean value obtained from the responses of all the participants was found to be 2.31, which assumes that unsuccessful readers, like successful readers, reported that they remembered, although not well, the strategies taught in the DBE.

To find the most and least remembered strategies as reported by unsuccessful readers, the mean score for each statement was rank ordered. Table 11 presents, from the most remembered to the least remembered, the instructed strategies as reported by unsuccessful readers.

Table 11

Ranking of unsuccessful readers' recall of the strategies taught in the DBE

R	Item No	Strategies	M	N
1	5	Using visual representations of text	1.94	17
2	2	Previewing text before reading	1.94	17
3	9	Highlighting	2.00	17
4	3	Skimming	2.12	17
5	17	Using prior knowledge	2.29	17
6	16	Consulting an outside source	2.29	17
7	13	Drawing inferences	2.35	17
8	10	Guessing meaning of unknown words and phrases	2.35	17
9	6	Making predictions	2.41	17
10	4	Scanning	2.41	17
11	1	Paying attention to text structure and organization	2.41	17
12	12	Identifying main ideas	2.47	17
13	7	Generating questions	2.71	17
14	18	Critiquing the text and the author	2.76	17
15	14	Analyzing	2.76	17
16	8	Confirming /disconfirming predictions, guesses, or inferences	2.76	17
17	15	Paraphrasing	2.94	17
18	11	Taking notes	3.06	17

Note. R = ranking of the strategies; M = mean; N = number of participants

As can be seen in Table 11, unsuccessful readers reported that they remember studying 12 of the strategies (5, 2, 9, 3, 17, 16, 13, 10, 6, 4, 1, and 12) taught in the DBE. However, they seem not to remember the lowest ranking six strategies (7, 18, 14, 8, 15, and 11) as much as the other strategies.

Comparison of Successful and Unsuccessful Readers' Recall of Instruction

Data collected from the second questionnaire was also analyzed by *t*-test to see the possible differences between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of recall of strategy instruction. Table 12 displays the potential differences between the two groups of readers in terms of their recall of instruction.

Table 12

The difference in recall of instruction between successful and unsuccessful readers

Group	N	M	sd	t
Successful	17	2.15	0.38	-1.46
Unsuccessful	17	2.31	0.25	

Note. N = number of participants; M = mean; sd = standard deviation; t = *t*-value

Table 12 demonstrates that a significant difference does not exist between the two groups in terms of recall of strategy instruction. However, the mean scores of the responses given by the two groups indicate that successful readers tend to remember studying the instructed strategies slightly more than unsuccessful readers do.

Analyses of Stimulated Recall Reports

Data obtained from the first and the second questionnaires reveal that successful and unsuccessful readers did not show significant differences in their reported use of strategies in general, top-down and bottom-up strategies, instructed strategies, and recall of strategy instruction. Therefore, the two groups of readers were analyzed to investigate whether they show variation in their strategy use while performing a reading task.

To gather data, two successful and two unsuccessful readers, chosen randomly from among the previous population of 34 successful and unsuccessful readers, were given two reading tasks. The students were asked to skim the first text and then read it. After reading, the students were asked to report what they did while reading. The same procedure was repeated for the second task.

The data were collected through stimulated recall. The data were analyzed by first transcribing the stimulated recall reports (see Appendix K for translated versions of sample transcriptions), coding the strategies that the students reported using and

then categorizing these strategies as top-down and bottom-up. The four participants' reported use of the METU-taught strategies was also analyzed to compare the two groups.

Although the two tasks were administered one after another and the results of stimulated recall were analyzed separately, for the purposes of this study, the data obtained from both tasks are presented together in this section.

Successful and unsuccessful readers who participated in this part of the study differed in their reports not only in terms of the number and the type (top-down or bottom-up) of the strategies they used while reading, but also in why and how they used these strategies. Table 13 illustrates with numbers the use of reading strategies as reported by the four participants during stimulated recall.

Table 13

Strategy use reported in stimulated recall by successful and unsuccessful readers

	Successful readers		Unsuccessful readers	
	S1	S2	U1	U2
Number of <i>strategies</i> used	17	10	6	4
Number of <i>top-down strategies</i> used	14	9	3	2
Number of <i>bottom-up strategies</i> used	3	1	3	2
Number of <i>instructed strategies</i> used	14	8	3	2

Note. S1 = successful reader1; S2 = successful reader2; U1 = unsuccessful reader1; U2 = unsuccessful reader2

Table 14 displays in detail the strategies that each participant reported using during reading, with the categorization of each strategy as previously identified in Oxford et al.'s (2004) classification.

Table 14

Strategies that successful and unsuccessful readers used while reading as reported through stimulated recall

		Successful Readers		Unsuccessful Readers	
No		S1	S2	U1	U2
1	T	Using visual representations of text	Using visual representations of text		
2	T	Making predictions	Making predictions		
3	T	Using prior knowledge	Using prior knowledge		
4	Bt	Paying attention to linking and discourse types	Paying attention to linking and discourse types		
5	T	Skipping unknown words or phrases	Skipping unknown words or phrases		
6	T	Critiquing the text and the author	Critiquing the text and the author		
7	Bt			Starting reading from the first paragraph and reading all the way through the last paragraph	Starting reading from the first paragraph and reading all the way through the last paragraph
8	Bt	Rereading		Rereading	Rereading
9	T	Guessing the meaning of unknown words and phrases	Guessing the meaning of unknown words and phrases		Guessing the meaning of unknown words and phrases
10	T	Highlighting	Highlighting	Highlighting	
11	T	Scanning			
12	T	Generating questions			
13	T	Drawing inferences			
14	T	Identifying main ideas			
15	Bt	Paraphrasing			
16	T	Using non-target language			
17	T	Taking notes			
18	T		Making a picture in the mind about what the text is saying		
19	T			Considering what type of a text it is	
20	Bt			Paying attention to tense of a verbs	
21	T	Skimming	Skimming	Skimming	Skimming

Note: T = top-down strategies; Bt = bottom-up strategies; S1 = successful reader1; S2 = successful reader2; U1 = unsuccessful reader1; U2 = unsuccessful reader2

The responses given through stimulated recall presented in table 13 and 14 indicate that successful readers participating in the stimulated recall use more strategies than do unsuccessful readers. One of the two successful readers (S1) reported using 17 different strategies and the other successful reader (S2) reported using 10 different strategies. In contrast, unsuccessful readers reported using fewer strategies, one (U1) reporting six and the other (U2) reporting four different strategies.

The responses presented in tables 13 and 14 further demonstrate that successful readers in this study seem to use more top-down strategies as compared to unsuccessful readers. The reports of S1, for example, reveal that of the 17 strategies, only three are bottom-up strategies (items 4, 8, and 15). Similarly, out of the 10 strategies that S2 reported using, with the exception of one bottom-up strategy (item 4), the others are all top-down strategies. Unlike successful readers, unsuccessful readers appear to use more bottom-up strategies than do successful readers. U1, for instance, reported using three top-down (items 10, 19, and 21) and three bottom-up strategies (items 7, 8, and 20) while reading. Likewise, half of the strategies that U2 reported using are bottom-up strategies (items 7 and 8).

Regarding the strategies that were taught in the DBE, successful readers tend to employ these strategies more than do unsuccessful readers. Of the 17 strategies S1 reported using, 14 were taught in the DBE. The other three strategies (items 5, 8, and 16) were not taught and practiced explicitly as part of strategy instruction. Similarly, among the 10 strategies S2 said that she used while reading, with the exception of two strategies (items 5 and 18), the others were taught in the DBE. Unlike successful readers, unsuccessful readers did not report using instructed strategies very much.

Half of the strategies that U1 reported (items 7, 8, and 20) and half of the strategies reported by U2 (items 7 and 8) were not taught in the DBE.

In order to explore the possible strategy processing differences regarding when and how the two groups of readers participating in the stimulated recall procedure reported using the same strategies, the participants' actual recall reports were analyzed.

The analysis indicates that although the two groups sometimes used the same strategies, they had different purposes in mind while employing those strategies. While reporting the use of the bottom-up strategy (as shown in Table 14) 'rereading', the successful reader (S1) said that he read certain sentences in the text twice because he thought those sentences were important to get the main idea of the text. In contrast, unsuccessful readers reported that they reread particular parts in the text because they were not sure whether they understood the sentences or not. They further explained that 'rereading' did not help them comprehend the sentences. Below are the statements of those successful and unsuccessful readers, S1, U1, and U2. Here and in the following quotations, the most relevant parts of the participants' responses to the discussed issue are presented in boldface.

(S1) I **read** some of the sentences in this part **twice**. They are the sentences that are **important to get the main idea of this paragraph**.

(U1) I was not sure whether I understood that part of the paragraph. Therefore, I **read these sentences again and again**, tried to focus on the grammatical structure of the sentences. Since I was not sure, I could not highlight any sentences and **did not understand the parts that I reread**.

(U2) I could not understand why his efforts were not appreciated and **read this part twice or three times**. Still, **I could not understand anything**.

Similar results were obtained from the analysis of the participants' reports related to the use of the top-down strategy (as presented in Table 14) 'highlighting'. The two groups of readers used the same strategy with different purposes. Successful readers stated that they highlighted certain sentences or words in the text because they thought those sentences were important.

(S1) I **underlined the key words** in the first paragraph that **helped me understand the main idea of this paragraph**...Let me tell you the **strategies I used here. I highlighted the key vocabulary items** like planning, assessing, industrial something. I don't know what they mean but I tried to guess their meaning. I think this is something like special expertise.

(S2) I **underlined the important words** here. I don't usually highlight everything. If I am looking for something specific in the text, for example an answer to a particular question, then I underline just that part in the text. Here again I highlighted these words **because they are the key items**.

The unsuccessful reader, (U1), however, highlighted the signaling words in the topic sentence of a paragraph but she did not explain during stimulated recall why she underlined those words. The reason for this might have been that she was not aware of or sure about why she highlighted those words.

(U1) I **highlighted the points in the topic sentence**.

Since the students were first asked to look through the text before reading it, they automatically skimmed it. At this stage, successful readers spent less time skimming and talked more about the text and could verbalize what they did while skimming. Unsuccessful readers, on the other hand, spent much more time skimming the text and could not report much about the content or what they did while skimming.

(S1) I looked at the **title and the picture at the front page**... Then, I looked at the **first lines of each paragraph to get an idea about what they are basically saying**... In the last paragraph, it says that he died because of cancer. Then, **I read the last sentence of the last paragraph**. I usually **try to understand the first and the last paragraphs well**. The other paragraphs in the middle are not so important. **The writer presents the topic in the first paragraph and explores his ideas in the last paragraph**. When I understand the last paragraph, I feel that I understand the whole text. When I cannot understand anything from what I read, I try to understand the content of the text from the **first sentences of the paragraphs**.

(S2) I read **the beginning and end of the paragraphs** to have an idea about what each paragraph is about. I **looked at the title and the picture**. Since I am interested in sports, I felt that I would like the text.

(U1) I looked at the **title and the first line or maybe the first two lines of each paragraph**. I tried to understand what each paragraph was about. I think the text is about a sportsman named 'Jesse Owens' but I don't know what he does.

(U2) **I read the whole text. I didn't do anything particular to understand it. I think it is about an athlete** whose name is 'Jesse Owens' **but I am not sure about it**. That is all. I just read the text.

The analysis of stimulated recall responses also showed that successful readers could distinguish between what is important and what is not for them to comprehend the text. They seem to be more aware of what to focus on and what to skip. The successful readers said that they did not read the whole text. They paid attention to different parts of the text, which they found critical for their comprehension.

(S1) **I usually skipped the unknown words** in the text. **If I thought that it was necessary for me to understand a particular word** in the text, **I tried to guess its meaning**. Other than that, I did not try to guess the meaning of each word. What **I paid attention to most was the general message** that the writer wanted to convey. The general idea is important. For example, the second paragraph talks about his father and where he was born. I don't think this information is necessary.

(S2) **I didn't try to guess the meaning of the words here because they are not important for me to understand the text. I paid attention to key words only. I didn't read the text word by word, I just read the key parts.**

Unlike successful readers, unsuccessful readers focused more on the confusing sentences or unknown words. They said that the reason why they could not skip the sentences or the words that they did not understand was that they could not decide whether that particular sentence or word was important for comprehending the text. They further explained that they read the text word by word.

(U1) There are some words whose meanings I couldn't understand. **When I come across with unknown words, I cannot go on reading or skipping it because I cannot say it is not important.** Maybe it is important... **I started reading from the first paragraph and read all the way through the last paragraph.** I read the whole text in detail. **I usually read texts sentence by sentence.** For that reason, I spend a lot of time reading.

(U2) **I didn't do anything special while reading. I just read the text.** The word 'whose' attracted my attention in the first paragraph. I tried to find what it referred to.

The statements taken from stimulated recall protocols and analyzed in detail above indicate that the four participants in this part of the study are different in their strategy use while reading. Although there were only four subjects in this stimulated recall sub-study, the responses yielded deeper insights into the reading processes than do the previous quantitative analyses. In a replication study, I would enlarge this section of the research with further probes into actual reading processes reported by readers.

Successful readers seem to use more strategies, and specifically top-down strategies, as opposed to unsuccessful readers. In addition, successful readers self reported using instructed strategies more than do unsuccessful readers. The last

distinction between the two groups of readers is that they used the strategies with different purposes.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the results of the statistical tests done on the collected data through questionnaires as well as the data collected through stimulated recall. The results were presented in three different sections: analyses of generic strategy use as reported by the students, successful and unsuccessful readers' recall of strategy instruction, and strategy use of successful and unsuccessful readers obtained from stimulated recall.

In the next chapter, the major findings of the study will be summarized in relation to the literature review.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This study investigated the overall strategy use in reading as reported by the students in the DBE, METU. The study also explored the extent to which successful and unsuccessful readers differ in their reported strategy use, recall of instruction, and strategy use while performing a reading task.

This study was conducted with 112 upper-intermediate level students at in the DBE, METU. First, generic strategy use of 112 students was determined through the administration of a questionnaire. Second, possible differences in terms of reported frequency and type of strategy use between 17 successful and 17 unsuccessful readers were investigated. Third, the two groups of 17 successful and unsuccessful readers' recall of strategy instruction was examined using another questionnaire to investigate the potential differences between the two groups. Finally, two successful and two unsuccessful readers' reported use of strategies after performing a reading task was determined through stimulated recall.

The research questions answered by this analysis were as follows:

1. What reading strategies do upper-intermediate level students at Middle East Technical University, Department of Basic English report that they use?
2. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers report that they use?

- 2.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in their reported strategy use?
3. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers remember being taught in reading classes?
 - 3.1. What is the difference between successful and unsuccessful readers in terms of recall of strategy instruction in reading classes?
4. What reading strategies do successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?
 - 4.1. What is the difference between the strategies that successful and unsuccessful readers appear to use while executing a reading task?

In this chapter, the findings of this study will be discussed. The findings of the results obtained through statistical analysis and the analysis of stimulated recall will also be related to the literature in the discussion section. The points where the results are in parallel with literature as well as the points that conflict with the literature will be explored. The possible reasons for these parallel or conflicting results will be discussed. Following the next section on pedagogical implications, limitations of the study are presented. This section is followed by suggestions for further research. In the conclusion, the major findings of the study are summarized.

Findings and Discussion

The findings of this study reveal that students in the DBE do not tend to report use of reading strategies with great frequency. Results obtained separately from the analysis of successful and unsuccessful readers' responses indicate that both successful and unsuccessful readers report use of reading strategies with moderate frequency.

Students' infrequent reported use of the reading strategies can be linked to the nature of strategy instruction. Although these students had strategy training in the 2004-2005 academic year in the Fall semester, the instruction given in the textbook might not have been explicit enough for students to develop or internalize the strategy use.

The findings of the study also show that there are similarities and differences between successful and unsuccessful readers. The results of the *t*-tests run with the questionnaires in the first and second part of the study showed non-significant differences between these two groups of readers in terms of reported strategy use and recall of strategy instruction. However, qualitative analysis of stimulated recall results indicates that successful and unsuccessful readers differ from one another in their use of strategies while performing a reading task.

The results reveal that there is not a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful readers' reported strategy use. While commenting on the similarities and differences between reported strategy use, the frequency and type of the reported strategies are considered. The results regarding the type of the strategies are interpreted based on the reported use of (a) top-down versus bottom-up strategies and (b) instructed strategies.

The reasons for the non-significance of the results concerning reported strategy use can be attributed to the issue of reliability and validity of using questionnaires in the assessment of reading strategies. Self-reports have been widely used in reading research and self-reported strategy use has usually been assessed in the form of questionnaires. Although this type of questionnaire yields insights into

general frequency of strategy use, it may not always provide valid and reliable results due to two main reasons (Oxford et al., 2004).

First, questionnaires may not always provide detailed and consistent results on strategy use since the students are not required to complete an actual task and the statements in the questionnaires are removed from the event that the researcher aims to observe (Gass & Mackey, 2000). When students respond to a strategy questionnaire without actually performing a task, students' reports about their actual behavior may not be accurate. That is, they might over or under report the frequency of strategy use due to memory problems or other obstacles (Cohen as cited in Oxford et al., 2004). In that case, since different learning tasks require the use of different strategies, participants may find it challenging to generalize their actual behaviors while reading. Thus, in this study, task-free strategy assessment might have caused difficulty on the part of the students while responding to the questionnaire.

Another reason why students' reports of strategy use through questionnaires may not always provide valid data is that the students may not report their real strategies for a fear of being judged by the teacher. In this case, they may pretend to use the strategies that they know the teacher is looking for. Such an approach to the questionnaire might have led students to hide the actual strategies they use (Duke & Pearson, 2002).

In spite of the non-significant differences in reported strategy use, successful readers in this study tended toward using more strategies than do unsuccessful readers. As for reported strategy types, successful readers seem to use more top-down strategies whereas unsuccessful readers use bottom-up strategies more

frequently. Similarly, successful readers appear to use instructed strategies more often than do unsuccessful readers.

The data analysis of recall of strategy instruction shows a similar pattern. Successful and unsuccessful readers do not differ significantly from one another in terms of their recall of instruction. The students in both groups did not report remembering well the strategies taught in the DBE in reading classes. However, results of the analysis of the questionnaire indicate that successful readers remember being taught the strategies in the questionnaire better than do unsuccessful readers. Considering the four-point Likert scale ranging from '1' (a lot) to '4' (not at all), successful readers responded with a mean score of 2.15 while unsuccessful readers reported recall of instruction with a mean score of 2.31.

Possible reasons behind these findings may be related to the time interval between the strategy training and the administration of the questionnaire. Effective strategy instruction pays attention to extensive recycling and practice since the internalization of the use of strategies in reading requires long-term and continuous training (Pressley, 2002). Thus, there are no shortcuts to teaching strategies (Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Sinatra et al., 2001). In the investigation of recall of strategy instruction, the focus of this study was the strategy instruction given using a particular reading course book titled *www.dbe.off-line.readings2*, which was used as the core reading material in the 2004-2005 Fall semester. Since the participants of the study had strategy training in the first term, they did not study the same course book in the second term. In other words, in the second semester, the students were not taught the strategies that the book included and about which the questionnaire

asked. Therefore, successful and unsuccessful readers in this study might have forgotten about having studied the strategies in the previous term.

Despite the non-significant differences in the analysis of the *t*-test results, stimulated recall results, which are the only qualitative data gathered for this study, revealed differences in the strategies used by the two successful and two unsuccessful readers. The reported strategies differ in terms of the (a) number, (b) type, and (c) purpose of use.

Successful readers reported using more reading strategies while performing the reading tasks than unsuccessful readers (Carrell, 1998; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Green & Oxford as cited in Oxford et al., 2004; Stoller, 2002; Vacca, 2002).

In terms of the types of reported strategy use, both groups of readers seem to use top-down and bottom-up strategies together. However, stimulated recall results indicate that successful readers tend to use more top-down (holistic) strategies than bottom-up (analytical) strategies. In contrast, unsuccessful readers seem to use more bottom-up, mechanical, strategies (Oxford et al., 2004). As for instructed strategies, successful readers reported using more strategies that are taught in the DBE than unsuccessful readers.

Finally, although the two groups showed similarities in their use of certain strategies, they reported using these strategies for different purposes. While successful readers were able to verbalize and explain the reasons for their strategy use, unsuccessful readers could not succeed in explaining why they used those particular strategies they reported using.

The main reason for the difference in reported strategy use between the two groups in stimulated recall might be that successful readers, with a larger storage of

vocabulary and a better structural knowledge, can use a variety of strategies to perform different reading tasks. Unsuccessful readers, on the other hand, are not as efficient as successful readers in varying their strategies in accordance with their purpose (Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Stoller, 2002; Vacca, 2002).

Another reason for the difference in strategy use while reading might be attributed to the difference in verbal ability and awareness. Due to greater verbal ability and the conscious use of the strategies, successful readers might have found it easier to verbalize what strategies they use during reading. In contrast, unsuccessful readers could not articulate clearly and accurately their reading processes since they might not have been attentive and aware of their strategy use or have the verbal resources to talk about them (Gambrell & Heathington; Markman as cited in Casanave, 1988; Cohen, 1990).

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study raise several important issues regarding reading strategy instruction as provided using reading textbooks. First, since direct explanation and scaffolding are the two major components of effective strategy instruction, the strategy instruction given in reading materials should integrate these elements in instruction (Harris & Pressley as cited in Sinatra et al., 2001). In order to be more effective in helping the students in DBE to become more strategic readers, reading strategy instruction in the textbook and/or in the curriculum can be made more explicit. As mentioned previously (see chapter 2), the students may be provided with (a) description of the strategies, (b) information related to the usefulness of strategies, (c) demonstration of strategy use through modeling, (d) practice

opportunities for strategy use, and (e) ways of evaluating strategy use (Sinatra et al., 2001).

Second, reading strategy instruction in the textbook might be improved through needs analysis. The strategies that are thought to be beneficial for DBE students can be determined. For example, the empirically validated reading strategies can be included in the DBE reading curriculum. In addition, strategies successful readers use can be examined with the participation of more students to be involved in both the qualitative and the quantitative analysis of the study. The analysis of successful reader strategies can be used in developing strategy instruction. Successful reader strategies may be taught to less successful readers (Hosenfeld as cited in Farrell, 2001).

Third, the strategy instruction in the textbook can be supported by teachers' manuals which may help teachers in explaining and scaffolding strategy use. The manuals including (a) directions about how and when strategies can be taught while dealing with the reading texts in the course book, (b) explanations about certain instruction models, (c) explanations and definitions of reading strategies, and (d) ways to develop students awareness of the use of reading strategies might be helpful for teachers (Pressley, Goodchild, Fleet, Zajchowski & Evans as cited in Pressley, 2001).

Fourth, besides supplementing the reading material, in-service training programs can also be helpful for DBE teachers since "strategic reading requires strategic teachers, which in turn, requires strategic staff development. That is, if low-achievers are to be strategic, their teachers must themselves be strategic" (Duffy, 1993, p. 245).

Limitations of the Study

This study has five main limitations. These limitations are the imbalance between ‘pre-reading’, ‘during-reading’ and ‘after-reading’ questionnaire items, the difficulty of generalizing from the study, absence of literature on recall of instruction, the number of the students who participated in the stimulated recall, and the design of the Likert scale in the second questionnaire.

First, the items in the questionnaire do not include equal numbers of strategies that are used ‘before’, ‘during’, and ‘after’ reading. The first questionnaire involves five ‘before reading’, and two ‘after reading’ strategies compared to 38 ‘during-reading’ strategies. Similarly, the second questionnaire consists of five ‘before reading’ and one ‘after reading’ strategy compared to 12 strategies used ‘during reading’. For the first questionnaire, a better balance between these three groups of strategies could give results that are more reliable since the aim of the questionnaire was to determine the overall strategy use by DBE students. The second questionnaire could not be changed since it includes the strategies that are taught as part of strategy instruction in the textbook. This realization of imbalance, however, can help textbook designers and material developers in deciding on the strategies to be taught and designing a curriculum that includes more balanced strategy training.

Second, the study is not generalizable in that the second part of the study, which investigated the recall of instruction, is limited to the strategy instruction in the EFL reading textbook entitled *www.dbe.off-line.readings2*. We could not collect data related to how strategy training is implemented in classrooms. The strategy training and the use of the textbook may vary across different classrooms. Thus, the

results cannot be generalized to the strategy training in the DBE. Other aspects of strategy instruction should also be examined in future research.

Third, although the focus of the second part of the study is recall of instruction, the literature review does not include a section on this, which is an important limitation of the study. The reason for this is that the researcher could not find relevant research on recall of reading strategy instruction.

Fourth, the number of the students who participated in the stimulated recall study could be increased. The results of the stimulated recall reports of two successful and two unsuccessful readers cannot be taken as evidence to make strong claims and generalizations about successful and unsuccessful reader behaviors. Since the last part of the study yielded important insights regarding the reported strategy use as compared to the questionnaire results, data from more participants could enable the reader to collect data that are more reliable on the reported use of reading strategies.

Finally, the Likert scale used in the second questionnaire ranges from positive to negative. That is, '1' means 'a lot' and '4' means 'not at all'. This type of reverse directional rating is not unknown in research studies but may be slightly counter-intuitive and may have caused some confusion among respondents.

Further Research

Based on the findings and limitations of the study, suggestions for future research can be made. Studying the strategies of successful and unsuccessful readers with a larger number of participants at different levels of proficiency, comparing reported and actual strategy use of successful and unsuccessful readers, investigating the effectiveness of strategy instruction by studying the extent to which students use

strategies and teachers' perceptions of instruction, and examining the use of limited number of strategies could be interesting potential areas for research.

First, since the results of the stimulated recall indicate a difference between the two groups of successful and unsuccessful readers, a similar study can be replicated with a larger number of participants. Studies to identify the differences between successful and unsuccessful readers can be designed with stimulated recall or think-aloud procedures.

Future research can also examine the strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers whose proficiency levels are different. For example, two groups of successful and unsuccessful readers can be selected from beginner, elementary, intermediate, or upper-intermediate level students, and their strategy use can be compared to see the extent to which strategy use is related to proficiency.

Another interesting research area would be to conduct case studies to examine the differences in reported and actual strategy use of successful and unsuccessful readers. This helps researchers find whether there is a correspondence between what students say and what they do. Instead of giving students task-free questionnaires, students can be provided with task-based strategy assessment tools. That is, students can be given a task accompanied by a questionnaire asking the strategies used during reading. Some time after the administration of the questionnaire, the same students can be given the same tasks and their strategy use can be examined through stimulated recall or think-alouds.

Future research can also investigate the effectiveness of strategy training. The students' use of the strategies that are taught through explicit instruction can be studied to see the extent to which students employ these strategies. Students can be

asked to report the strategies that they find most useful in comprehending a text.

These results can be supported by data obtained from teacher perceptions of strategy training. Teachers can be given surveys or might be interviewed so as to find what strategies they feel students need, they give greatest attention to in teaching, or they feel are most instructable.

Studying one or two strategies (e.g. prediction) more intensively instead of trying to look at a whole collection of strategies can provide more detailed and focused results about strategy use. Students can be provided with different tasks and their use of these particular strategies can be examined in addition to determining their performance results obtained from these tasks. Thus, the impact of the use of these strategies on students' performance in comprehension can be examined.

Conclusion

This study investigated the overall strategy use reported by the students in the DBE, METU and explored the differences between strategies used by successful and unsuccessful readers. The results showed that students, overall, made frequent use of 12 strategies. However, successful and unsuccessful readers did not differ significantly in their reported use of these strategies. Nor did the two groups differ in their reported recall of strategy instruction. In the stimulated recall of reading task performance, however, the successful readers reported the use of more strategies, and specifically, more top-down as well as instructed strategies. These results imply that although the results obtained from stimulated recall indicated a difference between the two groups of readers in the study, surveys of strategy use do not accurately reflect this.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, P. A., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1998). A perspective on strategy research: Progress and prospects. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10 (2), 129-154.
- Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 460-472.
- Auerbach, E. R., & Paxton, D. (1997). "It's not the English thing": Bringing reading research into the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (2), 237-263.
- Anderson, N. (1999). *Exploring second language reading: Issues and strategies*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Barnett, M. A. (1988). Reading through context: How real and perceived strategy use affects L2 comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72 (2), 150-162.
- Beckman, P. (2002). *Strategy instruction*. Retrieved October 30, 2004 from http://www.ericfacility.net/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed474302.html
- Best, J. W., & Khan, J. V. (1998). *Research in education*. (8th ed.). London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bimmel, P. (2001). Effects of reading strategy instruction in secondary education – A review of intervention studies. *Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 1, 273-298.
- Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 463-492.
- Bouvet, E. J. (2000). An investigation of foreign language students' conceptualizations of literary reading. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22 (2), 67-84.
- Brand-Gruwel, S., Aarnoutse, C. A. J., & Boss, K. P. P. (1998). Improving text comprehension strategies in reading and listening settings. *Learning and Instruction*, 8 (1), 63-81.
- Brantmeier, C. (2002). Second language reading strategy research at the secondary and university levels: Variations, disparities, and generalizability. *The Reading Matrix*, 2 (3), 1-14.

- Brown, C. M. (1998). L2 reading: An update on relevant L1 research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31 (2), 190-202.
- Brown, K. J. (1999-2000). What kind of text – For whom and when? Textual scaffolding for beginning readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 53 (4), 292-307.
- Brown, J. D., & Rodgers, T. (2002). *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carrell, P. L., & Eisterhold, J. C. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (4), 553-573.
- Carrell, P. L., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E. (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P. L., Pharis, B. G., & Liberto, J. C. (1989). Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23 (4), 647-678.
- Carrell, P. L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (2), 121-134.
- Carrell, P. L., & Carson, J. G. (1997). Extensive and intensive reading in an EAP setting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16, 47-60.
- Carrell, P. L. (1998). *Can reading strategies be successfully taught?* Retrieved December 7, 2004 from <http://langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/98/marc/carrell.html>
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Casanave, C. P. (1988). Comprehension monitoring in ESL reading: A neglected essential. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22 (2), 283-302.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. U.S.A: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cohen, A. D. (1990). *Language learning: Insights for learners, teachers, and researchers*. New York: Newbury House.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998) *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Collins, V. L., Dickens, S. V., Simmons, D. C., & Kameenui, E. J. (1996). *Metacognition and its relation to reading comprehension: A synthesis of the research*. Retrieved December 7, 2004 from <http://idea.uoregon.edu/~ncite/documents/techrep/tec23.html>

- Corte, E. D., Verschaffel, L., & Ven, A. V. D. (2001). Improving text comprehension strategies in upper primary school children: A design experiment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 531-559.
- Cotterall, S. (1991). Meiko: Case study of a second language reader. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 8 (1), 611-627.
- Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 61 (2), 239-264.
- Dubin, F., Eskey, D. E., & Grabe, W. (1986). *Teaching second language reading for academic purposes*. USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Duffy, G. G. (1993). Rethinking strategy instruction: Four teachers' development and low achievers' understandings. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93 (3), 231-247.
- Duffy, G. G. (2001). The case for direct explanation of strategies. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction* (pp. 28-41). New York: Guilford Press.
- Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup and S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 205-241). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Farrell, L. R. (2001). Teaching reading strategies: 'It takes time'. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 13 (2), 631-646.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (3), 375-405.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. London: Pearson Education.
- Janzen, J. (1996). Teaching strategic reading. *TESOL Journal*, 6, 6-9.
- Janzen, J., & Stoller, F. L. (1998). Integrating strategic reading in L2 instruction. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12 (1), 251-269.
- Kern, R. G. (1989). Second language reading strategy instruction: Its effects on comprehension and word inference ability. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (2), 135-149.

- Kim, A., & Lim, E. (1999). *How critical is back translation in cross-cultural adaptation of attitude measures?* [Electronic Version]. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Li, S., & Munby, H. (1996). Metacognitive strategies in second language academic readings: A qualitative investigation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 15 (3), 199-216.
- Mustafa, Z. (1998). Reading for science and technology in a foreign language: Students' evaluation of formal instruction on reading strategies. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 11 (2), 225-238.
- Nolan, T. E. (1991). Self-questioning and prediction: Combining metacognitive strategies. *Journal of Reading*, 35 (2), 132-138.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. (2001). Language learning strategies. In R. Carter, & D. Nunan, (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 166-172). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L., Chao, Y., Leung, S., & Kim, H. J. (2004). Effects of the presence and difficulty of task on strategy use: An exploratory study. *IRAL*, 42, 1-47.
- Padron, Y. N., & Waxman, H. C. (1988). The effects of ESL students' perceptions of their cognitive strategies on reading achievement. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 146-150.
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson, (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 609- 640). Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pressley, M. (2001). Comprehension strategies instruction: A turn-of-the-century status report. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction* (pp.11-27). New York: Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M. (2002). Metacognition and self-regulated comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samules (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 291-309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Pritchard, R. (1990). The effects of cultural schemata on reading processing strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25, 273-293.
- Salataci, R., & Akyel, A. (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14 (1), 1-16.
- Sinatra, G., Brown, K. J., & Reynolds, R. E. (2001). Implications of cognitive resource allocation for comprehension strategies instruction. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction* (pp. 62-75). New York: Guilford Press.
- Singhal, M. (2001). Reading proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness, and L2 readers. [Electronic Version]. *The Reading Matrix*. Retrieved February 9, 2005, from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/singhal/index.html>
- Stoller, F. L. (2002). Help your students become better readers. *Panama TESOL Newsletter*, 14 (2), 7-10.
- Thompson, I. (1988). Reading research and its curricular implications. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 32 (4), 617-642.
- Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice*. New York: Longman.
- Vacca, R. T. (2002). Making a difference in adolescents' school lives: Visible and invisible aspects of content area reading. In A. E. Farstrup and S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 184-204). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Wenden, A., & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Whitehead, D. (1994). Teaching literacy and learning strategies through a modified guided silent reading procedure. *Journal of Reading*, 38 (1), 24-30.
- Williams, J. P. (2002). Reading comprehension strategies and teacher preparation. In A. E. Farstrup and S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 243-260). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Yetgin, E. (2003). *Evaluation of reading strategy instruction in an EFL reading textbook and teachers' perceptions of that reading strategy instruction*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ankara: Bilkent University.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Activating student background knowledge in a take charge approach to foreign language reading. *Hispania*, 74 (4), 1124-1132.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Reading Strategy Questionnaire

Directions: *Show how often you use the strategy when reading, by checking the appropriate box. 0 means “almost never” while 5 means “almost always”.*

It is important to answer in terms of how well each statement describes you, NOT in terms of what you think you should do, or what other people do. THIS IS NOT A TEST. There are no right or wrong responses to these statements. The score you obtain will not affect your grade.

Depending on your language learning experience and needs, you may be using different types of strategies. The learning strategies presented here are general. Not everyone needs the same kind of strategies. A “low” score does not mean you are a bad learner.

Before I read a text,

1. I use the title to help predict the contents.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

2. I consider what type of text it is, such as a newspaper article, a scientific paper, or a novel.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

3. I skim it first, and later I read for details.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

While I am reading a text,

4. I pay attention to parts of sentences such as phrases and clauses.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

5. I pay attention to the beginning and the end of each paragraph.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

6. I focus on the tense of a verb, such as present tense and past tense.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

7. I try to understand the meaning of every word in a text.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

8. I translate each sentence into my native language.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
9. I start reading from the first paragraph and read all the way through the last paragraph.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
10. I pay attention to sentence structure, such as subjects and objects.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
11. I continue reading even if I have difficulty.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
12. I change reading speed depending on the difficulty of a text.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
13. I read aloud the difficult parts of a text.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
14. I skip unknown words.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
15. I link the content with what I already know.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
16. I try to understand the meaning of an unknown word by dividing it into parts.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
17. If I don't understand something such as a word or phrase, I guess its meaning using clues from the text..	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
18. If I don't understand something such as a word or phrase, I guess its meaning using information I know about the topic.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
19. I check what each pronoun refers to.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
20. I underline important parts.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always

21. I mark important parts, using colored pens or drawing stars.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
22. I go over difficult parts several times.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
23. I read aloud the entire text.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
24. I make a picture in my mind about what the text is saying.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
25. I try to understand the meaning without translating the text into my native language.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
26. If I'm having trouble, I go back to previous sentences.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
27. I follow the line I am reading with my finger or my pen.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
28. I use slashes to divide a sentence grammatically.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
29. When I cannot understand a sentence even if I know every word, I skip that sentence.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
30. I predict what will come next.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
31. I pay attention to linking words such as "however" and "besides" so that I can understand the structure.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
32. I write down key words.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
33. I try to figure out the main idea of each paragraph.	Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always

34. I read the comprehension questions first and then read the text. (*This item was not included in the NO TASK condition because it inherently assumes the presence of a task*)

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

After I read a text,

35. I summarize it in my own words.

Almost never	0	1	2	3	4	5	Almost always
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------

Appendix B

Okuma Stratejileri Anketi (Rebecca Oxford, 2004)

İsim: _____

Sınıf: _____

Yönerge: Bir metni okurken ne kadar sıklıkla strateji kullandığınızı uygun numarayı yuvarlak içine alarak gösteriniz. 0 “hemen hemen hiç” anlamındayken 5 “hemen hemen daima” anlamına gelmektedir.

Hemen hemen hiç					Hemen hemen daima
0	1	2	3	4	5

İfadeleri, sizin ne yapmanız gerektiği ya da başka insanların ne yaptıklarına göre DEĞİL, her bir ifadenin sizi ne kadar iyi anlattığına göre seçmeniz önemlidir. BU BİR SINAV DEĞİLDİR. Aşağıdaki ifadelerin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Elde ettiğiniz puan ders notlarınızı hiçbir şekilde etkilemeyecektir.

Dil öğrenme tecrübeleriniz ve ihtiyaçlarınıza göre farklı stratejiler kullanıyor olabilirsiniz. Burada sunulan stratejiler genel stratejilerdir. Herkesin aynı türde stratejilere ihtiyacı olmayabilir. “Düşük” bir puan kötü bir dil öğrencisi olduğunuz anlamına gelmez..

Bir metni okumadan önce,

1. Metnin içeriğini tahmin etmek için konu başlığını kullanırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. Ne çeşit bir metin olduğunu (gazete makalesi, bilimsel yazı, hikaye, vb) göz önünde bulundururum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. Metni önce ana hatlarıyla okurum daha sonra geri döner detaylı bir şekilde okurum.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Bir metni okurken,

4. Cümlelerin içindeki sözcük grubu (phrase) ve yan cümlecik (clause) gibi parçalara dikkat ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. Her bir paragrafın başlangıç ve sonunu dikkatlice okurum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Fiillerin zamanlarına dikkat ederim (geniş zaman,geçmiş zaman, vb)	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. Metindeki her kelimenin anlamını kavramaya çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. Metindeki her cümleyi Türkçe’ye çeviririm.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Okumaya birinci paragraftan başlayıp metni sonuna kadar okurum.	0	1	2	3	4	5

10. Cümle yapılarına (özne, nesne, vb) dikkat ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
11. Okurken zorluk yaşasam da okumaya devam ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
12. Okuma hızımı, metnin zorluk derecesine göre değiştiririm.	0	1	2	3	4	5
13. Metnin zor bölümlerini yüksek sesle okurum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14. Metnin içindeki bilmediğim kelimeleri atlarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
15. Metnin içeriğiyle o konuyla ilgili önceden bildiklerim arasında bağlantı kurarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
16. Bilmediğim bir kelimenin anlamını kelimeyi parçalarına bölerek anlamaya çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
17. Bir sözcük ya da sözcük grubunu (phrase) anlamadığım zaman, metindeki ipuçlarını kullanarak anlamı tahmin ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
18. Bir sözcük ya da sözcük grubunu (phrase) anlamadığım zaman, metnin konusuyla ilgili bildiklerimi kullanarak anlamı tahmin ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
19. Her bir zamirin (pronoun) neyi kastettiğini kontrol ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
20. Önemli yerlerin altını çizerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
21. Önemli yerleri renkli kalem kullanarak ya da yanına yıldız çizerek işaretlerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
22. Metnin zor bölümlerini birkaç kere gözden geçiririm.	0	1	2	3	4	5
23. Bütün metni sesli bir şekilde okurum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
24. Metinde anlatılanları kafamda canlandırmaya çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
25. Metni Türkçe'ye çevirmeden anlamaya çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
26. Anlamakta zorluk çekersem önceki cümlelere dönerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
27. Okumakta olduğum satırı parmağımla ya da kalemimle takip ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
28. Bir cümleyi gramer kurallarına göre parçalarına ayırmak için çizgiler (/) çizerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
29. İçindeki bütün kelimeleri bilmeme rağmen bir cümleyi anlayamadıysam, o cümleyi atlarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
30. Metinde daha sonra neler anlatılacağını tahmin ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
31. “Buna rağmen” ve “bunun yanında” gibi bağlaçlara dikkat ederim, böylece cümlelerin yapısını anlayabilirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
32. Anahtar kelimeleri yazarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
33. Metindeki her bir paragrafın ana fikrini çıkarmaya çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
34. Önce soruları okuyup sonra metni okurum.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Bir metni okuduktan sonra,

35. Metni kendi cümlelerimle özetlerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Anketi cevaplandırduğunuz için teşekkür ederim.

Appendix C
Informed Consent Form

Dear students,

My name is Pınar Uzunçakmak and I am a student of MA TEFL Program at Bilkent University. I am conducting a study about reading strategies students use in reading classes. The following questionnaire is designed for this study. I would appreciate it if you can answer the questions in the following questionnaire. Another version of this questionnaire will be distributed some of you again later this term.

Your responses to the items in the questionnaire will not have any positive or negative effect on your course grade. Your name is required on the questionnaire in order to keep track of individual students. However, all data collected through your responses will remain anonymous. Your identity will not be revealed in any report derived from this study.

Please read the questions carefully and answer all of them. Your answers will contribute to my study. Thank you for your participation.

Pınar Uzunçakmak
MA TEFL Program
Bilkent University
Ankara

I have read and understood the above and agree to participate in this study.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Appendix D

Bilgi ve Kabul Formu

Sevgili Öğrenciler,

Adım Pınar Uzunçakmak ve Bilkent Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce'nin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretimi Yüksek Lisans Programında öğrenciyim. Öğrencilerin okuma derslerinde strateji kullanımı üzerine bir araştırma yapıyorum. Elinizdeki anket bu araştırma için hazırlanmıştır. Anketteki soruları cevaplarsanız memnun olurum. Bu anketin başka bir versiyonu bu dönem içinde bazılarınıza tekrar dağıtılacaktır.

Anketteki ifadelere verdiğiniz cevapların ders notlarınıza hiçbir etkisi olmayacaktır. Anketi cevaplarken adınız istense de, bu yalnızca verdiğiniz cevapları ikinci anketteki cevaplarınızla karşılaştırmak içindir. Kimliğinizle ilgili hiçbir bilgi bu araştırma sonunda hazırlanan hiçbir raporda kullanılmayacaktır. Ders öğretmeniniz dahil kimse verdiğiniz cevaplarla birlikte adınızı bilmeyecektir.

Lütfen soruları dikkatlice okuyun ve hepsini cevaplayın. Cevaplarınız araştırmaya katkıda bulunacaktır. Katılımınız için teşekkür ederim.

Pınar Uzunçakmak

MA TEFL Programı

Bilkent Üniversitesi

Ankara

Bu formdaki bilgileri okudum ve araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Adı ve Soyadı:

İmzası:

Tarih:

Appendix E

Reading Strategy Questionnaire (Addendum)

Name: _____

Class: _____

Show how often you use the following reading strategies when reading, by checking the appropriate box. 0 means “almost never” while 5 means “almost always”.

It is important to answer in terms of how well each statement describes you, NOT in terms of what you think you should do, or what other people do. THIS IS NOT A TEST. There are no right or wrong responses to these statements. The score you obtain will not affect your grade.

Depending on your language learning experience and needs, you may be using different types of strategies. The learning strategies presented here are general. Not everyone needs the same kind of strategies. A “low” score does not mean you are a bad learner.

1. I look through the text to spot specific information such as dates, names, or numbers.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. I pay attention to visuals such as graphs, pictures, or tables.	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. While reading, I ask questions related to the text or what I have read.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. While reading, I try to confirm or disconfirm the predictions, guesses, or inferences I have made.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. While reading, I consult an outside source (such as a dictionary) to help comprehension.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. I translate the text into my native language to help comprehension.	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. I try to express the ideas in the text with my own words to help me understand the main idea of the text.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. I pay attention to indirectly stated ideas and try to make inferences about them.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. While reading, I try to connect information within the text.	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. After reading the text in detail, I evaluate the text and the writer’s viewpoint.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F

Okuma Stratejileri Anketi (Ek)

İsim: _____

Sınıf: _____

Aşağıdaki okuma stratejilerini herhangi bir metni okurken ne sıklıkta kullandığınızı uygun numarayı yuvarlak içine alarak gösteriniz. 0 “hemen hemen hiç” anlamındayken 5 “hemen hemen daima” anlamına gelmektedir.

İfadeleri, sizin ne yapmanız gerektiği ya da başka insanların ne yaptıklarına göre DEĞİL, her bir ifadenin sizi ne kadar iyi anlattığına göre seçmeniz önemlidir. BU BİR SINAV DEĞİLDİR. Aşağıdaki ifadelerin doğru ya da yanlış cevabı yoktur. Elde ettiğiniz puan ders notlarınızı hiçbir şekilde etkilemeyecektir.

Dil öğrenme tecrübeleriniz ve ihtiyaçlarınıza göre farklı stratejiler kullanıyor olabilirsiniz. Burada sunulan stratejiler genel stratejilerdir. Herkesin aynı türde stratejilere ihtiyacı olmayabilir. “Düşük” bir puan kötü bir dil öğrencisi olduğunuz anlamına gelmez.

Bir metni okumadan önce,

1. Metinde geçen tarih, isim, numara gibi belirli bilgileri bulmak için metnin hepsini okumadan gözden geçiririm.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. Metinle beraber verilen grafiklere, resimlere ve diğer yardımcı öğelere dikkat ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Bir metni okurken,

3. Metni okurken metinle ya da anladıklarım ile ilgili kendime sorular sorarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. Metni okudukça yaptığım tahminlerin, çıkarımların doğru olup olmadığını kontrol ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. Metni okurken anlamaya yardımcı olması için herhangi bir kaynaktan (sözlük, vs) yardım alırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Anlamamı kolaylaştırması için metinde anlatılanları anadilime çeviririm.	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. Metnin ana fikrini anlamamı kolaylaştırması için metinde anlatılanları kendi cümlelerimle tekrar ifade etmeye çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. Metinde dolaylı olarak anlatılan fikirlere dikkat eder ve ne anlama geldikleriyle ilgili çıkarımlarda bulunmaya çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Metni okurken, anlatılanlar arasında bağlantı kurmaya çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Bir metni okuduktan sonra,

10. Metni detaylı bir şekilde okuduktan sonra metni ve yazarın bakış açısını değerlendiririm.	0	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Anketi cevaplandırduğınız için teşekkür ederim.

Appendix G

Recall of Strategy Instruction Questionnaire

Name: _____

Class: _____

The following list includes reading strategies that you studied and practiced in the first term through the use of the reading course book “www.dbe-offline readings2”. In the list, by circling the number, indicate how much you remember about studying each strategy described and labeled. ‘1’ means ‘a lot’ while ‘4’ means ‘not at all’.

To help you remember the strategies defined and listed below, the names of each strategy was given in English in parenthesis.

		A LOT	SOME	NOT MUCH	NOT AT ALL
1.	Considering what type of text it is, such as a newspaper article, a scientific paper, or a novel (paying attention to text structure and organization)	1	2	3	4
2.	Previewing the text before reading in detail to have a general idea about the content (previewing text before reading)	1	2	3	4
3.	Skimming the text to get the main idea (skimming)	1	2	3	4
4.	Metinde geçen tarih, isim, numara gibi belirli bilgileri bulmak için metnin hepsini okumadan gözden geçiririm (scanning)	1	2	3	4
5.	Paying attention the graphs, pictures or other visuals presented with the text. (using visual representations of text)	1	2	3	4
6.	Predicting what will come next in the text (making predictions)	1	2	3	4
7.	Asking questions related to the text and your understanding of it while reading the text (generating questions)	1	2	3	4
8.	confirming/disconfirm your predictions, guesses, and inferences (confirming/disconfirming predictions, guesses, or inferences)	1	2	3	4
9.	Underlining the important parts in the text (highlighting)	1	2	3	4
10.	Guessing the meaning of unknown words or phrases in the text (guessing meaning of unknown words and phrases)	1	2	3	4

11.	Taking notes while reading (taking notes)	1	2	3	4
12.	Trying to figure out the main idea of each paragraph (identifying main ideas)	1	2	3	4
13.	Trying to understand indirectly stated ideas in the text and making inferences about implicitly stated ideas (drawing inferences)	1	2	3	4
14.	Being able to analyze the text by paying attention to the structures used in the text and the way ideas are presented (analyzing)	1	2	3	4
15.	Being able to paraphrase the ideas presented in the text using your own words (paraphrasing)	1	2	3	4
16.	Consulting an outside source while reading to help comprehension (consulting an outside source)	1	2	3	4
17.	Being able to link the content with what you already know (using prior knowledge)	1	2	3	4
18.	Being able to critique the text and the writer's viewpoint (critiquing the text and the author)	1	2	3	4

Appendix H

Okuma Strateji Eğitimi Hatırlama Anketi

İsim: _____

Sınıf: _____

Aşağıdaki liste ilk dönem “www.dbe-offline readings2” kitabında çalıştığınız ve pratik yaptığınız okuma stratejilerini içermektedir. Listede tanımlanmış stratejilerden her birini çalıştığınızı ne kadar hatırladığınızı uygun numarayı yuvarlak içine alarak gösteriniz. 1 “çok iyi hatırlıyorum” anlamındayken 4 “hiç hatırlamıyorum” anlamına gelmektedir.

Listelenmiş stratejileri hatırlamanızı kolaylaştırması için parantez içinde stratejilerin İngilizce karşılıkları da verilmiştir.

		Çok iyi hatırlıyorum	Biraz hatırlıyorum	Pek hatırlamıyorum	Hiç hatırlamıyorum
1.	Metnin ne çeşit bir metin olduğuna (gazete makalesi, bilimsel yazı, hikaye, vb) ve nasıl organize edildiğine dikkat etme (paying attention to text structure and organization)	1	2	3	4
2.	Metni detaylı okumadan önce içeriği hakkında bilgi edinmek için gözden geçirme (previewing text before reading)	1	2	3	4
3.	Metni detaylı okumadan önce hızlıca tarayıp ana fikrini anlamaya çalışma (skimming)	1	2	3	4
4.	Metinde geçen tarih, isim, numara gibi belirli bilgileri bulmak için, metnin hepsini okumadan gözden geçirme (scanning)	1	2	3	4
5.	Metinle beraber verilen grafiklere, resimlere ve diğer yardımcı öğelere dikkat etme (using visual representations of text)	1	2	3	4
6.	Metni okurken, daha sonra neler anlatılacağı hakkında tahminlerde bulunma (making predictions)	1	2	3	4
7.	Metni okurken, metinle ya da anladıklarınla ilgili kendine sorular sorma (generating questions)	1	2	3	4
8.	Metni okudukça yaptığın tahminlerin veya çıkarımların doğruluğunu değerlendirme (confirming/disconfirming predictions, guesses, or inferences)	1	2	3	4

9.	Metinde önemli gördüğün yerlerin altını çizme (highlighting)	1	2	3	4
10.	Metinde geçen anlamını bilmediğin sözcük veya sözcük gruplarının anlamını tahmin etme (guessing meaning of unknown words and phrases)	1	2	3	4
11.	Metni okurken okuduklarınla ilgili not alma (taking notes)	1	2	3	4
12.	Metindeki her bir paragrafın ana fikrini çıkarmaya çalışma (identifying main ideas)	1	2	3	4
13.	Metinde dolaylı olarak ifade edilen fikirleri anlamaya çalışma ve anlatılmak istenenler hakkında çıkarımlarda bulunma (drawing inferences)	1	2	3	4
14.	Metinde kullanılan yapılara ve fikirlerin sunuluş biçimine bakarak metni analiz etme (analyzing)	1	2	3	4
15.	Metindeki fikirleri kendi cümlelerinle tekrar ifade edebilme (paraphrasing)	1	2	3	4
16.	Metni okurken anlamaya yardımcı olması için herhangi bir kaynağa (sözlük, vs) başvurma (consulting an outside source)	1	2	3	4
17.	Metnin içeriğiyle o konuyla ilgili önceden bildiklerin arasında bağlantı kurma (using prior knowledge)	1	2	3	4
18.	Metni ve yazarın metne bakış açısını eleştirel yönden değerlendirme (critiquing the text and the author)	1	2	3	4

Anketi cevaplandırduğınız için teşekkür ederim.

Appendix I

Reading Task 1

Name: _____

Class: _____

Read the following text for comprehension. Read the text with awareness of reading processes and strategy use.



JESSE OWENS

- 1 Jesse Owens, whose four gold medals at the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin made him perhaps the greatest and most famous athlete in track and field history, never received much recognition at the time of his success. The victim of racial discrimination, Owens ultimately achieved a big success through his own inner courage and determination. Owens is not only a great athlete, but someone with great moral integrity who believed in the old-fashioned values of honesty and hard work.
- 2 Born on September 12, 1913, in Danville, Alabama, James Cleveland Owens was the son of a sharecropper and the grandson of slaves. The youngster picked cotton until he and his family moved to Cleveland when he was 9. There, when a schoolteacher asked the youth his name, "J.C." he replied. She thought he had said "Jesse" and he had a new name from then on.
- 3 He ran his first race at the age of 13. After finishing high school, he went to Ohio State University. Having no athletic scholarship, he paid his way as a \$100-a-month night elevator operator. As a sophomore, in the Big Ten championship games in 1935, he set even more records than he would in his Olympic glory a year later.
- 4 A week before the Big Ten, Owens accidentally fell down a flight of stairs. His back hurt so much that he could not exercise all week and he had to be helped in and out of the car that drove him to the Big Ten. In an unsuccessful attempt to lessen the back pain, Owens sat for a half hour in a hot tub. He still rejected suggestions that he withdraw and said he would try, event by event. He did try and the results are in the record book now. On May 25, 1935, Jesse Owens equaled the world record for the 100-yard dash, broke the world record for the broad jump (now called the long jump) with his only attempt, broke the world record for the 220-yard dash, and broke the world record for the 220-yard low hurdles.
- 5 The stage was set for Owens' victory at the Olympic Games in Berlin the next year and his triumph would come to be regarded as not only athletic but also political. Adolph Hitler had intended the Berlin Games to reinforce the Nazi doctrine of Aryan Supremacy; however, the United States Olympic track team of 66 athletes included 10 blacks and 6 of the individual gold medals in track won by American men were won by black athletes. Owens was the hero, winning the 100-meter dash in 10.3 seconds, the 200-meter dash in 20.7 seconds, and the broad jump at 26 feet 5 1/2 inches. He also headed the United States team that won the 400-meter relay in 39.8 seconds. Hitler did not congratulate any of the American black winners, a subject to which Mr. Owens addressed himself for the rest of his life. "It was all right with me," he said years later. "I didn't go to Berlin to shake hands with him, anyway. All I know is that I'm here now and Hitler isn't." Having returned from Berlin, he received no telephone call from the president of his own country, either. In fact, he was not honored by the United States until 1976, four years before his death, when he was awarded the

Presidential Medal of Freedom. Three years later, he received the Living Legends Award.

- 6 There were no big contracts for Owens after his Olympic victories. Not being able to find another job, he became a playground janitor. He ended his career as an amateur runner and accepted money to race against cars, trucks, motorcycles, and dogs. "Sure, it bothered me," he said later. "But, at least, it was an honest living. I had to eat." In time, however, his gold medals changed his life, "They have kept me alive over the years," he once said, "Time has stood still for me. That golden moment dies hard."
- 7 Jesse Owens died of cancer in 1980, at the age of 67. Although Owens was ignored at the time of his success, his personal victory over prejudice is perhaps best expressed in this statement, which was issued by President Carter at the time of his death: "Perhaps no athlete better symbolized the human struggle against tyranny, poverty, and racial bigotry."

Appendix J

Reading Task 2

Name: _____

Class: _____

Read the following text for comprehension. Read the text with awareness of reading processes and strategy use.

WHAT USE IS IT?

- 1 Is anthropology of purely academic interest, a fascinating, but useless branch of learning, which is swallowing valuable resources better used elsewhere? First and most basically, anthropologists add to the store of information about humankind in all its diversity, especially smaller populations, and societies whose written records are relatively recent. Many ways of life have disappeared or are disappearing, and anthropologists still have the important role of recording information about them through the written word or on film, photographs and tapes.
- 2 Some nations in the Third World are embarrassed by the survival of tribal populations in their midst, and hope that these lifestyles will become extinct as soon as possible, but these lifestyles have both a cultural and a scientific value, which may not be recognized by the forward-looking elite of a new nation eager to build up industry, agriculture, health services and so on. However, they are likely to be recognized at a later date as the nation matures. One example is Australia, where the Aborigines were badly treated until quite recently, and in some areas had been completely exterminated. Anthropologists were in the forefront of the campaign to bring the problems of Aboriginal poverty and ill-health, and the moral issue of Aboriginal land rights to the attention of the public. Today, though the Aborigines still suffer many disadvantages, their contribution to Australian national identity is fully recognized in official circles: for instance, Aboriginal history was a principal theme in the Museum of Australia which was opened in 1990.
- 3 For the scientific importance of studying these vanishing lifestyles, three arguments may be presented. First, medical and health care. Western medicine has recently been much more self-critical than it used to be and many doctors are well aware of the importance of treating patients in their social network rather than just a set of symptoms. So many diseases, from the common cold and migraine to heart attacks and cancer, are attributed to 'stress' in one form or another -- which must be a matter of the patient's relationships with others. Healers in 'primitive' societies use methods which we can study and learn from, such as rallying an afflicted person's family or a wider support group.

- 4 Second, the relative simplicity of traditional societies helps a researcher to gain insight into fundamental social processes such as economic exchange, decision-making and attribution of blame for misfortune. Since these processes are far more difficult to disentangle and analyze in a complex industrial society, trainee anthropologists are usually sent off to study a relatively simple society. It makes sense to proceed from the simple to the complex.
- 5 Third, to approach an understanding of human societies and human nature in general, we need to look at as many different cases as we can. For one thing, this procedure can disprove some entrenched legends or fallacies about human nature. For instance, it has often been claimed that inequality is intrinsic to all human societies. This claim is disproved by the existence of hunter-gatherer societies such as the Hadza of Tanzania who espouse a positive ideology of egalitarianism and where any individual claims to unequal prestige and power are socially disapproved.
- 6 Almost every field of study you can name has been influenced by anthropology. For example, biblical scholars have been helped to explain certain puzzling themes in the Bible, and the feminist movement has owed a lot to anthropological studies of the roles of women in non-western societies. However, the single most important justification for anthropology is its immense educational value as a force that can liberate us from some of the prejudices we have all grown up with. It helps travelers to focus their thoughts and understand more of what they see. The customs and rituals of foreigners lose much of their strangeness when they can be seen in the universal patterns outlined by anthropologists.
- 7 Apart from undertaking occasional longish periods of fieldwork in exciting places and teaching and writing books in universities, some anthropologists apply their science as well. Their traditional interest in and sympathy with minority populations gives them special aptitude in the field of ethnic and community relations. In Australia and North America, for instance, they regularly act as advocates for tribal groups in legal cases about land rights. Refugee aid and disaster relief are other fields where they are specially active, and many of the big relief agencies now employ anthropologists in various capacities: for instance, in monitoring the assimilation of Vietnamese boat refugees into host societies; or in giving 'early warning' that famine is likely to erupt shortly in one of the poorer countries of Africa due to lack of rain. There are also anthropologists who specialize in development planning and assessing the social impact of industrial or agricultural projects, mainly in Third World countries. Too many development projects fail because social factors are not sufficiently understood. A particular strength of the anthropologist's approach is that he views the operation of development policies through the eyes of those actually affected, rather than through the eyes of the policy-makers.

Appendix K

Sample Transcriptions

Transcription 1

Successful Reader 1 (S1) – TASK 1

- T: There are 2 reading passages that I want you to have a look at. You are going to read these texts one after another. There are not comprehension questions related to the texts. What I want you to do is first to read this text. Then, after you finish reading, I want you to tell me what you did or what you thought about while trying to comprehend the text.
- S: Okay.
- T: This is the first reading passage. Now, please read the purpose given to you and look through the text before reading it in detail.

3 minutes later

- S: Yes, I finished reading it.
- T: OK. Now, tell me what you did while reading.
- S: What did I do? I first looked at the picture at the front page. I usually pay attention to illustrations and pictures given with the text. When I looked at the picture, I made two guesses before reading the text. The picture either represents the athlete or it was used to prepare the reader for something else. For example, the text can be about sports in general. Then, I looked at the title. It is a name. I thought “Jesse Owens” is the person whose picture I saw at the front page. I thought the text was going to talk about his life. I always look at the title because I believe that the writer gives clues about the content in the title. Then, what did I do? Since you told me just to look through the text, I only looked at the first and last lines of each paragraph. I looked at the first lines of each paragraph to get an idea about what they are basically saying. If I did not misunderstand, Jesse Owens was successful but then he had an accident. In the last paragraph, it says that he died. Then, I looked at the conclusion paragraph, the last sentence. This is all I can tell you.
- T: OK. Now, could you please read the text in detail, again keeping in mind your purpose?
- S: OK.

6 minutes later

- T: Now, tell me if you did something different in the second reading.
- S: No, in fact. But I read it in detail. I knew the picture, the title, and the content in general. I read the paragraphs in detail this time to see if I missed something important in the first reading. I was expecting something different in fact. For example, I thought in the first reading that he had an accident, so he withdrew. However, I learned that he did not withdraw and broke the world record.

...

I underlined the key words in the first paragraph (*the victim of racial discrimination, honesty, and hard work*) that helped me understand the main idea of this paragraph... Let me tell you the strategies I used here. I highlighted the key vocabulary items like “planning”, “assessing”, “industrial something”. I don’t know what they mean but I tried to guess their meaning. I think this is something like “special expertise”. “The victim” was the key word here. I thought that this man had trouble because of racial discrimination. When I read the word “racial”, I linked it with the picture because the man in the picture was black.

...

I circled these words (*sophomore* and *glory*) because I don’t know what they mean. I tried to guess their meaning. It says “as a sophomore” here. It is like “as an amateur”. There are other words whose meaning I don’t know. I didn’t circle all the unknown words. I just paid attention to the ones that are key to comprehension. For example, here the sentence starts with “as a sophomore”. Then, there is this sentence “he set even more records”. The word “even” is a key word here. It gives me clues about the meaning of the word “sophomore”. I thought that it means, “although he was an amateur, novice, or young” ... I don’t know, something like that...

...

I usually don’t pay attention to the details in a text. If I think that the word isn’t important to understand one part of the text, I don’t try to guess its meaning. I generally don’t read or pay attention to all the words or all the sentences in the text. I skip unimportant parts. While reading this text, for example, I usually skipped the unknown words in the text. If I thought that it was necessary for me to understand a particular word in the text, I tried to guess its meaning. Other than that, I did not try to guess the meaning of each word. What I paid attention to most was the general message that the writer wanted to convey. The general idea is important. For example, the second paragraph talks about his father and where he was born. I don’t think this information is necessary.

...

For this same reason, I usually pay attention to first and last paragraphs in the text. In this text, in the last paragraph, it says that he died because of cancer. I read the last sentence of the last paragraph. I usually try to understand the first and the last paragraphs well. The other paragraphs in the middle are not so important. The writer presents the topic in the first paragraph and explores his ideas in the last paragraph. When I understand the last paragraph, I feel that I understood the whole text. When I cannot understand anything from what I read, I try to understand the content of the text from the first sentences of the paragraphs.

...

I paid attention to the names in the paragraphs to see their relation to the main idea of the text. For example, the name “Adolf Hitler” or the phrase “Presidential Medal of Freedom” attracted my attention

...

- S: I also paid attention to linking words such as “however, still, or but”. I usually pay attention to the connectors while reading a text.

...

I read carefully the parts where the writer of this text makes judgments or gives clues about his point of view. Here, for example, I tried to figure out the writer's stance. Where does the writer stand in this text? In my opinion, his choice of words is important. In this text, the writer uses expressions such as "the victim" and "the golden moment dies". I tried to figure out what this writer attempted to tell us about this particular topic.

...

Transcription 2

Unsuccessful Reader 2 (U2) – TASK 1

- T: There are 2 reading passages that I want you to have a look at. You are going to read these texts one after another. There aren't comprehension questions related to the texts. What I want you to do is first to read this text. Then, after you finish reading, I want you to tell me what you did or what you thought about while trying to comprehend the text.
- S: Okay.
- T: This is the first reading passage. Now, please read the purpose given to you and look through the text before reading it in detail.

7 minutes later

- T: Now, keeping in mind your purpose for reading, please tell me what you did while reading. How did you read the text?
- S: Am I going to tell you what I understood about the content?
- T: Not what you understood about the text, in fact. I want you to tell me what you did, what you thought about, or how you read the text.
- S: I read the whole text. I didn't do anything particular to understand it. I think it is about an athlete whose name is 'Jesse Owens' but I am not sure about it. That is all. I just read the text. I started reading from the first paragraph and read in the same way until the last paragraph. However, here, the word 'whose' attracted my attention in the first paragraph. I tried to find what it referred to. As I told you, I didn't do anything special while reading. I just read the text.

This sentence attracted my attention because I wondered what that "whose" referred to. Apart from that, nothing grabbed my attention in the text. I think the text is about Jesse Owens' life. In the second paragraph, the reason why he was called "Jesse" was explained. Then, the following paragraphs are about the races that he ran. He was awarded in these races but not all people congratulated him for his successes. I could not understand why his efforts were not appreciated and read this part twice or three times. Still, I could not understand anything. The last paragraph talks about his death.

- T: OK. Now, could you please read it in detail and tell me what you did while reading, again keeping in mind your purpose for reading?

8 minutes later

- S: I didn't do anything special. I just learned more about the content and the details. There are some unknown words in the text. Thus, I couldn't understand the text completely. I tried to guess the meaning of some words, but I couldn't guess the meaning of all the words... I usually don't read the paragraphs separately. I mean, I read the text as a whole; I want to get the general idea. However, sometimes I cannot understand the main idea. I did the same thing here in this text. I started reading from the first paragraph and read through the last paragraph.

Appendix L

Ranking of the frequency of the use of 45 strategies as reported by all participants
(112 students) based on averaged mean scores

R	IN	Reading Strategies	M	N	ST	SU
1	12	Changing reading speed depending on the difficulty of a text	4.10	112	Bt	W
2	44	Trying to connect information within the text	3.90	112	T	W
3	26	Going back to previous sentences when faced difficulty	3.84	112	T	W
4	37	Paying attention to visuals such as graphs, pictures, or tables	3.84	112	T	B
5	22	Going over difficult parts	3.79	112	Bt	W
6	17	Guessing meaning using clues from the text	3.72	112	T	W
7	1	Using the title to help predict the contents	3.56	112	T	B
8	11	Continuing reading despite difficulties	3.56	112	T	W
9	31	Paying attention to linking words	3.56	112	Bt	W
10	34	Reading the comprehension questions before reading the text	3.56	112	T	W
11	15	Linking content with background knowledge	3.42	112	T	W
12	24	Making a picture in the mind about what the text is saying	3.40	112	T	W
13	43	Making inferences	3.33	112	T	W
14	9	Starting from the 1 st paragraph and reading all the way through the last paragraph	3.31	112	Bt	W
15	18	Guessing meaning using background knowledge	3.30	112	T	W
16	6	Focusing on the tense of a verb	3.29	112	Bt	W
17	25	Using non-target language to understand the text	3.28	112	T	W
18	14	Skipping unknown words	3.01	112	T	W
19	5	Paying attention to the beginning and end of paragraphs	2.99	112	T	W
20	2	Considering what type of text it is	2.94	112	T	B
21	39	Confirming/disconfirming the predictions/guesses/inferences	2.85	112	T	W
22	3	Skimming	2.84	112	T	B
23	4	Paying attention to parts of sentences	2.82	112	Bt	W
24	19	Checking what each pronoun refers to	2.79	112	Bt	W
25	20	Underlining important parts	2.74	112	T	W
26	36	Scanning to locate specific information	2.67	112	T	B
27	16	Trying to understand the meaning of a word by dividing it into parts	2.66	112	Bt	W
28	40	Consulting an outside source to help comprehension	2.63	112	Bt	W
29	45	Evaluating the text and the writer's viewpoint	2.63	112	T	A
30	30	Predicting what will come next	2.57	112	T	W
31	7	Trying to understand the meaning of every word	2.49	112	Bt	W
32	10	Paying attention to sentence structure	2.47	112	Bt	W
33	33	Trying to figure out the main idea of each paragraph	2.39	112	T	W

Note. R = rank; IN = item numbers; M = means; N = number of participants; ST = strategy type; SU = stages of use; T = top-down strategies; Bt = bottom-up strategies; B = before reading strategies; W = while reading strategies, A = after reading strategies

Table cont'd						
R	IN	Reading Strategies	M	N	ST	SU
34	41	Translating the text into Turkish to help comprehension	2.39	112	Bt	W
35	38	Asking questions related to the text	2.36	112	T	W
36	42	Paraphrasing	1.91	112	Bt	W
37	27	Following the lines read with pen or finger	1.90	112	Bt	W
38	35	Summarizing the text	1.63	112	T	A
39	21	Marking important parts, using colored pens or drawing stars	1.60	112	T	W
40	8	Translating each sentence into Turkish	1.54	112	Bt	W
41	13	Reading aloud the difficult parts	1.54	112	Bt	W
42	32	Writing down key words	1.54	112	T	W
43	29	Skipping sentences that are not understood	1.49	112	T	W
44	23	Reading aloud the entire text	0.72	112	Bt	W
45	28	Using slashes to divide a sentence grammatically	0.62	112	Bt	W

Note. R = rank; IN = item numbers; M = means; N = number of participants; ST = strategy type; SU = stages of use; T = top-down strategies; Bt = bottom-up strategies; B = before reading strategies; W = while reading strategies, A = after reading strategies