

ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

TEACHERS' VIEWS ABOUT AND APPROACHES TO READING
INSTRUCTION AND READING STRATEGIES

Aysun YURDAIŞIK

MASTER OF ARTS

Adana, 2007

ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT

**TEACHERS' VIEWS ABOUT AND APPROACHES TO READING
INSTRUCTION AND READING STRATEGIES**

Aysun YURDAIŞIK

Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Neşe CABAROĞLU

MASTER OF ARTS

Adana, 2007

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of M.A.

Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. Neşe CABAROĞLU

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Meral ATICI

I certify that this thesis conforms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.

Prof. Dr. Nihat KÜÇÜKSAVAŞ
Director of Institute

PS: The uncited usage of reports, charts, figures, and photographs in this thesis, whether or original quoted from other sources, is subject to the Laws of Works of Art and Thought NO:5846.

Not: Bu tezde kullanılan özgün ve başka kaynaktan yapılan bildirişlerin, çizelge, şekil ve fotoğrafların kaynak gösterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 Sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserler Kanunu'ndaki hükümlere tabidir.

ÖZET

ÖĞRETMENLERİN OKUMA ÖĞRETİMİ VE OKUMA STRATEJİLERİ İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞ VE YAKLAŞIMLARI

Aysun YURDAIŞIK

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Neşe CABAROĞLU

Eylül, 2007, 120 sayfa

Bu çalışma üniversitelerin hazırlık okullarında çalışan okutmanların okuma öğretimi ve okuma stratejileri ile ilgili görüş ve yaklaşımlarını görmek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Çalışmaya 2006-2007 öğretim yılında Çağ Üniversitesi, Çukurova Üniversitesi ve Mersin Üniversitesi hazırlık okullarında çalışan 50 okutman katılmıştır.

Araştırmada belirlenen soruları yanıtlamak için katılımcılara anket uygulanmıştır. Anketten alınan yanıtlar ve katılımcıların çalıştığı üniversiteler doğrultusunda 6 katılımcıyla görüşme yapılmıştır.

Katılımcıların okuma öğretimi ve okuma stratejileri ile ilgili görüş ve yaklaşımlarını incelemek için yabancı dilde nasıl bir okuyucu oldukları, okuma dersini nasıl verdikleri, okuma dersinde karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve sınıfta okuma stratejileri öğretip öğretmedikleri ele alınmıştır. Aynı zamanda katılımcıların günlük hayatlarında okuma stratejileri kullanmalarının derse nasıl yansıdığı üzerinde de durulmuştur.

Çalışmanın sonuçları, yabancı dilde okuma konusunda okutmanların bilinmeyen kelimeleri ve öğrencinin daha önce karşılaşmadığı konuları karşılaşılan en önemli sorun olarak gördüğünü, iyi bir okuma dersinde okuma stratejilerinin öğretilmesi gerektiğini, okutmanların okuma öncesi stratejileri okuma sonrası stratejilerden daha fazla kullandıklarını, günlük hayatlarında okuma stratejileri kullanan katılımcıların derste daha fazla okuma stratejileri üzerinde yoğunlaştığını ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okuma, Okuma stratejileri, Öğretmenlerin görüşleri.

ABSTRACT**TEACHERS' VIEWS ABOUT AND APPROACHES TO READING
INSTRUCTION AND READING STRATEGIES****Aysun YURDAIŞIK****Master Thesis, English Language Teaching Department****Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Neşe CABAROĞLU****September, 2007, 120 pages**

This study was conducted to examine teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction. The study was carried out with 50 participants working at preparatory schools of Çağ University, Çukurova University, and Mersin University.

In order to answer the research questions a questionnaire and in-depth interviews were conducted. According to the results of the questionnaire and the institutions they worked at, 6 participants were chosen for the interviews.

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction at university preparatory levels; as to how teachers view themselves as readers of L2, how they think reading is taught, their concerns about reading instruction and if they are using reading strategies in the classroom. We also investigated the relationship between how teachers viewed themselves as readers and how this was reflected in their teaching.

The results of the study revealed that teachers think unknown vocabulary and unfamiliar topic are the most common difficulties students face with comprehending a text. An ideal reading instruction should include reading strategies, teachers use more pre-reading strategies than post-reading strategies, participants who use reading strategies in their daily lives make more use of reading strategies in class.

Key words: Reading, Reading strategies, Teachers' beliefs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Neşe Cabaroğlu, for her genuine interest, invaluable help, and continuous support throughout the preparation of my thesis.

I also wish to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya Yumru, Assist. Prof. Dr. Tijen Türeli, Assist. Prof. Dr. Jülide İnözü, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Sabahattin Çam for guiding me in my study and for giving their time and expertise.

I am gratefully indebted to Hamdi Önal, director of preparatory school of Çağ University, for his understanding and support during my study.

Many thanks go to my colleagues at Çağ University. They were both encouraging and helpful.

My greatest and sincere thanks to Eda Haşimoğlu, Pınar İşgüzar, Nadya Baltalı, Merih Karacaoğlu, Neriman Göncüoğlu, Serkan Balta and Sylvia Rodriguez for their invaluable friendship and endless support throughout the year.

Finally, I am grateful to my family for their continuous encouragement and support throughout the year and for their love throughout my life. I thank my father Nebi Yurdaşık and my mother Yüksel Yurdaşık. I especially thank my sister Dilhun Yazgan and my brother-in-law Uğur Yazgan. Thank you very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	viii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study	3
1.4. The Research Questions.....	4
1.5. Operational Definitions.....	4

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Reading and the Reading Process	5
2.2. Schema Theory	7
2.3. Reading Strategies	9
2.3.1. Definition of Reading Strategies.....	9
2.3.2. Categorization of Reading Strategies	10
2.3.3. Studies on Reading Strategies.....	13
2.4. Reading Instruction.....	17
2.5. Teachers' Beliefs and Reading Instruction.....	21

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction.....	25
3.2. Theoretical Framework.....	25
3.3. Research Questions.....	27
3.4. Setting and Participants	29

3.5. Questionnaires	29
3.5.1. Piloting the Questionnaire	31
3.5.2. Distribution of the Questionnaire	31
3.6. Interviews.....	31
3.6.1 Piloting the Interviews	32
3.6.2. Selecting the Participants.....	32
3.6.3. Interview Procedure.....	33
3.7. Data Analysis	34

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction.....	36
4.2. Results of the Questionnaire	37
4.3. Findings from the Interview	57
4.3.1. Interview Findings Part I	57
4.3.2. Interview Findings Part II.....	61
4.4. Summary of Findings.....	68

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary of the Study	70
5.2. Conclusions.....	70
5.3. Pedagogical Implications.....	74
5.4. Limitations of the Study	75
5.5. Suggestions for Further Research	75
5.6. Conclusion	76

REFERENCES	77
-------------------------	-----------

APPENDICES.....	85
------------------------	-----------

CURRICULUM VITAE	119
-------------------------------	------------

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1.	A Typology of Reading Strategies.....	11
Table 2.2.	Foreign Language Strategy Research	15
Table 3.1.	The Design of the Study	28
Table 3.2.	Characteristics of the Interview Participants	33
Table 3.3.	The Dates and the Length of the Interviews	34
Table 4.1.	Participants' Teaching Experience at University.....	37
Table 4.2.	Degree Programs Completed by the Participants	37
Table 4.3.	Teaching Reading in a General Course or as a Separate Course.....	38
Table 4.4.	Teachers' Perception of Themselves as Readers	38
Table 4.5.	What do Teachers do When They Have Difficulty When Reading ...	41
Table 4.6.	Do Teachers Repeat What They are Reading in Their Own Words.....	41
Table 4.7.	Do Teachers Reread Something That does not Make Sense	42
Table 4.8.	Do Teachers Ask Themselves Questions as They Read.....	42
Table 4.9.	How Familiar are the Teachers with the Concept of Reading Strategies.....	43
Table 4.10.	What are Teachers' Reasons for Teaching Reading Strategies in Class.....	44
Table 4.11.	Have Teachers Taken Any Courses Related to Teaching Reading or Reading Strategies	45
Table 4.12.	Items Related to Pre-reading Strategies.....	46
Table 4.13.	Questions Related to Vocabulary Teaching.....	47
Table 4.14.	Questions Related to the Use of Dictionaries	48
Table 4.15.	Items Related to While Reading Strategies	49
Table 4.16.	Items Related to Post-reading Strategies	52
Table 4.17.	Questions Presented in Questionnaire Part 5	54
Table 4.18.	Questions Presented in Questionnaire Part 6.....	56
Table 4.19.	Years of Experience in Teaching Reading	58
Table 4.20.	Solutions Suggested for Students' Limited Knowledge of Vocabulary.....	59

Table 4.21.	Factors Affecting the Degree of Success of a Reading Instruction Mentioned by the Teachers.....	60
Table 4.22.	Pre-reading Strategies Teachers Mentioned During the Interviews.....	64
Table 4.23.	While Reading Strategies Teachers Mentioned During the Interviews.....	65
Table 4.24	Post-reading Strategies Participants Mentioned During the Interviews.....	66

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Questionnaire Cover Letter	85
Appendix 2. Questionnaire	86
Appendix 3. Interview Consent Form.....	92
Appendix 4. Interview Questions	93
Appendix 5. Transcribed Forms of the Interviews	94

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Reading is the receptive process of written communication (Goodman, 1995). Allen and Bruton (1998) describe reading as a complex process of making meaning from a text, for variety of purposes and in a wide range of contexts. Reading is a psycholinguistic process in that it starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with meaning which the reader constructs (Goodman, 1995).

Comprehending a text is an interactive process between the reader's background knowledge and the text. Additionally, efficient comprehension requires the ability to relate the textual material to one's own knowledge; comprehending words, sentences, and entire texts involves more than just relying one's linguistic knowledge (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1995). Nunan (1999) states that our knowledge and expectations about the world will strongly affect our ability to understand the new information in a written text. As Carrell (1984) explains the role of background knowledge in language comprehension has been formalized as schema theory. The principle behind schema theory is that texts themselves do not carry meaning; rather they provide signposts, or clues to be utilized by readers in reconstructing the original meanings of writers (Nunan, 1999).

Nunan (1999) states that learning strategies are the mental and communicative procedures that learners use in order to learn and use language. Reading strategies, as noted by Garner (1987), may be defined as an action or series of actions employed in order to construct meaning.

As the basic aim of a reading lesson is to help the readers to be better at comprehending a text, teachers can help students by providing the basic strategies and situations to make them comprehend the text. Obvious variables such as student proficiency, age, L1 (first language) and L2 (foreign language) relations, motivation, cognitive processing factors, curriculum and materials resources, instructional setting, and institutional factors all affect the degree of success of reading instruction (Grabe, 2004).

A primary source of teachers' classroom practices is their belief systems which consist of the information, attitudes, values, expectations, theories, and assumptions about teaching and learning that teachers build up over time and bring with them to the classroom (Richards, 2000). Eskey and Grabe (1995) state that it is the teacher who must introduce, and provide practice in useful reading strategies for coping with texts in an unfamiliar language. As emphasized in various studies effective reading instruction should involve teaching reading strategies and how to use these strategies (Carrell, 1989; Oxford, 2003). It is the role of the teacher to raise students' awareness of reading strategies and this is shaped by teachers' beliefs.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Reading has been the most emphasized skill in traditional foreign language (EFL) teaching and it is the mainstay of English as a foreign language (FL) instruction in many countries (Susser & Rob, 1990). Reading can not be regarded as a set of mechanical skills to be learned once and for all, but rather as a complex process of making meaning from a text for variety of purposes and in a wide range of contexts (Allen & Bruton, 1998).

It should be considered that reading in English is essential for learners' academic success, and therefore teachers and researchers attribute attention to understand the factors effecting success in reading comprehension (Kamhi-Stein, 2003). Without comprehension, reading would be empty and meaningless. To achieve this, teachers should aid learners in understanding and using reading strategies (Yigiter, Saricoban, & Gurses, 2005). Reading strategies, as noted by Garner (1987), may be defined as an action or series of actions employed in order to construct meaning.

In trying to understand how teachers deal with teaching reading, it is necessary to examine beliefs and thinking processes of teachers which constitute classroom actions. Bandura (1997) claims that teachers' beliefs in their abilities to instruct students and influence students' performance are a very strong indicator of instructional effectiveness and he originally proposes that individual beliefs or efficacy expectations are major determinants of activity choice, willingness to expand effort, and persistence. Eskey and Grabe (1995) state that it is the teacher who must introduce and provide practice in using reading strategies for coping with texts in an unfamiliar language.

Many researchers studied strategy training and learners' beliefs. On the other hand, there are a limited number of studies combining reading instruction, teachers' beliefs and reading strategy instruction. Allen and Bruton (1997) carried out a study in secondary schools in Scotland to find out teachers' understanding of reading process and the teaching of reading strategies. El-Okda (2005) did a study on EFL student teachers' cognition about reading instruction. Some research has been conducted about strategy training of Turkish EFL students in reading (Civelek, 2002; Ekmekci & Okan, 1996; Gural, 2000; Guzel, 1996; Unal, 1999; Yazar, 2001; Yetgin, 2003; Sadik, 2005). Those studies mostly focused on university students (Unal, 1999; Sadik, 2005), or trainee teachers (Civelek, 2002) or materials for strategy instruction (Yetgin, 2003). Additionally, these studies did not combine strategies and beliefs. Tercanlioglu (2001) aimed to deepen the understanding of what pre-service teachers think about their own reading, their future responsibility as teachers of EFL reading, and about the effectiveness of the education they have received. Salli (2002) conducted a study aiming to investigate teachers' perception of strategy training at Eastern Mediterranean University. When we consider the importance of reading instruction in a foreign language especially for learners' academic achievement, in relation with the teachers' beliefs, the studies conducted are limited in our country. Therefore, a study combining teachers' beliefs, reading instruction and reading strategies is needed.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

Taking into consideration the importance of reading in learners' academic achievement, the role and importance of teachers' beliefs in teaching and scarcity of research in the area of reading strategies and teacher thinking, the present study aims at identifying how teachers view themselves as readers of foreign language, how they think reading is taught, their concerns about reading instruction and if they are using reading strategies in the classroom.

1.4. The Research Questions

1. How do teachers view themselves as readers in L2?
 - a. Do they use reading strategies in their readings? (If yes) Which strategies do they use?
2. How do teachers teach reading?
3. How do teachers think reading should be taught?
4. What are teachers' concerns about teaching reading in the classroom?
5. Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction?
 - a. How do teachers choose which strategy to use?
 - b. What are teachers' purposes for teaching strategies?

1.5. Operational Definitions

Reading: Reading is the receptive phase of communication (Goodman, 1968). It is a psycholinguistic process that starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with meaning which the reader constructs (Goodman, 1995).

Reading Strategies: Reading strategies as noted by Garner (1987), is defined as an action or series of actions employed in order to construct meaning.

Teachers' Beliefs: Teachers' belief systems are the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems which they work and their roles within it (Richards & Lockhart, 1997). Moreover, these values and beliefs serve as the background to much of the teachers' decision making and action (ibid.). Teachers' beliefs and teachers' views are used synonymously in the present study.

In the succeeding chapters of this thesis, a review of the literature will be presented and related studies to the present study will be discussed. In chapter 3, methodological procedures, setting and participants, research tools, and how they were utilized will be discussed. Chapter 4 presents the data obtained through questionnaires and interviews, and in the final chapter, the study will be summarized, the results will be discussed, the limitations of the study will be mentioned, and implications on the study will be drawn.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Reading and the Reading Process

At first thought, reading process seems easy to describe: the reader recognizes characters, puts them together into words, identifies the meanings of the words, and strings the words into sentences (Westhoff, 1991). Reading can not be regarded as a set of mechanical skills to be learned once and for all, but rather as a complex process of making meaning from a text, for variety of purposes and in a wide range of contexts (Allen & Bruton, 1998). In short, reading can be characterized as a constructive process in which information from the outside continuously interacts with knowledge available on the inside (Van Dijk & Kintsch; Alderson & Urquhart; Carrell, Devine, & Eskey; in Westhoff, 1991). Readers typically make use of background knowledge, vocabulary, grammatical knowledge, experience with text and other strategies to help them understand a written text (Pang et. al., 2003).

Peregoy and Boyle (2001) state that both first and second language readers look at the page and the print and use their knowledge of sound/symbol relationships, word order, grammar, and meaning to predict and confirm meaning. The linguistic system involved in reading is commonly referred to as graphophonics (sound/symbol correspondences), syntax (word order), and semantics (meaning) (ibid.).

Additionally, in the reading process, readers use their background knowledge about the text's topic and structure along with their linguistic knowledge and reading strategies to achieve their purpose for reading (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001). Regarding the reading process, as Goodman (1995) puts it, the brain seeks to maximize information it acquires and minimize effort and energy used to acquire it. According to Goodman (1995, p.16), five processes which have an intrinsic sequence are employed in reading. These are as follow:

1. Recognition-initiation. The brain must recognize a graphic display in the visual field as written language and initiate reading. Normally this would occur once in each reading activity, though it is possible for reading to be interrupted by other activities, examining pictures, for example, and then to be reinitiated.

2. Prediction. The brain is always anticipating and predicting as it seeks order and significance in sensory inputs.

3. Confirmation. If the brain predicts, it must also seek to verify its predictions. So it monitors to confirm or disconfirm with subsequent input what it expected.

4. Correction. The brain reprocesses when it finds inconsistencies or its predictions are disconfirmed.

5. Termination. The brain terminates the reading when the reading task is completed, but termination may occur for other reasons: the task is non-productive; little meaning is constructive, or the meaning is already known, or the story is uninteresting or the reader finds it inappropriate for the particular purpose. At any rate, termination in reading is usually an open option at any point.

Goodman (1995) states that reading is a psycholinguistic process in that it starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with meaning which the reader constructs; there is thus an essential interaction between language and thought in reading. The writer encodes thought as language and the reader decodes language to thought. According to Mei-yun (1989, p.14), the psycholinguistic models of reading can be summarized as the following process:

1. The reader approaches a text with expectations based on his knowledge of the subject.

2. He uses only minimal sampling of the text in deriving meaning by relying on his knowledge of the language and the subject, as well as his background knowledge, as a substitute for all the redundant features of the text.

3. On the basis of sampling, he makes predictions as to what message he expects to get from the text.

4. As he progresses into the material, he tests his predictions, confirming or revising them, and makes still more predictions on the basis of what he has been reading.

5. By making use of minimal orthographic, syntactic, and semantic clues in the material, he internally re-creates a replica of the textual message.

6. Once such reconstruction has taken place, he will test its accuracy against previous information, which includes the information extracted from the text, as well as the store of information in his long-term memory relevant to the topic.

7. a- If the reconstruction is in agreement with his previous knowledge, the cycle of sampling begins again.

b- If accuracy or inconsistency occurs, he will adopt some compensatory strategy such as re-reading.

In the light of psycholinguistic models of reading, good readers do not read word by word, but in meaningful units.

Hosenfeld (in Barnett, 1988) emphasizes that the level of reader comprehension of the text is determined by how well the reader variable (i.e. interest level in the text, purpose for reading the text, knowledge of the topic, foreign language abilities, awareness of the reading process, and the level of willingness to take risks) interact with the text variable (text type, structure, syntax, and vocabulary).

Most language specialists view reading as interactive (Eskey & Grabe, 1995; Goodman, 1968; Carrell, 1995; Nunan, 1999). The reading process is not simply a matter of extracting information from the text. Rather it is one in which the reading activates a range of knowledge in the reader's mind that he or she uses, and that, in turn may be refined and extended by the new information supplied by the text (Grabe, 1995). Barnett (1988) explains that one important part of interactive process theory emphasizes "schemata" which is the reader's preexisting concepts about the world and about the text to be read. Into this framework, the reader fits what she or he finds in any passage; if new textual information does not fit into a reader's schemata, the reader misunderstands the new material, ignores the new material, or revises the schemata to match the facts within the passage (ibid.).

2.2. Schema Theory

As it is stated earlier, schema theory suggests that our knowledge and expectations about the world will strongly affect our ability to understand new information by providing a framework within which that new information might fit (Nunan, 1999). In relation to this, it can be said that a great deal of research with both first and second language readers has been carried out using schema theory. The basic principle behind schema theory is that texts themselves, whether spoken or written, do not carry meaning; rather they provide signposts, or clues to be utilized by listeners or readers in reconstructing the original meanings of speakers or writers (ibid.). Schemata have two broad types – content schemata (which contain general or specific information on a given topic, involving knowledge of the world beyond texts) and formal/textual

schemata which contain information about how rhetoric (i.e. the study of using language effectively) is, or ought to be, organized, involving knowledge of rhetorical structures and conventions (Yali,2004). In short, the schema theory explains how readers' world knowledge plays an important role in reading. Efficient comprehension requires the ability to relate the textual material to one's own knowledge. Comprehending words, sentences, and entire texts involves more than just relying one's linguistic knowledge (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1995).

According to the schema theory, comprehending a text is an interactive process and this reading process can be divided into three types:

a- Bottom-up Process

In bottom-up processing, reading is a matter of decoding a series of written symbols; the readers are expected to get the meaning by recognizing letters and words (Yiğiter, Sarıçoban, & Gürses, 2005).

b- Top-down Process:

In top-down processing main aim is the interaction of the reader with the text. Nunan (1999) states that as the top-down process bases on schema theory, the reader brings to this interaction his knowledge of the subject at hand, knowledge of and expectations about how language works, motivation, interest and attitudes towards the text and the content it contains. Top-down processing is the making of predictions about the text based on prior experience or background knowledge, and then checking the text for confirmation or refutation of those predictions (Carrell, 1995).

c- Interactive Process:

Interactive processes gives importance to previous knowledge and prediction as well as accurate processing of the actual words of the text; according to this process, clues are taken from the page by the eye and transmitted to the brain; then, the brain tries to match existing knowledge to the data to facilitate the further processing of new information (Yiğiter, Sarıçoban, & Gürses, 2005).

Carrell (1984, 1987) has investigated the usefulness of the schema theory for second language reading. It was found that activating content information plays a major role in students' comprehension and recall of information from a text. Hudson's research (in Grabe, 1991) on schemata theory has argued that a high degree of background knowledge can overcome linguistic deficiencies; the major implication to be drawn from this research is that students need to activate prior knowledge of a topic before they begin to read.

2.3. Reading Strategies

2.3.1 Definition of Reading Strategies

Strategies are composed of cognitive operations over and above the processes that are a natural consequence of carrying out the task, ranging from one such operation to a sequence of interdependent operations (Hacker, 1998). Strategies provide ways to lessen demands on working memory and therefore facilitate comprehension (ibid.). Additionally, strategies include both monitoring strategies (e.g. rereading a difficult passage, looking back to prior text, predicting upcoming information, comparing two or more propositions) and control strategies (e.g., summarizing text information, clarifying text information by using reference sources external to the text, correcting incomplete or inaccurate text information) (ibid.).

Learning strategies are the conscious thoughts and actions that learners take in order to achieve a learning goal; strategic learners have metacognitive knowledge about their own thinking and learning approaches, a good understanding of what a task entails, and the ability to orchestrate the strategies that best meet both the task demands and their own learning strengths (Chamot, 2004). Drawn from the studies, second language acquisition entails active and dynamic mental processes that can be broadly grouped into three categories as follow:

- * metacognitive strategies (solving a problem, planning one's next move, testing, revising),
- * cognitive strategies (note taking, summarizing, paraphrasing, predicting, analyzing),
- * social/effective strategies (cooperation with peers, questioning, asking for correction, feedback) (O'Malley & Chamot, 2002;p143).

Reading strategies, as noted by Garner (1987), may be defined as an action or series of actions employed in order to construct meaning. Barnett (in Tercanlioğlu, 2004) has used the term reading strategy to refer to the mental operations involved when readers purposefully approach a text to make sense of what they read. Reading comprehension is essential to academic areas, to professional success and to life long learning. Grabe (1991) states that crucial importance of reading skills in academic contexts has led to considerable research on reading in a second language. Levine, Ferenz and Reves (2000) point out that the ability to read academic texts is considered

one of the most important skills that university students of English as a second language and English as a foreign language need to achieve. According to Rigney (in Singhal, 2001), research in second language reading suggests that learners use a variety of strategies to assist them with the acquisition, storage and retrieval of information. When readers encounter comprehension problems they use strategies to overcome their difficulties; different learners seem to approach reading tasks in different ways, and some of these ways appear to lead to better comprehension (Tercanlıoğlu, 2004). Research has shown that learners can be instructed to use appropriate reading strategies to help them improve comprehension and recall (Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto, 1989).

2.3.2. Categorization of Reading Strategies

Regarding the categorization of reading strategies, researchers use different classifications. The primary conclusion O'Malley and Chamot (2002) drew from their studies was that second language acquisition entails active and dynamic mental processes that can be broadly grouped into three categories: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and social/affective strategies. Oxford (2003), for instance, offers a useful and comprehensive classification scheme of the various strategies used by learners. Within the broader context of reading strategies, according to Oxford (2003, p.128), the following six strategies can more appropriately be referred to as sub-strategies:

- * General Cognitive Strategies: Cognitive strategies are used by learners to transform or manipulate the language. This includes note taking, summarizing, paraphrasing, predicting, analyzing, practicing, and using context clues.

- * Memory Related Strategies: Techniques that help the learner to remember and retrieve information are referred to as memory strategies. These include grouping, imagery, rhyming, moving physically, and structured reviewing.

- * Compensation Strategies: Compensation strategies include skills such as inferencing, guessing while reading, or using reference materials such as dictionaries.

- * Metacognitive Strategies: Metacognitive strategies are behaviors undertaken by the learners to plan, arrange, and evaluate their own learning. Such strategies include directed attention and self evaluation, organization, setting goals and objectives, seeking practice opportunities.

* **Affective Strategies:** Learners also use affective strategies, such as anxiety reduction through laughter and meditation, self-encouragement through affirmations, and self-reward through praise and tangible reinforcement.

* **Social Strategies:** Social strategies are those that involve other individuals in the learning process and refer to cooperation with peers, questioning, asking for correction, and feedback.

Based on the findings of numerous studies, recent research in the area of reading comprehension has focused on reading-related strategies, and strategy-training studies. For the most part, such studies have found that strategy training leads to improved reading performance (Singhal, 2001).

Nunan (1999) states that one of the most comprehensive typologies of reading strategies is the one developed by teachers in the ELTU (Chinese University of Hong Kong) at Chinese University. They note that by choosing the best strategies for different texts and purposes, it is possible for second language readers to significantly increase both their reading speed and their comprehension. Their typology is set out in Table 2.1:

Table 2.1. A typology of Reading Strategies

Strategy	Comment
1. Having a purpose	It is important for students to have a clear purpose and to keep in mind what they want to gain from the text.
2. Previewing	Conducting a quick survey of the text to identify the topic, the main idea, and the organization of the text.
3. Skimming	Looking quickly through the text to get a general idea of what it is about.
4. Scanning	Looking quickly through a text in order to locate specific information.
5- Clustering	Reading clusters of words as a unit.
6- Avoiding bad habits	Avoiding habits such as reading word-by word.
7- Predicting	Anticipating what is to come.

Table 2.1. Continued

Strategy	Comment
8- Reading actively	Asking questions and then reading for answers.
9- Inferring	Identifying ideas that are not explicitly stated.
10- Identifying genres	Identifying the overall organizational pattern of a text.
11- Identifying paragraph structure	Identifying the organizational structure of a paragraph, for example, whether it follows an inductive or deductive pattern.
12- Identifying sentence structure	Identifying the subject and main verb in complex sentences.
13- Noticing cohesive devices	Assigning correct referents and identifying the function of conjunctions.
14- Inferring unknown vocabulary	Using context as well as parts of words (e.g., prefixes, suffixes, and stems) to work out the meaning of unknown words.
15- Identifying figurative language	Understanding the use of figurative language and metaphors.
16- Using background knowledge	Using what one already knows to understand new ideas.
17- Identifying style and its purpose	Understanding the writer's purpose in using different stylistic devices, such as series of short or long sentences.
18- Evaluating	Reading critically and assessing the truth value of textual information.
19- Integrating Information	Tracking ideas that are developed across the text through techniques such as highlighting and notetaking.
20- Reviewing	Looking back over a text and summarizing it.
21- Reading to present	Understanding the text fully and then presenting it to others.

Adapted from Nunan, 1999.

This is one of the most comprehensive classification of reading strategies which provides a clear picture related to the concept of reading strategies in one's mind.

2.3.3. Studies on Reading Strategies

Carrell (1989) conducted a study to investigate metacognitive awareness of second language readers about reading strategies in both their first and second language, and the relationship between their metacognitive awareness and comprehension in both first and second language reading. Two groups of participants varying proficiency levels including 45 native speakers of Spanish enrolled at an ESL (English as a second language) intensive program at a university, and 75 native speakers of English studying Spanish were involved in the study. A metacognitive questionnaire was developed to elicit relevant information from subjects to tap their metacognitive awareness and judgments about silent reading in their first and second language. Subjects were also tested in their first and second languages. For reading in the L1, local reading strategies such as focusing on grammatical structures, sound letter, word meaning and, text details tended to be negatively correlated with reading performance. For reading in the L2, there were some differences between Spanish L1 and the English L1 groups, of more advanced proficiency levels, tended to be more global (used background knowledge, text gist, and textual organization) or top-down in their perceptions of effective and difficulty-causing reading strategies, while the Spanish-as-a-foreign language group, at lower proficiency levels tended to be more local or bottom-up, perhaps because they may have been more dependent on bottom-up decoding skills.

Carrell, Pharis, and Liberto (1989) reported a study of metacognitive strategy training for reading in ESL. Strategy training was provided to experimental groups. Control groups received no strategy training, but participated in pre- and posttesting. Results show that metacognitive strategy training is effective in enhancing second language reading, and that the effectiveness of one type of training versus may depend upon the way reading is measured. Further, the results show that the effectiveness of the training is related to differences in the learning styles of the students.

In an article Auerbach and Paxton (1997) presented an overview of a reading course design and pedagogical processes, the ways students were involved in inquiry and their findings. Students' voices were recorded as they reflected on changes in their strategies, conceptions, awareness, and feelings about reading in English. The findings were corroborated by evidence from pre- and postcourse interviews; think-aloud protocols, and comprehension tests. The findings suggested that transferring L2

research tools into the hands of learners and inviting them to reflect critically on their own reading could not only increase their metacognitive awareness and control in L2 reading but also significantly increased their enjoyment of English reading.

Tercanlioglu (2004), in her study, reported the results of an investigation conducted at a university in the United Kingdom. Data came from five sources: audio taped interviews of 17 postgraduate students, a demographic questionnaire, the Adult Survey of Reading Attitude (ASRA), a reading efficacy belief instrument, and three texts that measured reading comprehension. Results of the study revealed that L1 students rated scored items on both efficacy items on the reading efficacy belief instrument higher than ESL students; interviewees from both groups showed a clear preference for cognitive strategies, followed by metacognitive and support strategies; and reading comprehension scores were similar for both groups of students on the instruments used.

In his article Brantmeier (2002) provides an analysis of studies that have been cited for years and highlights some more recent investigations. Table 2.2 below summarizes research into strategy derivation indicating participants, research methods, coding scheme and results.

Table 2.2. Foreign Language Strategy Research

Researcher	Participants/Methods	Coding Scheme	Results
Hosenfeld (1977)	40 Ninth grade students learning French; think- aloud reports for each sentence they read	main-meaning line word solving	successful readers kept meaning of passage, whereas poor readers focused on unknown words
Block (1986)	9 university level ESL and native English students; think-aloud reports for each sentence they read	general strategies local strategies	successful learners used their general knowledge; focused on the overall meaning; differentiated main ideas from supporting points; the poor readers rarely did any of the above.
Anderson (1993)	26 Spanish speaking adult ESL students Descriptive Test of Language Skills Reading Comprehension Test Textbook Reading Profile With think-loud reports	understanding main ideas direct statement drawing inferences supervising supporting paraphrasing	students using strategies comprehend better; no relationship between the amount of unique strategies and comprehension
Raymond (1993)	43 native English readers of French Written questionnaire Written recall	top level structure strategy no top level structure strategy	structure strategy helped increase the amount of idea units recalled

Adapted from Brantmeier, 2002.

In the studies mentioned above the researchers used a variety of research methods with diverse participants to examine the reading strategies of second language

learners. Each study adds greatly to our understanding of reading process and contributes to the L2 reading strategy use.

In Turkey, researchers also studied on the Turkish students and their use of reading strategies. For instance, Salataci and Akyel (2002) investigated the reading strategies of Turkish EFL (English as a foreign language) students in Turkish and English and possible effects of strategy instruction on reading in Turkish and English. The participants consisted of eight Turkish students enrolled in a pre-intermediate level class of a one-year intensive English course offered at a Turkish medium technical university. The data came from think-aloud protocols, observation, a background questionnaire, a semi-structured interview and the reading component of the PET (the Preliminary English Test). The results indicated that strategy instruction had a positive effect on both Turkish and English reading strategies and reading comprehension in English.

In another study, Yigiter, Saricoban, and Gurses (2005) aimed to identify what strategies good readers employed in pre-, during- and post reading stages in classroom language learning. The preparatory ELT (English language teaching) students at Ataturk University were administered an inventory of strategy use. It was found in the study that good readers differed in some strategies whereas the good EFL (English as a foreign language) learners did not differ in pre-reading stage, but differed in both while-reading stage and post reading stage. The study concludes that the ELT and EFL learners may have different reading strategies depending upon their needs and interests.

There are many studies conducted in the area of reading strategies. Most of the studies focused on metacognitive awareness, the relationship between reading in first language and foreign language, and the strategy use of successful and unsuccessful readers. The participants of these studies were mostly university students (in some studies the participants were the students of English language teaching department) and high-school students. In these studies mainly questionnaires, interviews and think-aloud reports were utilized. All these studies show that reading strategies help the readers to comprehend the text better and to be better readers. At this point, reading instruction and the teachers play a vital role to help the students acquire reading strategies.

2.4 Reading Instruction

Traditionally reading instruction has involved either direct instruction of decoding skills (to decipher printed words by recovering the spoken word that a printed word represents) or informal teaching of comprehension. However, according to Resnick (in Carell, Pharis & Liberto, 1989), those who advocate a heavy emphasis on decoding mechanisms in reading also tend towards the direct instruction approach, whereas those who emphasize attention to language processing and reading for meaning, i.e. , comprehension tend to advocate and adopt learner-directed, informal instructional approaches.

The teaching of reading is a complex process. Obvious variables such as student proficiency, age, L1 and L2 relations, motivation, cognitive processing factors, curriculum and materials resources, instructional setting, and institutional factors all impact the degree of success of reading instruction (Grabe, 2004). The basic aim of the reading course is to help readers understand the written text. In this respect teachers need to provide the basic strategies, situations and opportunities for learners to make meanings from the text. According to Eskey and Grabe (1995, p.227) for the teaching of any kind of second language reading, there are two general implications:

1. Some time must be devoted in reading classes to such relatively bottom-up concerns as the rapid and accurate identification of lexical and grammatical forms. Even students who have developed strong top-down skills in their native languages may not be able to transfer these higher-level skills to a second language context until they have developed a stronger bottom-up foundation of basic identification skills.

2. On the other hand, some time must also be devoted to such top-down concerns as reading for global meaning (as opposed to mere decoding), developing a willingness to take chances (that is, to make educated guesses at meaning in the absence of absolute certainty), and developing appropriate and adequate schemata for the proper interpretation of texts. From the very beginning, successful readers do employ such strategies, even while developing their bottom-up skills. Reading of any kind of text must be treated as real reading, that is, reading for meaning. No student should ever be forced or encouraged to limit him-or herself to mere decoding skills.

In short, in reading instruction both bottom-up and top-down skills and reading strategies must be taught to students for the successful comprehension of the texts.

Rather than teaching in one traditional way the teacher needs to know and analyze students' conditions to see what fits best into their skills and knowledge. It is the student who needs to be taught so the materials and methods of instruction should be carefully chosen in order to make the students successful readers. Marshall (2004) claims that instruction should begin and end with students, which means that the teacher's understanding of students should form the basis of all instruction; to understand students, one must know the way people learn, including the effect of earlier learning experiences on students' attitudes and willingness to become involved in new learning.

According to Westhoff (1991) much ineffective or even counterproductive reading instruction shows the following characteristics:

1. Teaching foreign language reading is often almost identical with teaching the text used for this purpose. Aimed at giving students a detailed comprehension of the contents, the instruction concentrates on what is said and hardly pays attention to how students can grasp the meaning.

2. Reading lessons consist mainly of having students answer oral or written questions on a given text.

3. Teaching reading is actually sustained testing.

These three features do not seem very useful. Teachers should specifically focus on teaching reading strategies for understanding such elements as content, textual features, rhetorical elements (i.e. the study of using language effectively), and cultural background (Susser& Robb, 1990). In this respect Westhoff (1991, p. 8) offers some practical measures to help readers, as shown below:

- * Texts with familiar content
- * Abundant illustrations
- * Texts with clear, prominent markers (headings, subheadings, summaries...)
- * Advance organizers (introductory statements that serve as anchoring ideas for the material to be read)
- * Texts about actual events that have been discussed in class before the reading assignment
- * Background information about the country where the target language is spoken.

The points mentioned above may provide some help to the learners and teachers.

Rosenshine and Stevens (in Jager, 2002) grouped effective teacher activities under six teaching functions that could be applied in a reading class as daily retrospect, presentation of new content, guided practice, individual practice, periodical prospect, and feedback. Before students are able to be responsible for their own learning, they need help and assistance from the teacher. In these given activities the responsibility gradually shifts from teacher to student.

The basic aim of the reading course is to help readers. Teachers can help the students by providing the basic strategies and situations to make them comprehend the text. On the basis of strategy instruction literature and her experience, Garner (1987, p.132) proposes six guidelines for effective strategy instruction in classrooms:

1. Teachers must care about the processes involved in reading and studying, and must be willing to devote instructional time to them.
2. Teachers must do task analyses of strategies to be taught.
3. Teachers must present strategies as applicable to texts and tasks in more than one content domain.
4. Teachers must teach strategies over an entire year, not in just a single lesson or unit.
5. Teachers must provide students with opportunities to practice strategies they have been taught.
6. Teachers must be prepared to let students teach each other about reading and studying processes.

When teachers of second language reading recognize that each reader brings a unique set of past experiences, emotional and mental processes, level of cognitive development, and interest level in the topic to the reading process, they also recognize that not all teaching strategies will be effective for all students (Barnett, 1988). When isolating the most effective teaching strategies to use with a group of students, the second language teacher must also consider those reader strategies that are not necessarily related to content schemata. Such reader strategies include the following (ibid.):

- using titles and illustrations to understand a passage,
- skimming,
- scanning,
- summarizing,
- guessing word meanings,

- becoming aware of the reading process, and
- taking risks.

As Barnett (1988) puts it all of these strategies can be targeted for use with foreign language materials.

Savilla-Troike (in Mei-yun, 1989) summarizes an effective way to teach EFL reading. She says improving the reading skill of any student begins with identifying his weaknesses, and then implementing appropriate methods for strengthening these skills.

Unlike other competencies required in reading, such as knowledge of vocabulary and grammar comprehension monitoring is not something that can be obtained through rote-memorization, drilling, or the teacher's one way instruction (Yang,2002). Instead interaction between the students and the teacher seems to provide the best opportunities for developing the competency of comprehension monitoring (ibid.). In practical terms, the following implications for classroom action can be drawn:

- * Use pre-reading, schema-building tasks, particularly with lower proficiency students to help them apply what they already know to the task of reading;
- * Teach learners strategies such as predicting, skimming, scanning, and give them opportunities to match the strategies to the purposes;
- * Provide a variety of reading purposes;
- * With higher proficiency students, develop activities for helping them identify and track logical referential relationships in texts;
- * Use activities that require students to transform data from one modality to another and from textual to nontextual (e.g., diagrammatic) form;
- * Give students opportunities to go beyond the texts, evaluating and critiquing what they read (Nunan, 1999, p.268).

Based on extensive and still accumulating research, the following implications for academic reading instruction and curriculum design are reasonably well supported. Although stated as instructional implications, all but the last of these goals can also be viewed as component abilities of learners that need to be developed for effective reading comprehension (Grabe, 2004, p.46).

- * Ensure word recognition fluency
- * Emphasize vocabulary learning and create a vocabulary- rich environment.
- * Activate background knowledge in appropriate ways.
- * Ensure effective language knowledge and general comprehension skills.
- * Teach text structures and discourse organization.

- * Promote the strategic reader rather than teach individual strategies.
- * Build reading fluency and rate.
- * Promote extensive reading.
- * Develop intrinsic motivation (to be motivated by internal factors) for reading.
- * Plan a coherent curriculum for student learning.

Any instructional setting and any group of curriculum developers must determine priorities based on student needs, institutional expectations, and resource constraints. However, Eskey and Grabe (1995) point out three constants of reading instruction regardless of age, proficiency of the students, their educational needs, time available and so forth. These are the quantity of reading; appropriate materials and the judgment of the teacher, for it is often the teacher who really determines how much and what his or her students read (*ibid.*). The teacher can have a major effect on whether any given student chooses to go on reading in a language.

2.5. Teachers' Beliefs and Reading Instruction

Traditionally, language teaching has been described in terms of what teachers do; that is, in terms of the actions and behaviors which teachers carry out in the classroom and the effects of these on learners (Richards & Lockhart, 1997). Teachers' tacit beliefs about teaching and learning constitute the main component of the knowledge base of teaching English as a foreign language (El-Okda, 2005). Hampton (in Richards, Gallo & Renandya, 2002) notes that teachers' beliefs or personal constructs determine how they approach their teaching; and that these beliefs may be quite general or very specific. Teachers' belief systems are the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems which they work and their roles within it (Richards & Lockhart, 1997). Moreover, these values and beliefs serve as the background to much of the teachers' decision making and action (*ibid.*). Teacher beliefs form a structured set of principles that are derived from experience, school practice, personality, education theory, reading, and other sources (Richards, 2000).

Teacher beliefs are related to student learning through some events or sequences of events, mediated by the teacher, that happen in the classroom (Orton, 1996). These

events might be said to “cause” student learning in the sense that the events in the classroom lead, in the case of effective teaching, to student learning (ibid.). In fact teacher beliefs are closely related to teacher intentions and acts and these actions are the cause of student learning. Richards, Gallo and Renandya (2002) emphasize that language teachers’ beliefs should help clarify how teachers change their approaches to teaching and learning over time.

In trying to understand how teachers deal with teaching reading it is necessary to examine teachers’ beliefs and thinking processes of teachers which constitute classroom actions. Bandura (1997) claims that teachers’ beliefs in their abilities to instruct students and influence students’ performance are a very strong indicator of instructional effectiveness and he originally proposed that individual beliefs or efficacy expectations are major determinants of activity choice, willingness to expand effort, and persistence.

It is the teacher who must create the world of reading in a particular class, it is the teacher who must stimulate interest in reading, who must project his or her enthusiasm for books, and who must help students to see that reading can be of real value to them, it is also the teacher who must choose, or edit, or modify, or even, in some circumstances, create appropriate materials for students with varied needs and purposes to read in challenging; but not overwhelming, and in a sequence of increasing difficulty which will lead to improvement, but not to frustration (Eskey & Grabe, 1995).

Payne (in Yang, 2002) who investigated the effects of comprehension monitoring on basal readers’ reading comprehension indicated that initially the classroom teacher took a directive role in explaining the reading process, modeling mental processing, and providing guided practice; but gradually, students learned to perform the steps independently while reading. This shows the significance of teacher intervention in developing students reading ability.

In order to achieve positive effects on comprehension skills teachers should provide high quality reading comprehension instruction. Pressley (in Jager, 2002) emphasizes that students need to be taught explicitly to use comprehension skills when they read. It is not satisfactory that students answer the comprehension questions and teachers supervise. Pearson et al. (in Jager, 2002) state that teachers must explain the students how expert readers make sense of text; teachers have to learn students’ skills that help them understand the texts. Besides these, students need to learn how, when, and where to use these skills. With respect to instruction, Eskey and Grabe (1995)

claim that it is the teacher who must introduce, and provide practice in, useful reading strategies for coping with texts in an unfamiliar language.

Effective instruction in strategic reading entails a number of classroom processes or moves; Janzen (2003) sees five (which overlap to a certain extent) as primary which are as follow:

1. general strategy instruction
2. teacher modeling
3. student reading
4. analysis of strategies used by the teacher or by students when thinking aloud
5. explanation/discussion of individual strategies on a regular basis.

Teachers can organize their class activities to reflect these processes.

Allan and Bruton (1997) explored teachers' perceptions on teaching reading and reading strategies to support reading development. The study was carried out in a context in which many teachers made explicit their concerns about those students who had difficulty in understanding texts. The study focused on whether the strategies were taught to students. Also, the study aimed to find out teachers' understanding of reading process and the teaching of reading strategies in secondary schools in Scotland. The results showed that most of the teachers they studied thought that reading was important and should be taught and developed in secondary school. The majority however did not see themselves knowledgeable about the reading process.

One project (Tercanlioglu, 2001) aimed to deepen the understanding of what pre-service teachers thought about their own reading, their future responsibility as teachers of EFL (English as a foreign language) reading, and about the effectiveness of the education they had been receiving. She found that the teacher educators were ambivalent about their responsibility for delivering professional education of the teaching of reading; correspondently the students did not feel well-prepared to teach reading, and were not all enthusiastic about teaching it.

Sallı (2002) conducted a study with the objective to investigate teachers' perception of strategy training at Eastern Mediterranean University. The results showed that teachers were familiar with reading strategies but they used more pre-reading strategies rather than during reading and post-reading strategies.

El-Okda (2005) made a study to shed some light on EFL student teachers' cognition about reading instruction. Based on analysis of the data, he made a number of conclusions: student teachers of English came to the method courses with pre-existing

beliefs about teaching the reading skill; those beliefs constituted what might be called a sub-system of beliefs about teaching a foreign language; student teachers' belief systems about reading could host conflicting beliefs; a major finding of the study is that beliefs are not very much idiosyncratic as reported in some previous studies, those beliefs might be culture-specific.

In this chapter literature review of reading, schema theory, reading strategies, studies made on reading strategies, reading instruction and teachers' beliefs were described. In the following chapter methodology of the study will be presented. Setting and participants, data collection tools, piloting the questionnaire and the interview will be discussed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the methodological procedures for this study are presented. First, the background of the methodology for this study is mentioned. Then, the participants of the study and the setting in which the study was conducted are described. Lastly, the data collection instruments and the ways data were collected and analyzed are presented.

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction at university preparatory levels as to how teachers view themselves as readers of L2, how they think reading is taught, their concerns about reading instruction and if they are using reading strategies in the classroom. It was hoped that this study would also reveal information about the relationship between how teachers viewed themselves as readers and how this reflected in their classroom practices.

3.2. Theoretical Framework

The study adapts a constructivist approach to investigate research questions under scrutiny. Constructivism maintains that individuals create or construct their own understandings or knowledge through the interaction what they already know and believe, the ideas, events, and activities with they come in contact (Canella & Reif, 1994). Kelly proposed that people organize their experiences by developing bipolar dimensions of meaning, a personal construct and these constructs are used to anticipate and predict what we perceive (Raskin, 2002). Kroll and LaBoskey (in Abdal-Haqq, 1998) state that knowledge is acquired through involvement with content instead of imitation or repetition. According to Resnick (in Jager, 2002), learning occurs not by recording information but by interpreting; students actively process information, using prior knowledge, skills, and strategies. Teachers can not simply transfer knowledge to

the learners; instead, teachers have to involve the learners in a process in which they can actively possess the information.

Spivey and Mellon (1989) state that the attempt to understand the process of reading has been an interdisciplinary effort, undertaken by researchers from various disciplines, including psychology, linguistics, artificial intelligence, and education- all of whose contributions are made within the broad framework of the constructivist tradition. Constructivism portrays the reader as actively building a mental representation by combining new information from the text with previously acquired knowledge (*ibid.*). According to Abbott et al. (in Spivey & Mellon, 1989) since reading is a constructive process, readers do read between the lines and make their own connections; this inference-making ability allows discourse to be rather sketchy, since readers can fill in gaps and can supply links in the propositional content, often on the basis of schematic knowledge structures. Holding a constructivist view of knowledge enables the teacher to help students be better readers by using reading strategies consciously.

Another assumption guiding the present study is the presence and importance of teachers' beliefs. Teacher beliefs and desires give rise to, or explain, teacher intentions to act; these actions can be regarded as the efficient cause of student learning, at least in those instances where students actually do learn (Orton, 1996). Constructivist teachers develop skills and abilities to empower students and to make them feel competent and significant (Gray, 1997). Teachers' beliefs or personal constructs determine how they approach their teaching; these beliefs may be quite general or very specific (Hampton in Richards, Gallo & Renandya, 2002). Bandura (1997) claims that teachers' beliefs in their abilities to instruct students and influence students' performance are a very strong indicator of instructional effectiveness, and he adds that individual beliefs or efficacy expectations are major determinants of activity choice, willingness to expand effort, and persistence.

Finally, the assumptions about reading strategies are also taken into consideration when carrying out the present research. Learning strategies are the mental and communicative procedures learners use in order to learn and use language (Nunan, 1999). Reading Strategies are of interest for what they reveal about the way readers manage their interaction with the written text and how these strategies are related to text comprehension and learners can be instructed to use appropriate strategies to help them improve comprehension and recall (Carell, Pharis & Liberto, 1989). Oxford and

Crookall (1989) defines strategies as learning techniques, behaviors, problem-solving or study skills which make learning more effective and efficient.

3.3. Research Questions

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do teachers view themselves as readers in L2?
 - a. Do they use reading strategies in their daily lives? (If yes) Which strategies do they use?
- 2 .How do teachers teach reading?
3. How do teachers think reading should be taught?
4. What are teachers' concerns about teaching reading in the classroom?
5. Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction?
 - a. How do teachers choose which strategy to use?
 - b. What are teachers' purposes for teaching strategies?

The table below shows the research questions, purposes for the research questions, data collection instruments and the number of participants.

Table 3.1. The Design of the Study

Research Questions	Data Collection	Number of Participants	Aim
How do teachers view themselves as readers in L2? a- Do they use reading strategies in their readings? (If yes) Which strategies do they use?	Questionnaire Interview	50 6	To find out how teachers view themselves as readers and if they use reading strategies in their readings.
How do teachers teach reading?	Interview	6	To find out how teachers teach reading.
How do teachers think reading should be taught?	Interview	6	To find out teachers' opinions about ideal reading instruction.
What are teachers' concerns about teaching reading in the classroom?	Interview	6	To find out whether teachers are facing any difficulties in teaching reading and if yes what kind of difficulties they are facing with and if they are trying to find any solutions.
Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction? a- How do teachers choose which strategy to use? b-What are the teachers' purposes for teaching strategies?	Questionnaire Interview	50 6	To find out if teachers are using strategies in the classroom if they are using the strategies for a reason and purpose.

3.4. Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at Cag University, Cukurova University, and Mersin University. The preparatory school education offered at these universities consists of two 14-week semesters. Students are placed at appropriate levels from beginner to pre-intermediate level at the beginning of the academic year.

Fifty teachers were selected from the preparatory schools of Cag University, Cukurova University, and Mersin University by using convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is the strategy of sampling by convenience; doing what is convenient (Patton, 1990). Thirty-nine of the participants were female and 11 of the participants were male. The questionnaire (Appendix 2) was distributed on March 25, 2007 and the participants were asked to return the questionnaire within a week. Out of 65 teachers, 50 returned the questionnaire. After the analysis of the questionnaire, criterion sampling was used for the identification of interview participants. The logic of criterion sampling is to review and study the cases that meet some predetermined criterion of importance (Patton, 1990). Six of the participants were chosen according to the diversity of the answers they gave on the questionnaire. The selection of interview participants will be further explained in section 3.6.2.

3.5. Questionnaires

In order to gather data on how teachers view themselves as readers, their familiarity with reading strategies and use of reading strategies in the classroom a questionnaire was utilized. The questionnaire (Appendix 2) is chosen because it can save time (Wallace, 2004) and it enables the researcher to collect data in field settings. Additionally, the data themselves are more amenable to quantification than discursive data such as free-form field notes, participants observers' journals, the transcripts of oral language (Nunan, 2004).

The questionnaire was based on the study carried out at Eastern Mediterranean University by Salli (2002). The questionnaire for this study consisted of six parts. The first part aimed at gathering background information about the participants; their names, gender, years of teaching experience at university, and degree (programs) completed.

Part II was added as open-ended questions depending on the research questions of this study. The second part of the questionnaire served to answer the first research

question, which was “how do teachers view themselves as readers in L2?” In this part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to answer 8 open-ended questions. The questions aimed at learning how the participants perceived themselves as readers and the reasons behind, what kind of reading materials were most difficult, what caused the greatest difficulty while reading, what they could do to understand better, what they did when they came across with a word that they did not know, what might stop them when they were reading, what they did when they had difficulty while they were reading.

The questions in the third part of the questionnaire helped us answer the fifth research question, which was “Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction?” and 5b, regarding teachers’ purposes for teaching strategies. In this part of the questionnaire, participants were asked three questions. The first question aimed at learning participants’ self-assessed degree of familiarity with the concept of reading strategies. The second question was comprised of a list of reasons for teaching reading strategies and the participants were asked to tick all that applied to them. Also, teachers were provided with an option where they could write their reasons apart from the written options given. The third question was an open-ended question, which asked the participants if they had taken any courses related to teaching reading or reading strategies during their education.

The forth part of the questionnaire served to answer question 5a, which was “how do teachers choose which strategy to use?” Part IV was compromised of 37 Likert-typed questions in which participants were asked to tick only one option according to the degree of frequency they taught various reading strategies at various phases of a lesson. The response options were ‘always’, ‘usually’, ‘sometimes’, ‘rarely’, and ‘never’.

Part V aimed at finding out how frequently the participants made use of the materials to teach reading strategies, and consisted of eight Likert-type items. Part VI was aimed at gathering teachers’ perceptions of the materials in terms of the degree of reading strategies they fostered. In this part, participants were asked four opinion type questions and were asked to tick one opinion among ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘neutral’, ‘disagree’, and ‘strongly disagree’.

3.5.1. Piloting the Questionnaire

In order to make sure that the items in the questionnaire were clear, understandable, and would not prejudge the teachers' perceptions, the questionnaire was piloted on the second week of March with preparatory school teachers of Cukurova University, Mersin University and Cağ University. Their constructive feedback was taken into consideration in the process of rewording items, adding new ones, modifying ambiguous wordings, and deleting the items that were irrelevant to the purpose of the study. Additionally, grammatical mistakes were corrected and instructions were modified. For this reason pilot study proved to be very beneficial.

3.5.2. Distribution of the Questionnaire

The questionnaires were distributed at Çağ University, Çukurova University, and Mersin University preparatory schools on March 25, 2007. Teachers received the questionnaires with a cover letter (Appendix 1) including the purpose of the study and the preparation of the questionnaire, and were asked to complete the questionnaires and return them to the contact person at their university. One person at each university was chosen as a contact person as they could easily distribute and collect the questionnaires to their colleagues and these contact people could easily be contacted by the researcher. Out of 65 teachers 50 teachers returned the questionnaires. The data were entered into the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) program by the researcher. Both the data entered into the SPSS program and open-ended questions were analyzed by the researcher.

3.6. Interviews

For this study, semi-structured interviews were conducted. Nunan (2004) indicates that in a semi-structured interview, the interviewer has a general idea of where to direct the interview, and what should come out of it. In addition to this, topics and issues rather than questions determine the course of the interview. The aim of designing semi-structured interviews for this study was to allow the participants to state their ideas

and provide room for them to explain their reasons on how they teach reading and how they use and teach reading strategies in their courses. The interview helped to collect in-depth information from the participants and also to obtain data that could not be obtained from the questionnaire.

The interview questions (Appendix 4) were prepared by considering a typical reading lesson. For example, questions were designed in order to gather data on how teachers teach reading, what their concerns were, how they dealt with the problems, and whether they employed particular reading strategies to facilitate students' comprehension of texts before, during, or after reading. Additionally, how teachers did what they did and why they did such activities were the follow-up questions for most of the items.

3.6.1 Piloting the Interviews

For the interview, a number of semi-structured questions were prepared. Two participants, who were experienced in teaching reading and who were volunteer to help, were asked to take part in the piloting of the interview. The given feedbacks helped to modify ambiguous questions and decide on the follow-up questions. For example, the sixth question in the first part of the interview was found to be ambiguous; it was 'What should be the properties of a reading instruction?' An alternative way of asking the same question was decided as 'How do you think reading should be taught?' Similarly, the first question in the second part of the interview was not clear to the participants in the pilot study; it was 'What do you think reading strategies are?' An alternative way of asking the same question was decided as 'What are the reasons for using reading strategies?'

3.6.2. Selecting the Participants for the Interview

After analyzing the data gathered from the questionnaires, 6 teachers were chosen for the interview according to the diversity of answers they gave and the institution they teach at. The following criteria were considered while choosing the six participants for the interview:

* Their perceptions of themselves as readers (Very good, good, average, not very good) (questionnaire part 2);

* The degree of familiarity with the concept of reading strategies (Very, somewhat, slightly, not at all) (questionnaire part 3);

* The university they work at.

Table 3.2. Characteristics of the Interview Participants

Participants	Gender	Years of Teaching	Age
		Experience at University	
P1	Female	33 years	55
P2	Male	3 years	28
P3	Male	3 years	41
P4	Female	7 years	28
P5	Female	20 years	44
P6	Female	10 years	35

Note: P= participant

3.6.3 Interview Procedure

The aim of the interview was to get in-depth answers to the following research questions as previously stated:

2. How do teachers teach reading?
3. How do teachers think reading should be taught?
4. What are teachers' concerns about teaching reading in the classroom?
5. Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction?
 - a. How do teachers choose which strategy to use?
 - b. What are teachers' purposes for teaching strategies?

The interview consisted of two parts. The questions asked in the first part were about how they dealt with the problems while teaching reading and the properties of a good reading instruction; part II was about reading strategies and the strategies that teachers employed. A total of 15 questions (Appendix 4) were prepared, but since the interview was semi-structured, additional questions were asked to the participants

according to the answers received. Some examples of these follow-up questions are as follows ‘Should the meanings of all the words be given?’ ‘Do you make the students read the text silently or do you make them read aloud?’ ‘Do you think the reading passages you teach are appropriate for the students?’ ‘What is the role of the teacher in a reading class?’

All the interviews were recorded and the interviewees were given a consent form (Appendix 3) to sign prior to the interview and their permissions were taken to record. The number of questions asked to the participants varied because of the nature of the interview. Additionally, the questionnaires that the interviewees had filled in were used as references during the interviews. When necessary, their answers to certain questions were referred to as they respond to related questions during the interviews. The interviews were conducted both in English and Turkish depending on the interviewee’s choice. The table below shows the dates and the length of the interviews:

Table 3.3. The Dates and the Length of the Interviews

Date of interview	Participant	Length of interview
21/4/2007	1	26 min.
25/4/2007	2	24 min.
26/4/2007	3	30 min.
28/4/2007	4	23 min.
30/4/2007	5	27 min.
2/5/2007	6	29 min.

3.7. Data Analysis

In this study, quantitative data were collected through questionnaires, and qualitative data were gathered through interviews. The questionnaire allowed the researcher to gather information about the teachers’ perception of themselves as readers and their perception and understanding of reading strategies and the purpose for teaching them. The questionnaire also enabled the researcher to obtain preliminary data about how teachers made use of the materials and their perceptions about the reading strategies presented in the coursebooks. The interviews, on the other hand, were

conducted in order to obtain detailed information about the teachers' concerns about teaching reading in the classroom, how they dealt with them, the properties of an ideal reading instruction, and how teachers decided which strategies to teach.

The items in parts IV, V, and VI of the questionnaire were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). For every item, frequencies and percentages were taken. In order to find the significance of the distribution of answers for each item, Chi-square tests were used.

The interviews were both taped, transcribed and analyzed by the researcher. The questions were analyzed on a cross-sectional basis (Mason, 1996). Moreover, non-cross sectional analysis of individual transcripts also revealed additional points. Content analysis was also used for coding data and identifying the categories within data (Patton, 1990).

In this chapter setting and participants, data collection tools, piloting the study were discussed. In the next chapter, the data analysis procedures and the results will be presented in detail. In addition, significant results, both quantitative and qualitative will be displayed in tables.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

The aim of this study was to investigate university preparatory school teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction and reading strategies. The participants of this study were 50 preparatory school teachers who were teaching at Cag University, Cukurova University, and Mersin University in the 2006-2007 academic year. As a first tool, the questionnaire was distributed to 65 teachers, 50 of which were returned. As a second means of data collection, 6 teachers were selected according to the diversity of answers they gave in the questionnaire, and interviewed individually.

The first and second parts of the questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively. For some of the questions, frequencies and percentages were computed. The third part was analyzed through categorization. The fourth, fifth, and sixth parts were analyzed quantitatively using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequencies and percentages of each question were taken. Additionally, Chi-squares were computed in order to see whether the distribution of the answers for each question was significant.

For the interview, 6 participants were chosen. Basically, the participants were selected according to their perception of themselves as readers, the degree of familiarity with the concept of reading strategies they reported, and according to the university they worked at. According to these criteria, 2 of the participants perceived themselves as very good readers, 3 of them perceived themselves as good readers and one of them perceived himself as an average reader. Considering the familiarity with the concept of reading strategies, 2 of the participants were 'very familiar', one of them was the one who reported as being 'slightly' familiar, and the last two were chosen among the participants who said they were 'somewhat' familiar with the concept of reading strategies.

4.2. Results of the Questionnaire

Questionnaire Part 1

In the first part of the questionnaire, the aim was to get some background information about 50 participants, among whom 11 of them were male and 39 were female. Table 4.1 below displays the range of teachers' total years of teaching experience at a university.

Table 4.1. Participants' Teaching Experience at University

Years of teaching experience at university	F	P
1-4	16	32,0%
5-8	8	16,0%
9-12	4	8,0%
13-16	11	22,0%
17 +	11	22,0%
Total	50	100%

Note: F= frequency; P= percentage.

As seen in the table, while 16 participants out of 50 had 1-4 years of teaching experience at university, 11 of the teachers indicated that they had 17 or more years of teaching experience at university. The results showed that the participants who taught at Cukurova University, Cag University, and Mersin University preparatory schools could be regarded as experienced teachers. As seen in table 4.1, 34 of the 50 respondents (68%) have at least five years of teaching experience at university. Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that the teachers are familiar with the education system in general.

Table 4.2 presents the information about the degree programs of the participants completed.

Table 4.2. Degree Programs Completed by the Participants

Degree Completed	F	P
BA	39	78,0%
MA	8	16,0%
PhD	3	6,0%
Total	50	100,0%

Note: F= frequency; P= percentage.

As seen in the above table, while 8 of the participants held M.A. degree, and 3 of the participants held Ph.D. degree, other participants specified having B.A. degrees.

Table 4.3 below displays if the teachers teach reading in a general course or as a separate reading course.

Table 4.3. Teaching Reading in a General Course or as a Separate Course

Type of courses	F	P
In a general course	43	86,0%
Separate reading course	4	8,0%
Both	3	6,0%
Total	50	100,0%

Note: F= frequency; P= percentage.

As seen in the table above the majority of the teachers teach the reading skill in a general course, 4 of the teachers teach reading as a separate reading course and 3 of the teachers teach both in a general course and as a separate reading course.

Questionnaire Part 2

The second part of the questionnaire sought to answer the first research question which was, “How do teachers view themselves as readers in L2” and 1b “Do they use reading strategies in their readings; if yes which strategies do they use?”. This part consisted of 8 open ended questions.

The first question was about teachers’ perception of themselves as readers, the teachers were asked to classify themselves. Table 4.4 below shows the results for this question.

Table 4.4. Teachers’ perception of themselves as readers

	F	P
Very Good	12	24,0%
Good	32	64,0%
Average	4	8,0%
Not Very Good	2	4,0%

Note: F= frequency; P= percentage.

The results of the first question show that the majority of the teachers (88%) perceive themselves as good or very good readers. Among 50 participants, 4 (8%) of the teachers chose average reader option; and only 2 (4%) of the teachers describe themselves as 'not very good reader'.

The participants were also asked the reason behind their perception of themselves as very good, good, average, or not very good readers. 18 of the participants out of 50, preferred not to give any reasons for how they perceived themselves as readers. Four of the participants among the ones who perceive themselves as 'very good' readers responded that they used reading strategies in their readings; others stated that they liked reading. Regarding the participants who viewed themselves as good readers, 6 of them responded that they read a lot, whereas 3 others responded that they did not read a lot; 3 of them stated that they loved reading, 3 of the respondents answered that they used reading strategies; and 2 of the teachers said they found reading boring. Among the 4 participants who viewed themselves as 'average' readers, 3 of them complained about not having enough time for reading. One of the two teachers who described themselves as 'not very good' readers gave the reason of having no time.

The second question was about the type of reading materials that the participants found difficult to understand. Twenty-five of the participants found technical and scientific material difficult to understand; 16 of the participants found ESP (English for specific purpose) materials (i.e. medicine, economy, law, etc...) difficult to understand; 5 of the participants found the texts that they did not have enough background information difficult; and for 2 participants formal texts were difficult. Considering the answers given by the participants it can be assumed that almost all the teachers found the texts which were not familiar to them difficult to understand.

The third question asked about the types of reading materials that the participants found easiest to understand. Eleven of the participants found stories easiest to understand and 13 of the participants found novels easiest to understand. Ten of the participants explained that they found the texts which they were familiar with easiest to understand. For 5 of the teachers all the texts except for the ones with special terminology were easiest to understand. Four teachers found course materials easiest; and 2 of the teachers found almost all the texts easy.

The participants were asked what caused them the greatest difficulty when they tried to understand what they read. Most of the participants (60%) stated that unknown

vocabulary including technical terms and terminology caused them difficulty when they tried to understand what they read. For 8 of the participants lack of concentration, for 6 participants being unfamiliar with the topic and for 3 participants structure of the text; and for 3 participants both unknown vocabulary and the structure of the text caused the greatest difficulty when they tried to understand what they read. We can conclude that unknown vocabulary and unfamiliar texts cause the greatest difficulty for the teachers.

The fifth question was to find out what teachers could do to be better at understanding what they read. Eighteen (36%) participants out of 50 responded that they could use reading strategies (i.e. using a dictionary, taking notes, underlining words, linking the given information, getting some information about the topic before reading, etc.) to be better at understanding what they read. Thirteen participants thought that they could read more; 6 participants needed to concentrate well, and 5 participants thought they could improve their vocabulary to be better at reading.

With the fifth question the participants were asked what they did when they came across a word that they did not understand. Twenty-four of the participants answered that they guessed the meaning of the words; whereas 8 of the participants stated that they used a dictionary. On the other hand, 15 participants responded that they both tried to guess and used a dictionary. Five of the participants who tried to guess the meaning of the word from the context also skipped the word. Two participants explained that they asked someone the meaning of the word if they could not guess.

The seventh question was about the factors that would make the participants stop reading. The participants gave various answers. When we categorize the given answers, 22 participants explained that boring or uninteresting texts would make them stop reading, 10 participants gave the reason of unknown words, 4 participants mentioned the difficult texts, and 6 participants stated that organization and the style of the text would make them stop reading. One of the participants specified that she would stop reading if there was no point in reading that text.

The eighth question asked the respondents what they did when they were reading and they had difficulty. Categorized summary of their responses is shown in table 4.5:

Table 4.5. Q.8 When you are reading and you have difficulty, what do you do?

Answers	No.
Reread	12
Give up reading	7
Stop reading for a while	6
Try to understand the reason	5
Ask for help	4
Get information about the topic	4
Various strategies	4
Simplify	3
No difficulty while reading	1

As can be seen in Table 4.5, the majority of the teachers stated that they would use reading strategies. Only 7 of the participants chose to give up reading when they had difficulty. The teachers reported different ways to deal with difficulties they had while reading. Rereading was commonly reported by the teachers. ‘Various strategies’ which was expressed by four of the participants included strategies like writing, taking notes, underlining, translating, and using the dictionary.

The eighth question also had 3 sub-questions. 8a was “Do you ever repeat what you are reading in your own words?”. Table 4.6 below shows the results.

Table 4.6. Q. 8a Do you ever repeat what you are reading in your own words

	F	P
Always	2	4,0%
Usually	10	20,0%
Sometimes	19	38,0%
Rarely	13	26,0%
Never	6	12,0%

Note: F= Frequency; P= Percentage.

As seen in Table 4.6, the majority of the participants (38%) stated that they sometimes repeated what they were reading in their own words.

Question 8b was about rereading something that did not make sense. Table 4.7 below shows the results for this question.

Table 4.7. Q.8b Do you ever reread something that does not make sense?

	F	P
Always	12	24,0%
Usually	19	38,0%
Sometimes	12	24,0%
Rarely	6	12,0%
Never	1	2,0%

Note: F= Frequency; P= Percentage.

As it is shown in table 4.7, 19 teachers (38%) out of 50, usually reread something that did not make sense whereas 7 of the participants (14%) rarely or never reread something that did not make sense. It can be said that rereading is at least sometimes used by 86% of the teachers.

The last question of this part asked “Do you ever ask yourself questions as you read?”. The results of this question are displayed in table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8. Q. 8c Do you ever ask yourself questions as you read?

	F	P
Always	4	8,0%
Usually	16	32,0%
Sometimes	20	40,0%
Rarely	5	10,0%
Never	5	10,0%
Total	50	100,0%

Note: F= Frequency; P= Percentage.

As Table 7 shows 20 teachers (40%) out of 50 sometimes and 10 of the teachers (20%) rarely or never asked themselves questions as they read.

Questionnaire Part 3

The third part of the questionnaire sought to answer the research question 5b, which was “What are teachers’ purposes for teaching strategies?”

The first question was about the teachers' self-assessed degree of familiarity with the concept of reading strategies. Table 4.9 below shows the results for this question.

Table 4.9. Q.1 How familiar are you with the concept of reading strategies?

	F	P
Very	22	44,0%
Somewhat	20	40,0%
Slightly	7	14,0%
Not at all	1	2,0%
Total	50	100,0%

Note: F= Frequency; P= Percentage.

The results of the first question show that most teachers considered themselves as being 'very' familiar with the concept of reading strategies. Among 50 participants, 20 of them ticked the 'somewhat' option. 7 of the participants said that they were 'slightly' familiar with the concept of reading strategies. Only one teacher indicated the 'not at all' option for this question. The results show that almost all the teachers reported having been familiar with the reading strategies and having some ideas about them.

The participants were asked about the reasons why they taught reading strategies. The second question of part 3 (see table 4.10) aimed at finding out the teachers' reported reasons for teaching reading strategies. In this question, participants were presented various reasons for teaching strategies. They were also given an extra option where they could write their personal reasons, if any, other than ones presented.

Table 4.10. Q.2 What are your reasons for teaching reading strategies in class?

Items	Frequencies of respondents
A. It helps students understand texts better.	46
B. To improve their enjoyment of the texts.	37
C. Because they are included in the pack.	9
D. To develop subskills for developing overall reading skills.	41
E. For the appreciation of the text.	10
F. To have students be aware of the language they are learning.	32
G. To save time while reading.	25
H. To prepare students for the text.	29
I. To enhance autonomy.	33

As seen in Table 4.10, almost all the participants agreed that teaching reading strategies helped the students understand texts better and teaching reading strategies developed subskills for developing overall reading skills. Thirty-seven teachers said that teaching reading strategies improved the students' enjoyment of the texts and 32 of them reported that teaching reading strategies helped students be aware of the language they were learning. 33 teachers indicated that teaching reading strategies enhanced autonomy; which meant they thought helping students to be independent readers was important. Out of 50 participants, none of the respondents gave a reason other than the ones provided.

The third question asked the participants if they took any courses related to teaching reading or reading strategies during their education. Table 4.11 displays the results of this question.

Table 4.11. Q.3 Have you taken any courses related to teaching reading or reading strategies?

	F	P
Took courses related to reading or reading strategies	34	68,0%
Did not take courses related to reading or reading strategies	14	28,0%

Note: F= Frequency; P= Percentage.

As the table shows most of the teachers (68%) took courses related to reading or teaching reading strategies during their education. 14 of the respondents reported that they did not take any courses related to reading or reading strategies. Three teachers added that they took courses about reading and reading strategies in Cote (Certificate for Overseas Teachers). One respondent indicated that she had written her M.A. thesis on reading in a foreign language.

Questionnaire Part 4

The purpose of the fourth part of the questionnaire was to find out which reading strategies teachers report actually teaching. In this part, the participants were presented 37 Likert-type items and then asked to rate the teaching practices presented in this part in consideration of what they actually do while dealing with a reading text in class.

Table 4.12 presents the results for the items that are considered as pre-reading strategies. The general impression is that the teachers do most of pre-reading activities in class before they have students read the text. It is clearly seen that almost all the teachers (80 %) usually or always set a purpose for reading.

Table 4.12. Items Related to Pre-Reading Strategies

Question	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely or Never	χ^2
Q.1	25 (50,0%)	15 (30,0%)	5 (10,0%)	3 (6,0%)	25,667**
Q.2	33 (66,0%)	9 (18,0%)	5 (10,0%)	2 (6,0%)	46,320**
Q.3	36 (72,0%)	8 (16,0%)	4 (8,0%)	2 (4,0%)	60,400**
Q.4	17 (34,0%)	18 (36,0%)	11 (22,0%)	2 (4,0%)	13,500**
Q.5	2 (4,0%)	10 (20,0%)	16 (32,0%)	21 (28,0%)	16,388**
Q.6	7 (14,0%)	16 (32,0%)	11 (22,0%)	14 (28,0%)	3,833
Q.7	37 (74,0%)	7 (14,0%)	4 (8,0%)	2 (4,0%)	65,040**
Q.8	8 (16,0%)	8 (16,0%)	20 (40,0%)	13 (26,0%)	7,898*
Q.9	7 (14,0%)	15 (30,0%)	17 (34,0%)	9 (18,0%)	5,667
Q.10	12 (24,0%)	19 (38,0%)	14 (28,0%)	4 (8,0%)	9,531*

Note: Q1. I set a purpose for reading.

Q2. I ask students to read the titles and predict what the text is about.

Q3. I ask students to look at illustrations/pictures and try to guess how they relate to the text.

Q4. I set a context before students begin reading.

Q5. I use instructional aids (e.g. realia, music, etc.) to set a context.

Q6. I have the students quickly look over the text before reading.

Q7. I ask students warm-up questions related to the text before reading.

Q8. I teach vocabulary before students read the text.

Q9. Before doing discussions or any other activity, I have students read the text.

Q10. I ask students to relate the text/topic to their experience.

χ^2 = Chi-square

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

The Chi-square test results for questions 1,2,3,4,5,7,8 and 10 were all found to be significant. Numbers 1,2,3,4,5, and 7 were significant at a level of $p<.01$ and number 8 and 10 were found to be significant at a level of $p<.05$. According to these results, it can be assumed that instruction in pre-reading strategies is a widespread, common part of these teachers' teaching practices. This may be because the coursebooks include pre-reading activities. Moreover, teachers feel the need to motivate students and set a purpose.

Table 4.13 below presents the results about teachers' vocabulary teaching practices. The results show that teachers do generally pre-teach vocabulary before reading. However, they do not tend to teach the entire new vocabulary in a reading text.

Table 4.13. Questions Related to Vocabulary Teaching

Question	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely or Never	χ^2
Q.8	8 (16,0%)	8 (16,0%)	20 (40,0%)	13 (26,0%)	7,898**
Q.13	16 (32,0%)	10 (20,0%)	10 (20,0%)	14 (28,0%)	2.160

Note: Q8. I teach vocabulary before students read the text.

Q13. I teach all the new vocabulary in the text.

χ^2 = Chi-square

* $p<.05$

The Chi-square results presented in the table above show that the responses to question 8 are significant at a level of $p<.05$. The significant result for this question shows the 32% of the teachers always or usually and 40% of the teachers sometimes teach vocabulary before they have students read the text. However, the results for teaching all the new vocabulary is more evenly divided and therefore, not significant. It can be assumed that the majority of the teachers tend to teach only the necessary vocabulary.

The following discussion is about the use of mono and bilingual dictionaries in reading instruction. The results for these questions are presented in table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14. Questions Related to the Use of Dictionaries

Question	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely or Never	χ^2
Q.14	7 (14,0%)	6 (12,0%)	12 (24,0%)	21 (42,0%)	12,261**
Q.15	16 (32,0%)	11 (22,0%)	15 (30,0%)	7 (14,0%)	4.143

Note: Q14. I ask students to use monolingual dictionary.

Q15. I allow students to use a bilingual dictionary.

χ^2 = Chi-square

** $p < .01$

As seen in the above table, question 14 is about the use of monolingual dictionaries and question 15 is about the use of bilingual dictionaries in reading instruction. Although the Chi-square results show the responses to question 15 to be insignificant, most of the teachers (54%) allow their students to use bilingual dictionaries. The results for question 14, however, are significant at a level of $p < .01$, 42% of the teachers rarely or never ask their students to use a monolingual dictionary, whereas 26% of the teachers always or usually and 24% of the teachers sometimes ask students to use a monolingual dictionary.

After the discussion of teachers' use of pre-reading strategies, the succeeding discussion is about the while-reading strategy practices of teachers in their reading instructions. All the while-reading strategies items in part IV of the questionnaire are presented in table 4.15, along with the frequencies and the Chi-square results.

Table 4.15. Items Related to While-reading Strategies

Question	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely or Never	χ^2
Q.16	25 (50,0%)	12 (24,0%)	9 (18,0%)	4 (8,0%)	19,280**
Q.17	28 (56,0%)	9 (18,0%)	7 (14,0%)	6 (12,0%)	26,000**
Q.18	4 (8,0%)	14 (28,0%)	15 (30,0%)	17 (34,0%)	8,080*
Q.19	12 (24,0%)	12 (24,0%)	10 (20,0%)	16 (32,0%)	1,520
Q.20	9 (18,0%)	22 (44,0%)	9 (18,0%)	9 (18,0%)	10,347*
Q.21	6 (12,0%)	13 (26,0%)	8 (16,0%)	23 (46,0%)	13,840**
Q.22	13 (26,0%)	14 (28,0%)	15 (30,0%)	7 (14,0%)	3,163
Q.23	7 (14,0%)	4 (8,0%)	13 (26,0%)	26 (52,0%)	22,800**
Q.24	10 (20,0%)	13 (26,0%)	21 (42,0%)	6 (12,0%)	9,680*
Q.25	13 (26,0%)	11 (22,0%)	18 (36,0%)	8 (16,0%)	4,240
Q.26	6 (12,0%)	21 (42,0%)	11 (22,0%)	12 (24,0%)	9,360*
Q.27	9 (18,0%)	16 (32,0%)	11 (22,0%)	14 (28,0%)	2,320
Q.28	11 (22,0%)	7 (14,0%)	12 (24,0%)	20 (40,0%)	7,120

Note: Q16. I teach students how to guess the meaning of unknown words.

Q17. I ask students guess/predict the meaning of unknown words.

Q18. I tell the students skip unknown words.

Q19. I ask students to underline unknown words.

Q20. I ask students to underline key words and/or phrases.

- Q21. I ask students to take notes while reading.
- Q22. I ask students to read carefully and slowly.
- Q23. I stress the importance of reading every word.
- Q24. I ask students to read the text more than once.
- Q25. I ask students to try to visualize what they read.
- Q26. I tell students to make guesses about up-coming information in the text.
- Q27. I have students read aloud in class one at a time.
- Q28. I teach students to read the first and last paragraphs more carefully.

χ^2 = Chi-square

** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

Table 4.15 presents the results for questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, which are about the while-reading strategies. Questions 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 26 were found to be significant on a Chi-square test. Questions 16, 17, 21, and 23 were significant at a level of $p < .01$ and questions 18, 20, 24, and 26 were found to be significant at a level of $p < .05$.

Questions 16 and 17 are about guessing the meanings of unknown words. Both of the questions were found to be significant at a level of $p < .01$ on a Chi-square test. For question 16, 74% of the teachers report that they always or usually teach students how to guess/predict the meaning of unknown words. For question 17, again 74% of the teachers said that they always or usually asked students to guess and predict the meaning of unknown words.

For question 18, which was about instructing students to skip unknown words as a strategy, the Chi-square calculation is significant at a level of $p < .05$. We can not conclude that this is a frequent teaching practice. Thirty percent of the respondents reported that they only sometimes told the students to skip unknown words, and 34% of them stated that they rarely or never told the students to skip the unknown words. The results of the question 19 were not found to be significant; it can not be assumed that teachers frequently include underlining unknown words in their teaching reading because 20% of the participants sometimes and 32% of them rarely or never ask students to underline unknown words. On the other hand, majority of the teachers (62%) responded the question 20 that they usually or always included the strategy about underlining key words and/or phrases. The Chi-square calculation for this question is significant at a level of $p < .05$. From the results, we can conclude that the teachers put

more emphasis on the key words/phrases instead of dealing with all the unknown words.

For question 21, the results display that the teachers do not frequently include note taking in their teaching reading instruction. Forty-six percent of the participants reported that they rarely or never asked students to use the note taking strategy. Question 22 is about telling students to read carefully and slowly. Most of the teachers (54%) responded that they always or usually told their students to read carefully and slowly. The calculation of the Chi-square for this question was not significant. Question 23, which was about stressing the importance of reading every word was found to be significant on a Chi-square test. The majority of the teachers (52%) rarely or never stress the importance of reading every word.

Although question 24, which was about reading the text more than once was significant at a level of $p < .05$; 42% of the respondents stated that they sometimes and 46% of the respondents stated that they always or usually asked students to read more than once. When it comes to question 25, 48% of the teachers noted that they usually or always and 36% of the teachers sometimes told students to try to visualize what they read. The Chi-square result for this question was not significant.

The Chi-square test for question 26 (I tell the students to make guesses about up-coming information in the text) revealed significant results at a level of $p < .05$. Fifty-four percent of the teachers responded that they always or usually told the students to make guesses about up-coming information in the text.

Questions 27 (I have students read aloud in class one at a time) and 28 (I teach students to read the first and the last paragraphs more carefully) are the strategies that are not frequently used. The Chi-square calculations for both of the questions were not found to be significant. For question 28, 40% of the participants reported that they rarely or never taught students to read the first and last paragraphs more carefully.

The following discussion is about the data gathered on teachers' practices of post-reading strategies. Table 4.16 presents the results for questions 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37, which are about post-reading strategies. Except for questions 31, 33 and 37; the findings for all the other questions were found to be significant on a Chi-square test. Numbers 29, 32, 34, and 35 were found to be significant at a level of $p < .01$, and numbers 30 and 36 were found to be significant at a level of $p < .05$. Considering these results, we can conclude that post-reading strategies are at least sometimes applied

in the reading instructions. However, as the percentages show in table 4.16, post-reading strategies are not as frequently used as pre-reading strategies.

Table 4.16. Items Related to Post-reading Strategies

Question	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely or Never	χ^2
Q.29	32 (64,0%)	9 (18,0%)	7 (14,0%)	2 (4,0%)	42,640**
Q.30	10 (20,0%)	16 (32,0%)	19 (38,0%)	5 (10,0%)	9,360*
Q.31	19 (38,0%)	12 (24,0%)	11 (22,0%)	8 (16,0%)	5,200
Q.32	15 (30,0%)	22 (44,0%)	11 (22,0%)	2 (4,0%)	16,720**
Q.33	6 (12,0%)	13 (26,0%)	17 (34,0%)	14 (28,0%)	5,200
Q.34	3 (6,0%)	2 (4,0%)	18 (36,0%)	26 (52,0%)	33,694**
Q.35	7 (14,0%)	25 (50,0%)	15 (30,0%)	3 (6,0%)	22,640**
Q.36	4 (8,0%)	10 (20,0%)	19 (38,0%)	15 (30,0%)	10,500*
Q.37	5 (10,0%)	16 (32,0%)	17 (34,0%)	11 (22,0%)	7,408

Note: Q29. I ask comprehension questions about the text.

Q30. I ask students to draw conclusions about the text they have read.

Q31. I ask students to discuss the text after reading.

Q32. I ask students to comment on the text.

Q33. I ask students to summarize the text (written or oral).

Q34. I give students a quiz about the text.

Q35. I give students follow-up activities related to the text.

Q36. I assign students tasks to do using the information in the text.

Q37. I ask students to interpret the texts.

χ^2 = Chi-square

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

For question 29, almost all the teachers, 82% of the teachers, stated that they always or usually asked students comprehension questions about the text. Questions 30, 31, 32, and 33 are about drawing conclusions, commenting on the text and summarizing the text. Although question 30 was found to be significant at a level of $p < .05$ and question 32 was found to be significant at a level of $p < .01$, question 31 was not found to be significant. Considering the percentages, it can be assumed that these strategies are commonly used by the teachers. For question 35, 94% of the participants reported that they at least sometimes assigned students follow-up activities. Question 36 was found to be significant at a level of $p < .05$. Thirty-eight percent of the teachers sometimes and 30% of the teachers never or rarely assigned students tasks to do using the information given in the text. Regarding the item asking students to interpret the text, the results were not found to be significant. The strategy is not commonly preferred by the teachers.

Questionnaire Part 5

This part of the questionnaire was related to the research questions 5, which was “Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction” and 5a, which was “How do teachers choose which strategy to use?” Since it was not possible to get detailed information through other questions at the questionnaire, the purpose of this part was to gain some information as a starting point for the interviews. The questions in this part ask how the teachers make use of the reading strategies in the coursebooks.

Table 4.17 presents the results of the questions asked in part 5 of the questionnaire. The questions in this part asked aimed at investigating whether the teachers make use of the course materials in order to teach reading strategies, to some extent why they choose to do so, and whether they add any additional materials or aids.

The Chi-square calculation for all items, except for question 8, was found to be significant. The answers to questions 1,2,3,4,5,6, and 7 were significant at a level of $p < .01$ and the answer to question 8 was not significant. As a result it can be said that teachers make use of the coursebooks in their reading instructions.

Table 4.17. Questions Presented in Questionnaire Part 5

Question	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely or Never	χ^2
Q.1	35 (70,0%)	10 (20,0%)	3 (6,0%)	2 (4,0%)	57,040**
Q.2	15 (30,0%)	21 (42,0%)	10 (20,0%)	4 (8,0%)	12,560**
Q.3	6 (12,0%)	18 (36,0%)	18 (36,0%)	6 (12,0%)	12,000**
Q.4	7 (14,0%)	20 (40,0%)	17 (34,0%)	6 (12,0%)	11,920**
Q.5	2 (4,0%)	13 (26,0%)	18 (36,0%)	17 (34,0%)	12,880**
Q.6	21 (42,0%)	23 (46,0%)	6 (12,0%)		10,360**
Q.7	8 (16,0%)	3 (6,0%)	18 (36,0%)	21 (42,0%)	17,040**
Q.8	8 (16,0%)	13 (26,0%)	16 (32,0%)	13 (26,0%)	2,640

Note: Q1. I use the pictures in the coursebook.

Q2. I use the instructions step by step in the coursebook.

Q3. I prefer using the 'suggested approach' materials in the book.

Q4. I try to simplify materials in terms of language.

Q5. I make changes in the materials in terms of content.

Q6. When the text is unfamiliar to students, I try to relate it to their culture.

Q7. When the text is culturally unfamiliar to students I skip it and use other materials.

Q8. In addition to the reading text provided, I use extra aids.

χ^2 = Chi-square

**p<.01

For question 1, almost all the participants (90%) said that they always or usually used the pictures in the coursebook. During the interviews participants stated that they used the pictures in the coursebooks as warm-up activities to familiarize the student with the text.

Questions 2,3,4 and 5 were asked to find out if teachers followed the coursebook or modify them. Seventy-two percent of the teachers reported that they followed the instructions step by step in the coursebook and 54% of the teachers reported that they tried to simplify the materials in terms of language. When this issue was raised during the interview, 3 of the participants out of 6 explained that they tried to simplify the material to help the students with the problems they were facing while reading.

Questions 6 and 7 were about cultural issues in the reading texts. All the teachers reported that they tried to relate an unfamiliar text to students' culture. This was voiced by the participants during the interviews. Participant 3 said:

“Well sometimes the texts are not appropriate because it may be about an American or an English issue which is not in the mind set of Turkish culture, so I try to relate them to their own world.”

When the results of the question 6 and 7 are compared, although all the teachers at least sometimes relate the text to the students' culture, skipping an unfamiliar text is not a commonly preferred strategy.

Questionnaire Part 6

The purpose of this part of the questionnaire was to elicit data on teachers' perceptions of the reading strategies presented in the coursebook. In this part, teachers were presented four items and were asked to rate their opinions from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Table 4.18 below presents the results for the questions asked in part 6 of the questionnaire. The Chi-square calculation for questions 1 and 4 were found to be significant whereas the calculation for questions 2 and 3 were not significant.

Table 4.18. Questions Presented in Questionnaire Part 6

Question	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely or Never	χ^2
Q.1	8 (16,0%)	18 (36,0%)	18 (36,0%)	6 (12,0%)	9,840*
Q.2	7 (14,0%)	20 (40,0%)	13 (26,0%)	10 (20,0%)	7,440
Q.3	13 (26,0%)	13 (26,0%)	13 (26,0%)	11 (22,0%)	0,240
Q.4	9 (18,0%)	16 (32,0%)	4 (8,0%)	21 (42,0%)	13,520*

Note: Q1 The way reading materials are designed is appropriate for teaching reading strategies.

Q2. Reading strategies are included in the materials on an ongoing and systematic basis.

Q3. Each text is designed for specific reading strategies.

Q4. The amount of materials on reading strategies presented in the coursebook is sufficient for teaching reading strategies.

χ^2 = Chi-square

* $p < .05$

For question 1, 36% of the teachers indicated that they agreed about the appropriateness in design of the reading materials for teaching reading strategies. For question 2, 54% of the participants strongly agreed or agreed that reading strategies were included in the materials on an ongoing and systematic basis, whereas 26% of the teachers were neutral and 20% of the teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. For question 4, 50% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the amount of materials on reading strategies presented in the coursebook was sufficient for teaching reading strategies; other 50% of the teachers chose 'neutral', 'disagree', or 'strongly disagree' options about the issue. The answers to question 3 seem to be more evenly divided; 26% of the teachers strongly agreed, 26% of the teachers agreed, 26% of the teachers were neutral and 22% of the teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that each text was designed for specific reading strategies.

4.3. Findings from the Interview

For this study, interviews were also used as a data collecting tool. The purpose for using interview was to gather in-depth and detailed information and to explore further how teachers taught reading, their concerns about teaching reading and if they were using reading strategies in their readings.

Six of the 50 participants were asked to participate in the interview phase of the study. As previously explained in chapter 3, the participants were selected according to the answers they had given in the questionnaire. Basically the participants were chosen according to their perception of themselves as readers, their degree of familiarity with the concept of reading strategies and the institute they worked at.

The interview consisted of two parts. The first part sought to find answers to research question 2, which was “How do teachers teach reading?” and question 3, which was “How do teachers think reading should be taught?” and question 4, which was “What are teachers’ concerns about teaching reading?”. The second part of the interview aimed to find answer to question 5, which was “Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction?”, question 5a, which was “How do teachers choose which strategy to use?” and question 5b, which was “What are teachers’ purposes for teaching strategies?”

4.3.1. Interview Findings Part I

Years of Experience in Teaching Reading

The first question in the first part of the interview was about the background of the participants. Table 4.19 below shows the experiences of the participants in teaching reading.

Table 4.19. Years of experience in teaching reading

Participants	Years of experience in teaching reading
P1	20
P2	3
P3	3
P4	10
P5	20
P6	10

Note: P= participant.

All the teachers can be considered as experienced in reading instruction.

Difficulties Students face in Reading Lessons

The second question was about the difficulties students faced in the classroom. Regarding the difficulties students faced in the classroom, all the participants mentioned students' limited knowledge of vocabulary, structure, limited knowledge of grammar, unfamiliar topic and also inappropriate level of the text. Apart from these, participant 5 mentioned wrong use of strategy by the students and their different learning styles. For example she said,

“...Since they tend to understand the text in detail or because of their different learning styles they face difficulties. They also face difficulties because they have never applied reading strategies in their life, or they apply wrong strategies; I mean the strategies that are not in accordance with the text or what they are asked to do...”

Participant 3 had a different point of view considering the tasks that students were asked to do, he said,

“...the difficulty they face sometimes depends on what they are asked to do after reading, for example if they are asked to analyze or evaluate, if they are to answer true or false as an assessing.”

Solutions to Problems Students Face in Reading Lessons

Although the participants talked about the similar problems which students faced during reading, when they were asked the kinds of solutions they suggested for the

difficulties students faced, their answers were quite different. About the lack of vocabulary knowledge, which causes difficulty when students do reading in L2, participants suggested different solutions. Table 4.20 below shows the answers given by the participants.

Table 4.20. Solutions suggested for students' limited knowledge of vocabulary

Factors	Mentioned by
Use of dictionary	P1, P3, P5, P6
Guess the meaning of words	P4, P5, P6
Give the definitions	P1
Give Turkish meaning	P2
Underline the words	P6

Note: P= Participant.

Basically, the teachers focused on guessing the meaning of the words and using a dictionary. Three of the teachers stated that they preferred guessing the meaning of the words from the context and 4 of the teachers preferred asking the students to use a dictionary. On the contrary, one of the teachers said they would let the students learn the Turkish meanings.

Solutions to Difficulties Regarding Structure or Grammar of the Text

Regarding the difficulties students had about the structure or grammar of the text, participant 1 and 2 stated that they would simplify the sentences; participant 5 responded that she would make explanations and give examples. As a general suggestion for the difficulties students face in a reading class participants 4, 5, and 6 explained that they would help the students use reading strategies. Participant 6 said, "I try to do the reading task step by step and I try to have them use reading strategies."

Strategies to Ensure Students' Understanding of the Material

The participants were asked what they did to ensure that students understood the reading material. All the participants agreed that students' answering the questions displayed how much they understood the reading material. Participant 5 said, "For sure

there has to be a task to do, the important thing is that if they could answer the questions or the ratio of their right answers is important.” Participant 3 said:

“I assess the students every week in some form whether as an oral presentation or they have to do a quiz. So that you continually monitor, I think continual assessment is necessary.”

Factors Affecting the Degree of Success of a Reading Instruction

Table 4.21 shows the participants’ points of views affecting the degree of success of a reading instruction.

Table 4.21. Factors affecting the degree of success of a reading instruction mentioned by the teachers

Factors	Mentioned by
Interesting Material	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
Appropriate level	P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
Motivation	P3, P5, P6
The teacher	P4, P5, P6
Warm-up activity	P2
Different activities	P1
Knowledge of the grammar	P2
Good learning environment	P3
Current material	P4

Note: P= participant.

All the participants agree that the text is an important factor to affect the degree of success of a reading instruction. For example, Participant 6 said,

“...when students face a text which does not interest them, their motivation decreases and they can not comment on the text...”

Three of the participants viewed the teacher factor as affecting the degree of success of a reading instruction. Despite the fact that most of the teachers see the material as a key factor, Participant 6 said,

“If a teacher does not do what is required to do, even a good and an interesting text may be boring to the students.”

Properties of a Reading Instruction

In parallel to the factors affecting the degree of success of a reading instruction, the teachers were also asked what the properties of a reading instruction should be. Participant 5 clearly stated that reading instruction should involve teaching reading strategies as she said:

“As a result of all my experience for years, I can say that the aim should be teaching reading strategies. The student should know why he or she is reading and the strategy should help him or her reach his goal.”

Participants 2, 4, and 6 talked about some strategies which should be the properties of a reading instruction, they did not talk under the name of reading strategies concept in general. They named some pre-reading strategies and other strategies such as guessing the meanings of the words, skimming and scanning.

Participant 1 indicated that the reading instruction should lead the student to learn the vocabulary and the grammar. She said,

“One of the aims of teaching reading is to teach vocabulary. They learn the vocabulary, use the vocabulary, and also they use the grammar.”

In contrast to this, participant 6 pointed out that teaching vocabulary was not the priority of a reading instruction.

4.3.2 Interview Findings Part II

The second part of the interview was designed to find out what they thought reading strategies were, if teachers were using and teaching reading strategies, how they chose which strategy to use and their purposes for teaching strategies. The interviewees were asked what they thought reading strategies were or the reasons for using reading strategies. This question was asked because before asking questions about reading strategies it was necessary to find out what the concept of reading strategies meant to them. Three of the participants were not sure what reading strategies were. For instance participant 1 said,

“Strategy is a teaching style I think. According to our aim we should apply different strategies like skimming or scanning.”

The other 3 participants had the idea that reading strategies caused better understanding of a text. P4 said,

“Reading strategies are to make a reading task easier for a student and make the student gain speed while reading.”

Similarly, participant 5 said,

“We use reading strategies to be better and conscious readers. We can read depending on what we need...”

It can be said that the teachers have a similar concept in their minds regarding the reading strategies. They had a general idea about what reading strategies are.

Use of Reading Strategies

All the participants were asked about the reading strategies they used in their own reading process and whether they taught the strategies in their reading instruction. The answers to these questions were quite diverse. Among six interviews, 3 participants (P3, P5, and P6) expressed clear awareness of the use of reading strategies in their daily lives and the use of the appropriate reading strategies in their classroom instruction. Two of the participants (P1 and P2) were not sure about the reading strategies they used in their daily lives. One participant (P4) said that she was not using any reading strategies because she read for pleasure.

However, P6 clearly stated her awareness of reading strategies in her daily life as such:

“I use some particular strategies. For example, I try to find what the words or pronouns refer to. I reread and try to guess the meanings of the words; if I need something in detail I scan the text or if I need just general information I skim. The strategy I use depends on the text.”

When she was asked if she was teaching any reading strategies in class, she said,

“I teach reading strategies but not by giving the names of strategies, but according to the level of the students I teach them some strategies like finding references. Also the coursebook leads the students to use some particular reading strategies.”

Similarly, P5 said,

“Actually I do not need to use reading strategies, but I use when I read a newspaper or I read about my profession. I use scanning and skimming. When I need details or looking for some certain information I use scanning. It depends on what I read and the reason I am reading for.”

She was also asked if she was teaching any reading strategies in her instruction, her answer was:

“Our coursebook involves teaching strategies in reading. Even if we do not directly express the name of the strategy the book names it...Our aim is to make students independent readers. Our exam also requires using certain strategies.”

Participant 2 said he was not sure about using reading strategies in his daily life. He said, “Indeed I use reading strategies unconsciously. I can not name the strategies. First of all, I do not use the dictionary for every word; I try to guess the meaning of the words... I am not sure if it is a strategy... I look at the title or pictures.” When he was asked if he was teaching reading strategies, he said:

“I usually ask the students to use the strategies that the coursebook suggests... I want them to guess the meanings of the words or use a dictionary... I do not want to do anything wrong. I do not want to apply wrong strategies.”

Although participant 4 stated that she did not use any reading strategies, she stated that she was teaching reading strategies such as guessing the meaning of the words, summarizing, guessing what is going to happen next.

Considering the answers given by the teachers, we can say that the strategies included in the coursebooks are primarily preferred. Four of the participants (P1, P2, P5, and P6) said that they used the reading strategies suggested by the books. For instance participant 1 said, “If the book suggests any strategies I teach them. The book gives the methods anyway. I follow the suggested strategies of the book.”

When participants were asked if they were modeling any strategies to their students to make comprehension easier, 4 of the participants stated that they did not do any modeling by giving various reasons. Participant 1 said, “I have never done that... I only guide them to find the main idea sometimes.” Only participant 6 explained that she did modeling. She said:

“I model guessing the meaning from the context, finding keywords, finding references, and using the dictionary like how they are going to find the parts of speech or the meaning of the word which is suitable to the text.”

Almost all of the participants believe that guiding the students to use particular strategies will help the student and it is sufficient.

Pre-reading Strategies

During the interview, the participants were asked what they did before having students read the text. Table 4.22 shows the answers given by the participants.

Table 4.22. Pre-reading Strategies Teachers Mentioned During the Interviews

Vocabulary Related	Mentioned by	Topic Related	Mentioned by
Pre-teaching key words	P1	Asking questions	P1, P2
Underlining key words	P2	Using strategies	P2
Guessing the meaning	P2	Using the title	P3, P5
		Using the picture	P3, P5
		Activating schemata	P3, P4, P5, P6
		Relate to prior lesson	P5

Note: P= participant.

Majority of the participants (4 out of 6) reported that they tried to relate students background knowledge to the information in the text (activating schemata) prior to actual reading. In order to activate students' schemata or relate students' background knowledge with the context, participants made use of the title and pictures in the book. For instance participant 3 said:

“Our book is good that way...There is a title and a picture, so before we read we try to have a discussion about the picture and the book does give questions to prepare the students for the text. As an example, we read about a bakery business and having your own business and in the picture a man was holding a piece of bread and the question was ‘Would you like to have your own business?’ So there will be discussion before we go on reading. They get the general picture.”

Similarly, P4 said that they had a discussion or did brainstorming about the topic. Although P1 and P2 did not explicitly stated that they activated students schemata, they both said that they asked some questions about the topic.

While Reading Strategies

During the interviews it was observed that teachers paid less attention to while-reading strategies than pre-reading strategies. Table 4.2 shows the responses given by the interviewees.

Table 4.23. While-reading Strategies Participants Mentioned During the Interviews

While-reading Strategies	Mentioned by
Guessing the meaning from context	P2, P3, P4, P6
Giving tasks	P1, P5
Anticipating what is to come	P4, P5
Using tasks in the book	P2
Asking questions	P3
Emphasizing some points	P3
Skimming	P6

Note: P= participant

As seen in the table above, 4 of the participants out of 6 mentioned the strategy of guessing the meaning of unknown words from context. Giving tasks before students start reading and having the students guess what is going to happen next mentioned by 2 of the participants. When the participants were asked about while-reading strategies, the answers of P6, who is ‘somewhat’ familiar with the concept of reading strategies, and P5 who is ‘very’ familiar with the concept of reading strategies, were quite different from each other. P6 said:

“I focus on how they read, their pronunciation and intonation. I try to have them read by focusing on the punctuation... I do not do anything to help their comprehension at this stage. They try to understand themselves.”

However, participant 5 gave an answer which was more based on strategy training as follows:

“We never tell them just to read the text. They should have an aim. They certainly must find some information in the text. They can use skimming for example. If the text is suitable we ask what is going to happen next.”

P1 and P5 talked about giving students a task. P1 said “I tell them to focus on some points depending on the questions that I am going to ask.” P5 said “...while they are reading I ask some questions so that the students have a goal...”

These comments of teachers show that they use limited number of while reading strategies.

Post-reading Strategies

The participants were also asked if they were encouraging their students to use reading strategies after reading. As seen in the table below teachers mentioned limited number of strategies for post-reading.

Table 4.24. Post-reading Strategies Participants Mentioned During the Interviews

Post-reading Strategies	Mentioned by
Answering the questions	P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6
Summarizing	P1, P5, P6
Commenting on the text	P1, P4
Drawing conclusions	P5, P6
Making questions	P6
Using the new vocabulary	P3

Note: P= participant

As seen in Table 4.24, almost all the participants talked about similar strategies: answering the questions and summarizing. Commenting on the text and drawing conclusions are the secondary activities. All the participants seemed to be using the comprehension questions given in the text. P2 also added that:

“We answer the questions given with the text. Sometimes I ask some more questions about the important points to check if they have understood. Sometimes I ask

follow-up questions to see if the students really understood or just memorized the answer.”

In addition to answering the questions P6 said she had the students make questions about the text.

Four of the participants told that they spoke about the text; they summarized, commented on the text, or they drew conclusions. Regarding this post-reading strategy P4 said “...we talk about the text, if the students understand the text and find it interesting they have a lot to say...” Similarly, P1 said “In the last phase we summarize the text or I ask them what they liked the most or what they understood.”

Strategy Selection

In order to find answer to the research question 5a, which was “How do teachers choose which strategy to use?” interviews were used. The interviews showed that the text was important about deciding on the strategy and the teachers generally used the strategies suggested by the books. For example P2 said the following:

“I follow what the book suggests. I think because the books suggest the best strategy according to the text. I do not want to do anything wrong.”

Similarly P3 said, “The book guides you to use which strategy when.” P1, P2, P4, and P6 stated that their choice of criteria depended on the text. P6 said:

“The reading material is my criterion when choosing the strategy and it depends on the aim... I have to work on the text and guide the students.”

In contrast to other participants, P5 said she chose the text based on the strategy to teach. She said;

“We teach many reading strategies. The exam determines the strategy to teach to some extent, I mean we teach the strategies that will help the student in the exam such as guessing, scanning or skimming. The criteria for the strategy is the coursebook and the coursebook is in accordance with our aim but we sometimes support the strategies given in the book. For example we do not focus on open-ended questions because our exam questions are not open-ended type.”

It can be said that the teachers mostly rely on the strategies given in the books. They can also teach some extra strategies depending the type and level of the text.

4.4. Summary of Findings

In the data analysis chapter, both the results of the questionnaire and the interview were presented. Some parts of the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively; the interview and part 2 in the questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively.

The general impression from the questionnaire is that when the teachers were asked to rate themselves as readers the majority of the teachers found themselves good or very good readers. It is difficult for them to understand the texts which they do not provide any background knowledge or enough vocabulary knowledge. Most of the teachers have at least an idea of what reading strategies are and why they need to teach reading strategies. From the questionnaire and interview results we can conclude that teachers tend to use more pre-reading strategies such as making use of pictures, titles and while-reading strategies like anticipating what is to come, or guessing the meaning of the word from the context. On the contrary, it seems that teachers are less likely to use post-reading strategies.

The teachers reported that the reading material should be interesting or at least related to the background knowledge of the students. The participants also pointed out that teachers' beliefs, which formed the basis of the way the teacher approaches to reading instruction, was another important factor. In addition to this, although most of the teachers did not express clear awareness of reading strategies, they thought that reading instruction should involve strategy training.

According to the teachers, students' limited knowledge of vocabulary was the most important difficulty students faced with in understanding a text. As Laufer (2003) states no text comprehension is possible without understanding the text's vocabulary and it has been consistently demonstrated that reading comprehension is strongly related to vocabulary knowledge, more strongly than to the other components of reading. In such cases teachers generally suggested guessing the meaning of words from context and using a dictionary. During the interviews, all the participants reported that students also faced difficulties while reading because of lack of the knowledge of grammar, unfamiliar topic and inappropriate level of the text. Nevertheless, the teachers' suggested solutions to the problems were quite diverse. They stated that they simplified the text, made explanatory sentences, and gave examples. Some of the teachers also explained that they made the students use reading strategies.

When the teachers were asked about the factors affecting the degree of success of a reading instruction two of the participants mentioned motivation. According to Gardner (in Narayanan, 2006), the term motivation in a second language learning context is seen as referring to the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so. What the two participants had in mind about motivation was quite different. Participant 3 talked about the intrinsic motivation (i.e. the urge to engage in the learning activity for its own sake) of the student, he said, “I think motivation is the key...the student has the responsibility, if they are not motivated, no mentor or resources can help the students learn.” When participant 5 talked about the motivation she meant the extrinsic motivation (i.e. motivation that is derived from external incentives), she said, “The most important thing is the motivation, why he is reading the text, how the strategy will help him, and the text should be motivating.”

The participants were also asked if they were using any reading strategies and which strategies they were using. Five of the participants (P1, P2, P3, P5, and P6) expressed that they used ‘skimming’ and ‘scanning’ strategies in their daily lives. However, when they were asked if they were teaching reading strategies in their reading instruction and which strategies they were teaching, none of the participants said that they taught ‘skimming’ or ‘scanning’. Only P6 mentioned ‘skimming’ and ‘scanning’ as a while reading strategy that she suggested her students to use.

For the use of the materials on reading strategies, most of the teachers followed the tasks given by the books such as visuals, questions or strategies suggested to guide the students. Although the participants did not strongly agree that the reading strategies presented in the coursebooks were well-designed, they relied on the strategies suggested by the books.

On the whole, it seems that outcome of the interviews are consistent with the results gathered from the questionnaire. The answers given during the questionnaire provided answers to some of the research questions which were not asked in the questionnaire and also provided deeper insight to the answers given in the questionnaire.

In this chapter data analysis procedures and the results were presented. In the next chapter, the findings of this study and implications for reading instruction and teaching reading strategies will be discussed.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary of the Study

This study investigated teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction and reading strategies. For this study, a questionnaire and an interview were used as data collection tools. The participants of this study were 50 preparatory school teachers out of Cag University, Cukurova University, and Mersin University in the 2006-2007 academic year. A questionnaire was administered to 50 teachers in order to get a general picture of their views of themselves as readers and their reading strategy instruction. The responses to the questionnaire were recorded and analyzed quantitatively and one part was analyzed qualitatively by the researcher.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted after the analysis of the questionnaires. For the interviews, 6 participants were chosen according to their perception of themselves as readers, their degree of familiarity with the concept of reading strategies and the institution they worked at. The aim of the interview was to get in-depth information about their strategy training and find answers to how they taught reading, how they thought reading should be taught and their concerns about teaching reading in the classroom. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed by the researcher. The interview consisted of two parts. The first part was about general reading instruction and the second part was about teaching reading strategies.

5.2. Conclusions

In response to the first research question, which was "How do teachers view themselves as readers in L2?" and "Do they use reading strategies in their readings; if yes which strategies do they use?" the findings from the questionnaire showed that the majority of the teachers (88%) viewed themselves good or very good readers and they reported using reading strategies but only limited number of the interviewees expressed clear awareness of using reading strategies in their own readings. They tend to use such

strategies as skimming, scanning, guessing the meanings of unknown words, and using the dictionary.

Along with the questionnaire, the interviews also provided fruitful information in response to the research questions. With the interview, the second research question, which was “How do teachers teach reading?”, was researched. According to the teachers’ reports we can conclude that they prefer using pre-reading, while reading, and post-reading strategies and they follow the activities or the strategies suggested by the books. Such instruction combines direct teaching of several strategies while students are reading and comprehending a text (Grabe, 2004). Students learn to engage with texts strategically through a process of teacher modeling, teacher support, and gradual independent use of strategies to comprehend the text better (*ibid.*).

The third research question, which was “How do teachers think reading should be taught?”, revealed that teachers think the reading material and the teacher are important factors affecting the success of a reading instruction. They reported that the reading material should be interesting or at least related to the background knowledge of the students. Similarly, Salatacı and Akyel (2002) found out that the texts should be based on learners’ interest and background knowledge. The participants also pointed out that teachers’ beliefs, which formed the basis of the way the teacher approaches to reading instruction, was another important factor. As reported in the literature by Yigiter, Saricoban and Gurses (2005) teachers are sources of ideas for developing reading strategies. Although most of the teachers did not express clear awareness of reading strategies, they thought that reading instruction should involve strategy training.

The fourth research question aimed to find out about teachers’ concerns about teaching reading in the classroom. During the interviews, all the participants reported that students faced difficulties because of lack of the knowledge of vocabulary and grammar, unfamiliar topic and inappropriate level of the text. Text comprehension requires both language knowledge (vocabulary and grammar knowledge) and recognition of key ideas (Grabe, 2004). Since unfamiliar topic creates difficulties for students in comprehending a text, teachers should make sure that the passage is on a topic that is familiar to their students or students should be made familiar with the topic (Day, 1994).

The teachers’ suggested solutions to the problems were quite diverse. They stated that they simplified the text, made explanatory sentences, and gave examples. Some of the teachers also explained that they made the students use reading strategies.

The fifth research question, which was “Are teachers using or teaching reading strategies in reading instruction” was searched through both by the questionnaire and the interview. The teachers who used reading strategies in their daily lives seemed to make more use of strategy use in their instructions. According to the results of the questionnaire, most of the teachers reported teaching almost all the listed pre-reading strategies, such as predicting what the text was about by making use of the pictures or titles provided in the book, setting a context, or relating the text to the background knowledge of the students. During the interviews, the teachers also mentioned similar strategies. Relating students’ background knowledge to the information in the text is mentioned by the majority of the teachers. Following the findings of schema theory as explained in section 2.2, interactive models of reading suggest that readers reconstruct the text information, based on the text, and on prior knowledge available to them (Rivas, 1999). In order to activate students’ schemata participants stated that they made use of the title and the pictures in the book. By doing this, teachers believed that they would motivate students and provide an aim for reading the text. Possible reasons for high usage of pre-reading strategies might be that pre-reading strategies are emphasized in the coursebooks.

As for while reading strategies, teachers reported that they used guessing the meaning of unknown words from context or skipping unknown words instead of stressing the importance of every word, underlining key words, and guessing the upcoming information from the context. During the interviews, it was seen that participants who perceived themselves ‘very’ familiar with the concept of reading strategies made more use of the while reading strategies than the teachers who perceived themselves ‘slightly’ familiar with the concept of reading strategies. Regarding teachers’ making less usage of while reading strategies, Barnett (1988) explains that helping students to employ strategies in while reading phase can be difficult because individual students need different strategies, yet teachers can pinpoint valuable strategies and explain which strategies individuals most need to practice.

The results of both the questionnaire and the interviews revealed that teachers made less use of the post-reading strategies; this may be because they are less familiar or place less value on post-reading strategies. Two of the participants gave the reason of not having enough time. Almost all of the teachers reported asking comprehension questions. Some of the teachers made use of drawing conclusions, commenting on the

text, and summarizing. During the interviews, almost all of the participants talked about two specific strategies, which were answering the questions and summarizing.

The second extension of the fifth research question was: “How do teachers choose which strategy to use?” In order to answer this research question, teachers were directly asked during the interviews if they had any criterion when choosing a strategy and they told indirectly while answering the questions about the strategies they made use of. In part 6 of the questionnaire most of the teachers expressed their satisfaction with the design and amount of the reading strategies, the general outcome showed that the text was important about deciding on the strategy and the teachers generally used the strategies suggested by the books. As it was discussed in the data analysis chapter, almost all of the teachers reported making use of titles, pictures and comprehension questions in the coursebooks.

The third extension of the fifth research question was: “What are teachers’ purposes for teaching strategies?” Their purposes for teaching certain strategies which were elicited through the questionnaire were as follow:

- * To help students understand texts better,
- * To develop subskills for developing overall reading skills,
- * To improve students’ enjoyment of the texts,
- * To enhance autonomy,
- * To have students be aware of the language they are learning,
- * To prepare students for the text,
- * To save time while reading.

The responsibilities of teachers are to train students to determine their own goals and strategies and how to use all these strategies according to their levels, interests, and needs. It is also emphasized in the reading research that creating independent readers, focusing on the text and making use of appropriate strategies should be the long-term goal of strategy training (Grant, 1994 & Janzen, 2003). If the students know what they are doing and their benefits, they are going to enhance their efficiency of reading comprehension to become independent which is the aim of the foreign language teachers (Yigiter, Saricoban & Gurses, 2005).

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

Based on teachers' views, the reading texts should be familiar to the student, with a familiar text it would be easier to activate student schemata and motivate them to read the text. Culturally bound texts prevent students to get involved in the reading texts; therefore the texts should be chosen according to students' needs, interest, and level. Readers comprehend texts better when texts are culturally familiar or when they relate to well-developed disciplinary knowledge of a reader (Grabe, 2004).

Lack of time was an issue raised by participants during the interviews. Most of the teachers stated that they taught the reading skill in a general course and because of that they did not have enough time. If the reading instruction is taught as a separate course, it may be more possible to focus on strategies and enough time can be allocated.

Especially for the teachers who are not very familiar with the concept of reading strategies, more explanations, explicit instructions or why to use certain strategies should be given with the books or in teachers' books. If the teachers can pass on to their students why they should learn some strategies, it may be easier to get the students involved in the strategy training process.

Various workshops might be organized for the teachers. Through workshops, teachers might be informed about the concept of reading strategies, different strategies and how to train students on those strategies. In such cases teachers will gain more familiarity with reading strategy instruction and they will be able to share their views and experiences.

As the teachers base their strategy instruction on the strategies suggested by the books, the books should be well-designed for strategy training. Because the teachers in the present study seemed to be more focused on pre-reading strategies than post-reading strategies; the number and the type of post-reading strategies could be increased. Some of the participants explained that they made use of the comprehension questions to ensure that students understood the reading material. Other post-reading activities like summarizing, speaking, or writing show how much students understood the text. Also with these activities the newly learned language and other skills can be enhanced. With respect to the mentioned benefits, more post-reading activities might be included in the books.

Some of the teachers indicated that they taught certain strategies without drawing students' attention to the importance of them. Raising students' consciousness on the value and usefulness of reading strategies is also important. As the aim is to help students become autonomous learners, the students should have clear awareness of using reading strategies.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

The research study investigated the teachers' perceptions towards reading instruction and reading strategy training of 50 teachers who taught at preparatory schools of Cag University, Cukurova University, and Mersin University in the 2006-2007 academic year. Since the research was done with a limited number of participants, the results of the study can only be generalized to the teachers who share similar characteristics with these participants. It is, however, possible to draw lessons for teachers working in other contexts.

The study was also limited in that it relied only on teachers' reports, and no classroom observations were done to support the findings.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

Because of the time and distance constraints, involving all the teachers working at preparatory schools of different universities was not possible. The study could be replicated to include a greater number of instructors teaching at different universities. This would allow for a greater exploration of teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction and reading strategies.

Another possibility for future research would be to add an observation element to the study to find out whether and how teachers really teach reading. Additionally, students could be included in a future study. Their perception of teaching reading and strategies might also be investigated in order to allow for a comparison of teachers' and students' ideas. Alternatively, students could be observed in the following years in order to see how they benefit from reading strategy training.

5.6 Conclusion

The research investigated teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction and reading strategies. The study revealed that teachers who use reading strategies in their daily lives are more knowledgeable about reading strategies and they have a clear awareness of the reading strategies while instructing in the classroom.

Unfamiliar texts, lack of vocabulary, and grammar knowledge, inappropriate level of the text were the common points that the teachers reported regarding the difficulties students faced in a reading class. Teachers reported that in case of difficulties teachers either helped directly to the students or guided them to use reading strategies. Most of the teachers thought that a good reading instruction should involve strategy training.

Teachers tend to use more pre-reading strategies than post-reading strategies. Lack of time, students' boredom, or limited number of activities included in the books were given as reasons for little use of post-reading strategies by teachers. According to the results, for the use of strategies, teachers rely on the strategies suggested by the books. From the interviews conducted it can be concluded that different types of strategies and explicit strategy instructions could be included in the books.

The results of the studies and pedagogical implications might be used for better results in reading instruction and strategy training in reading instruction.

REFERENCES

- Abdal_Haqq, I. (1998). *Constructivism in teacher education: considerations for those who would like practice to theory*. Retrieved September 12, 2005, from <http://www.ericdigests.org/1999-3/theory.htm>
- Allan, J. & Bruton, A. (1997). *Teaching and developing reading in secondary school*. Retrieved August 21, 2005, from <http://www.scrc.ac.uk/rie/nl59/nl59allanbruton.html>
- Allan, J. & Bruton, A. (1998). *Squeezing out the juice: Perceptions of reading in the secondary school*. Retrieved August 5, 2005, from [http:// www.scrc.ac.uk/spotlight/spotlight61.html](http://www.scrc.ac.uk/spotlight/spotlight61.html)
- Auerbach, E. R. & Paxton, D. (1997). It is not the English thing: Bringing reading research into the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31/2, 237-261.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barnett, M. A. (1988). Teaching reading in a foreign language. *ERIC Digest*, ED305829. Retrieved November 21, 2005, from <http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9211/reading.htm>
- Brantmeier, C. (2002). Second language reading strategy research at the secondary and university levels: variations, disparities, and generalizability. *The Reading Matrix*, 2/3. Retrieved December 5, 2005, from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/brantmeier/article.pdf>
- Canella, G. S. & Reiff J. C. (1994). Individual constructivist teacher education: Teachers as empowered learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 21(3), 27-38.

- Carrell, P. L. (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. *Modern Language Journal*, 68, 332-343.
- Carrell, P. L. (1987). Content and formal schemata in ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21/3, 461-481.
- Carrell, P. L. (1989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 121-134.
- Carrell, P. L. (1995). Some causes of text-boundedness and schema inference in ESL reading. In P. L. Carrell, J Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 101-113). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P. L. & Eisterhold J. C. (1995). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 73-92). New York: 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.
- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of modern language teaching*, 1/1. Retrieved August 30, 2006, from <http://eflt.nus.edu.sg/v1n12004/chamot.pdf#search=%22issues%20in%20language%20learning%20strategy%20research%20chamot%22>
- Civelek, M. (2002). A study on cognitive reading strategy use of ELT students at Dicle University through think aloud. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Dicle University, Diyarbakır.

- Day, R. R. (1994). Selecting a passage for EFL reading class. *English Teaching Forum*, 32/1. Retrieved September, 2006 from <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol32/no1/p20.htm>
- El-Okda, M. (2005). EFL student teachers' cognition about reading instruction. *The Reading Matrix*, 5/2. Retrieved June 15, 2006 from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/okda/article.pdf>
- Ekmekci, O. & Okan, Z. (1996). A look at learners' strategies: Effects of strategy training in language learning. *Dil dergisi*, 60, 16-30.
- Eskey, D. E. & Grabe, W. (1995). Interactive models for second language reading: perspectives on instruction. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 223-238). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Garner, R. (1987). *Metacognition and reading comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Goodman, K. S. (1968). The psycholinguistic nature of the reading process. In K. S. Goodman (Ed.), *The psycholinguistic nature of the reading process* (pp. 13-26). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Goodman, K.S. (1995). The reading process. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 11-21). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25/3, 375-406.
- Grabe, W. (1995). Reassessing the term "interactive". In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 56-70). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24. Retrieved August 22, 2005, from <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayfulltext?type>
- Grant, R. (1994). Comprehension strategy instruction: Basic considerations for instructing at-risk college students. *Journal of Reading*, 38/1, 42-48.
- Gray, A. (1997). *Constructivist teaching and learning*. Retrieved September 22, 2005, from <http://www.ssta.sk.ca/research/instruction/97-07.htm>
- Gural, M. M. (2000). The role of teaching cognitive and metacognitive strategies in developing reading comprehension of foreign language learners. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Guzel, O. (1996). Strategies for solving reading comprehension. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Gazi University, Ankara.
- Hacker, J. D. (1998). Self-regulated comprehension during normal reading. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in educational theory and practice* (pp. 165-191). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Jager, B. (2002). *Teaching reading comprehension: The effects of direct Instruction and cognitive apprenticeship on comprehension skills and metacognition*. Retrieved August 4, 2005, from <http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/faculties/ppsw/2002/b.de.jager/>
- Janzen, J. (2003). Teaching strategic reading. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 287-294). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kamhi-Stein Lia D. (2003). Reading in two languages: How attitudes toward home language and beliefs about reading affect the behaviors of 'underprepared' L2 college readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37/1, 35-71.

- Laufer, B. (2003). The lexical plight in second language reading: Words you don't know, words you think you know, and words you can't guess. In J. Coady & Thomas Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 20-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, A., Ferenz, O. & Reves, T. (2000). EFL academic reading and modern technology: How can we turn our students into independent critical readers? *TESL-EJ*, 4, 1-9. Retrieved August 12, 2006, from <http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej16/al.html>
- Marshall, N. (2004). The students: Who are they and how do I reach them? In D. Lapp, J. Flood, & N. Farnan (Eds.), *Content area reading and learning instructional strategies* (pp. 79-93). Mahwah, N. J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
- Mei-yun, Y. (1989). Teaching efficient EFL reading. *English Teaching Forum*, 27/2, 13-16.
- Narayanan R. (2006). *Motivation variables and second language learning*. Retrieved May 12, 2007, from <http://www3telus.net/linguisticissues/motivationvariables>
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (2002). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orton, R. E. (1996). *Teacher beliefs and student learning*. Retrieved September 15, 2007, from http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/96_docs/orton.html

- Oxford, R. & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: Methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 404-419.
- Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning strategies in a nutshell: Update and ESL Suggestions. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodolgy in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 124-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pang, S. E., Muaka, A., Bernhardt, B., & Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Teaching reading*. Retrieved August 3, 2005, from <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/Publications/EducationalPracticesSeriesPdf/prac12e.pdf>
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. California: Sage Publications
- Peregoy, S. F. & Boyle, O. F. (2001). *Reading, writing, & learning ESL*. New York: Longman.
- Raskin, J. D. (2002). Constructivism in psychology: Personal construct psychology, radical constructivism, and social constructivism. *American Communication Journal*, 5/3. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from <http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol5/iss3/speacil/raskin.pdf>
- Richards, J. C. (2000). *Beyond training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B. & Renandya W. A. (2002). *Exploring teachers' beliefs and the process of change*. Retrieved December 11, 2005, from <http://www.professorjackrichards.com/pdfs/exploring-teacher-change.pdf>
- Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1997). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Rivas, R. M. M. (1999). Reading in recent ELT coursebooks. *ELT Journal*, 53/1, 12-21.
- Sadık, S. (2005). Effects of strategy instruction focus activities on students' reading strategy use. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Salataci, R. & Akyel, A. (2002). Possible effects of strategy instruction on L1 and L2 reading. *Reading in a foreign language*, 14/1. Retrieved November 11, 2005 from <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2002/salataci/salataci.html>
- Sallı, A. (2002). Teachers' perception of strategy training in reading instruction. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Singhal M. (2001). Reading proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness and L2 readers. *The Reading Matrix*, 1/1. Retrieved February 12, 2006 from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/singhal/article.pdf>
- Spivey, N. N. & Mellon, C. (1989). *Construing constructivism: Reading research in the United States*. Retrieved September 15, 2005, from <http://www.writingproject.org/downloads/csw/OP12.pdf>
- Susser, B. & Robb, T. N. (1990). EFL extensive reading instruction: Research and procedure. *JALT Journal*, 12/2. Retrieved September 15, from <http://www.kyoto-su.ac.jp/~trobb/sussrobb.html>
- Tercanlioglu, L. (2001). Pre-service teachers as readers and future readers teachers of EFL reading. *TESL_EJ*, 5/3. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from http://writing.berkeley.edu/TESL_EJ/ej19/a2abs.html.
- Tercanlioglu, L. (2004). Postgraduate students' use of reading strategies in L1 and ESL contexts: Link to success. *International Education Journal*, 5/4. Retrieved August 17, 2006, from <http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/education/iej/articles/v5n4/tercanlioglu/paper.pdf>

- Unal, K. (1999). The use of cognitive skills in reading and reading tests. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Cukurova University, Adana.
- Wallace M. J. (2004). *Action research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Westhoff, G. J. (1991). Increasing the effectiveness of foreign language reading Instruction. *ADFL Bulletin*, 22/2. Retrieved September 20, 2005, from <http://www.adfl.org/adfl/bulletin/V22N2/222029.htm>
- Yali, C. (2004). *A research into effectiveness of comprehension strategies for facilitating reading performance and reader development*. Retrieved July 4, 2006, from http://www.elc_china.org/lw/pdf/cuiyali.pdf
- Yang, Y. (2002). Reassessing readers' comprehension monitoring. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14/1. Retrieved May 21, 2006, from <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2002/yang/yang.html>
- Yazar, U. (2001). *Teaching reading effectively with reading strategies*. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Atatürk University, Erzurum.
- Yetgin, E. (2003). Evaluation of reading strategy instruction in an EFL reading textbook and teachers' perception of that strategy instruction. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Yigiter K., Saricoban A. & Gurses T. (2005). Reading strategies employed by ELT learners at the advanced level. *The Reading Matrix*, 5/1. Retrieved March 17, 2006 from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/saricoban/article2.pdf>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Colleagues,

I am currently enrolled in the MA ELT program at Çukurova University. I am conducting a study on teachers' views about and approaches to reading instruction and reading strategies at university preparatory levels.

The purpose of the study is to find out how as how teachers perceive themselves as readers, how they think reading is taught, their concerns about reading instructions, and if they are using reading strategies in the classroom. These findings may contribute to better understanding of teachers' perception about teaching reading and reading strategies.

The questionnaire is the first phase of the study. The second phase is the interview, which will be held with teachers selected according to diversity of answers given. Therefore, in order to get in touch with those teachers, I will ask you to provide your name and surname in part I if possible. The personal information provided will be kept secretly confidential and under no circumstances will be used or shared.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you in advance for your help and cooperation.

Aysun YURDAIŞIK

Çağ University, Mersin

Tell. : (0324) 6514800

aysunyurdaisik@cag.edu.tr

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please circle the appropriate choices and provide the necessary information below.

1. Name:
2. Surname:
3. Gender: a. Male b. Female
4. Years of teaching experience at university
 - a. Less than 1 year
 - b. 1-4
 - c. 5-8
 - d. 9-12
 - e. 13-16
 - f. 17 or more
5. Do you teach reading in a general course or as a separate reading course?

6. Degree Program(s) completed:
 - a. BA/BS in _____ at (university)
 _____(year) _____.
 - b. MA/MBA in _____ at (university)
 _____(year) _____.
 - c. PhD in _____ at (university)
 _____(year) _____.

PART II:

Please answer the questions as frankly as possible .

1. Do you think that you are a good reader?

Very Good____ Good____ Avarage____ Not Very Good____

Why or why not?

2. What types of reading materials are most difficult for you to understand?

3. What types of reading materials are easiest for you to understand?

4. What causes you the greatest difficulty when you try to understand what you read?

5. What could you do to be better at understanding what you read?

6. What do you do when you come to a word that you do not understand?

7. What might stop you when you are reading?

8. When you are reading and you have difficulty, what do you do?

a. Do you ever repeat what you are reading in your own words?

Always____ Usually____ Sometimes____ Rarely____ Never____

b. Do you ever reread something that does not make sense?

Always____ Usually____ Sometimes____ Rarely____ Never____

c. Do you ever ask yourself questions as you read? Yes____ No____

Always____ Usually____ Sometimes____ Rarely____ Never____

PART III:

1. How familiar are you with the concept of reading strategies? Please put a tick (✓) in the appropriate box.

- ☐ Very
- ☐ Somewhat
- ☐ Slightly
- ☐ Not at all

2. What are your reasons for teaching reading strategies in class. (Please (✓) tick all that apply)

- ☐ It helps students understand texts better.
- ☐ To improve their enjoyment of the texts.
- ☐ Because they are included in the pack.
- ☐ To develop subskills for developing overall reading skills.
- ☐ For the appreciation of the text.
- ☐ To have students be aware of the language they are learning.
- ☐ To save time while reading.
- ☐ To prepare students for the tests.
- ☐ To enhance autonomy.

Others

3. Have you taken any courses related to teaching reading or reading strategies during your education?

PART IV:

While answering the questions in this part, please consider **what you actually do** while dealing with a reading test. Tick (✓) only **one option** for each item.

5- always, 4- usually, 3- sometimes, 2-rarely, 1- never

No.	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1.	I set a purpose for reading.					
2.	I ask students to read the titles and predict what the text is about.					
3.	I ask students to look at illustrations/pictures and try to guess how they relate to the text.					
4.	I set a context before students begin reading.					
5.	I use instructional aids (e.g. realia,music,etc.) to set a context.					
6.	I have the students quickly look over the text before reading.					
7.	I ask students warm-up questions related to the text before reading.					
8.	I teach vocabulary before students read the text.					
9.	Before doing discussions or any other activity, I have students read the text.					
10.	I ask students to relate the text/topic to their experience.					
11.	I ask students to relate what they read to what they already know.					
12.	I set a time limit for reading in class.					
13.	I teach all the new vocabulary in the text.					
14.	I ask students to use monolingual dictionary.					
15.	I allow students to use a bilingual dictionary.					
16.	I teach students how to guess the meaning of unknown words.					
17.	I ask students to guess/predict the meaning of unknown words.					
18.	I tell the students to skip unknown words.					
19.	I ask students to underline unknown words.					

20.	I ask students to underline key words and/or phrases.					
21.	I ask students to take notes while reading.					
22.	I tell students to read carefully and slowly.					
23.	I stress the importance of reading every word.					
24.	I ask students to read the text more than once.					
25.	I ask students to try to visualize what they read.					
26.	I tell students to make guesses about up-coming information in the text.					
27.	I have students read aloud in class one at a time.					
28.	I teach students to read the first and last paragraphs more carefully.					
29.	I ask comprehension questions about the text.					
30.	I ask students to draw conclusions about the text they have read.					
31.	I ask students to discuss the text after reading.					
32.	I ask students to comment on the text.					
33.	I ask students to summarize the text (written or oral).					
34.	I give students a quiz about the text.					
35.	I give students follow-up activities related to the text.					
36.	I assign students tasks to do using the information in the text.					
37.	I ask students to interpret the text.					

PART V:

Please answer the questions below considering the reading materials in coursebooks.

5- always, 4- usually, 3- sometimes, 2-rarely, 1- never

No.	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1.	I use the pictures in the coursebook.					
2.	I use the instructions step by step in the coursebook.					
3.	I prefer using the 'suggested approach' materials in the book.					
4.	I try to simplify the materials in terms of language					
5.	I make changes in the materials in terms of content.					
6.	When the text is unfamiliar to students, I try to relate it to their culture.					
7.	When the text is culturally unfamiliar to students I skip it and use other materials.					
8.	In addition to the reading text provided, I use extra aids.					

PART VI:

Answer the questions below considering if the reading materials foster reading strategy training.

5- strongly agree, 4- agree, 3- neutral, 2-disagree, 1- strongly disagree

No.	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1.	The way reading materials are designed is appropriate for teaching reading strategies.					
2.	Reading strategies are included in the materials on an ongoing and systematic basis.					
3.	Each text is designed for specific reading strategies					
4.	The amount of materials on reading strategies presented in the coursebook is sufficient for teaching reading strategies.					

APPENDIX 3

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Dear Participant,

You have been asked to participate in a survey. The purpose of the study is to investigate the teachers' perceptions about teaching reading and reading strategies. In order to achieve the goal, first you answered a questionnaire; second you are going to be interviewed in order to have deeper insights of how you think reading is taught, your concerns about reading instructions, if you are using reading strategies in the classroom and your criteria in choosing the reading strategies.

Your participation in the study will bring invaluable contributions to have better understanding of teachers' perceptions about reading instruction and reading strategies. Any information given to me will be kept confidential and your name will not be released.

I would like to thank you for your participation.

Aysun YURDAIŞIK

I have read and understood the information given above. I hereby agree to my participation in the study.

Name.....

Signature.....

Date.....

APPENDIX 4

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Part 1

- 1- How long have you been teaching reading?
- 2- What are the difficulties in reading that students face in your classroom?
- 3- What kind of solutions do you suggest for the problems?
- 4- What do you do to ensure that students understand the reading material?
- 5- What kinds of factors affect the degree of success of a reading instruction? (ex: material, motivation, teacher...)
- 6- What should be the properties of a reading instruction? (How do you think reading should be taught?)

Part 2

- 1- What do you think reading strategies are? (What are the reasons for using reading strategies?)
- 2- Do you use reading strategies in your daily life?
- 3- If yes - what are they? (how do you use?)
 - what are your reasons?
- 4- Do you teach any reading strategies in your reading instruction? Why/ why not?
- 5- Do you model any strategies to make comprehension easier for students? If yes, what kind of models do you suggest to your students?
- 6- Suppose you are giving a text to your students. How would you deal with it as a start before students read it? (ex: give the vocabulary, activate schemata...)
- 7- As the students start reading do you suggest them to use reading strategies?
 - a- If yes, what are they?
- 8- After reading do you encourage your students to use reading strategies?
 - a- If yes, what kind of strategies would you suggest your students?
9. Do you have any criteria when choosing a strategy for your students?
 - a- If yes what are they?

APPENDIX 5

TRANSCRIBED FORMS OF THE INTERVIEWS

Interview 1

A : Ne kadar zamandır reading öğretiyorsunuz?

P1 : 74 ten beri 33 sene.

A : Öğrencile sınıfta reading yaparken ne tür zorluklarla karşılaşılıyorlar?

P1 : Kelime bilmiyolarsa cümleyi anlamıyorlar zaten. Uzun cümleleri anlamakta zorluk çekiyorlar.

A : Bu tür durumlarda ne tür çözümler öneriyorsunuz öğrencilere?

P1 : Kelimede problem varsa kelimeyi öğreniyorlar. Cümleleri basitleştirerek, bölerek anlatıyorum yani. Uzun cümleleri bölerek anlatıyorum anlamalarını sağlıyorum, ben yardım ediyorum. İşin içinden çıkamazlarsa ben yardım ediyorum.

A : Onların anladıklarından nasıl emin oluyorsunuz peki?

P1 : Sorulara doğru yanıt veriyorlar.

A : Sizce bir reading dersinin başarısını etkileyen faktörler nelerdir?

P1 : Şimdi konuya yabancılarsa bazen ilgilerini çekmeyebiliyor. Bilmedikleri konuda bazılarının ilgisini çekmeyebiliyor çünkü hiçbirşey anlamıyorlar. Ama ilginç geldiği zaman da hoşlarına gidiyor. Evet ilginç konular hoşlarına gidiyor onun dışındakilerden hoşlanmıyorlar.

A : Başka? Öğretmenin rolü nedir sizce?

P1 : Monoton olmadığı sürece, hep aynı şey yapılmadığı sürece daha zevkli oluyor ders. Ama bir dersi aynı şekilde işlediğin zaman hoşlarına gitmeyebiliyor. Örneğin ben bazen vocabulary verip ardından reading yapıyorum, bazen hiç vocabulary vermeden direk parçayla başlıyorum. Vocabularyı açıklayarak gidiyorum, önce bir parçayı anlıyorlar, sonra vocabularya geçiyorum. Tahtaya yani yazma işini sonraya bırakabiliyorum.

A : İyi bir reading dersinin özellikleri ne olmalı?

P1 : Önce genel konu üzerinde durup arkadan daha özele daha etraflı daha doğrusu daha inceleyerek yapıyorum. Readinglerin bir noktada amacı vocabulary de vermek. Hem vocabulary öğreniyorlar, hem o vocabulary i cümlede kullanıyorlar, hem de tabii ki o konudaki grameri de kullanıyorlar. En son zaten parçayı anladıktan öğrendikten sonra da kendilerinin anlatma olayı var. Hem de production var yani speakingi var.

A : Bu bölümdeki sorular reading strategies ile ilgili.

P1 : Vocabulary önce veriyorum sonra veriyorum strategy ye girer herhalde.

A : Sizce reading strategy kavramı neyi ifade ediyor sizin için, neden kullanıyoruz?

P1 : Reading strategy derken...

A : Size reading strategy kavramı neyi ifade ediyor?

P1 : Strategy derken öğretme şekli sanırım. Amacımıza göre farklı stratejiler kullanmalıyız skimming, scanning gibi. Şimdi mesela bir article ise tamamını anlaması gerekiyorsa detaylı olarak inceliyorum. Ama bir mesela reading kitabıysa chapterdaki genel anlam olarak

A : Neden reading strategy kullanıyorsunuz?

P1 : Bazı şeyleri en ince detayına kadar bilmek gerekiyor ama bazılarında da üstten geçip okuma genel anlam scanning miydi bazılarında da o yeterli. Fazla bir şey almasına gerek yok. Bir mesela article okuyorsa herhangi bir yerde ya da sadece anafikri alacaksa scanning yeterli. Ama detaylı soru sorulmayacaksa uzun uzun incelemenin anlamı yok. Onu mu demek istediniz bilmiyorum. Ama genelde yani biz derslerde parçaları enine boyuna inceliyoruz. Sadece okuma kitaplarını fazla incelemiyoruz.

A : Benim sormak istediğim bir reading passage işleyeceğiniz zaman sınıfta bazı strategy kullanıyorsanız. Bunları neden kullanıyorsunuz?

P1 : Çocuk okuduğunu anlıyor mu. Genel bilgiyi alabiliyor mu ya da detaylı olduğu zaman her cümlesini anlamış mı, vocabulary anlamış mı.

A : Peki siz günlük hayatınızda okurken strategy kullanıyor musunuz?

P1 : Yani, okuduğum şeye göre değişiyor. Mesela çok fazla tasvir varsa atlıyorum ya da çok fazla isim varsa, bir olayı almış sonucu benim için önemliyse ortalarını geçiyorum, bakmıyorum. Tamamını okuyana kadar ne olmuş ona bakıyorum. Skimming, scanning kullanıyorum duruma göre.

A : Peki reading dersinde reading strategy öğretiyor musunuz?

P1 : Yani kitap istiyorsa bahsediyorsa öğretiyorum. Zaten verdikleri metodlarda onlar var. Normalde coursebookların verdiği şeyleri izliyorum.

A : Ekstradan strategy vermiyor musunuz?

P1 : Ordakiler yetiyor onlara. Eskiden mesela biz reading yaparken bize herhangi bir ipucu yoktu. Şimdiki kitaplarda var önce şunu yapın sonra bunu yapın diye ama o ipucu olmadığı zaman ilk önce vocabulary veriyorduk vocabulary verdikten sonra cümlelere yani readinge geçiyorduk. O reading hakkında da detaylı yapıyorduk. İlk öğretmenliğe başladığım yıllarda bizim izlediğimiz yöntem buydu. Çünkü o zaman sadece reading parçası vardı başka bir şey yoktu. O reading parçasıyla ilgili de sorular vardı. Yöntemimiz oydu ama şimdi kitaplar çok farklı yaklaştıkları için biz de parçalara daha farklı yaklaşabiliyoruz. Yani birinde true false yapıyor fazla detaylı soru sormuyor, bazen sadece onu yapıp geçerken bazen kendimce bilmeleri gereken daha önemli olan acaba şuraları kavramışlar mı diye bulabilecekler mi diye önemli gördüğüm yerlerde ayrıntılı sorular soruyorum. Direkt readingde yanıtı olan sorular değil de genelde onu tercih ediyorum zaten, reading de cevabı olan tamam bir iki tane soruyorsun da daha mesela paragrafı anlayıp o paragraftan çıkaracağı ya da iki üç cümleden çıkaracağı sorular soruyorum.

A : Comprehension'a yönelik yani.

P1 : Ezbere yönelik orda gördüğüne yönelik değil de. O zaman çünkü bana anlamış gibi gelmiyor. Soruyu sorduğun zaman yanıtı ordaysa bana öğrenmiş gibi gelmiyor.

A : Hiç strategy örnekliyor musunuz öğrencilere mesela ben bunu böyle yapıyorum mesela guess the meaning yaparken bakın böyle düşünüp böyle yapıyorum ya da scanning yaparken şu noktalara dikkat ettim, hiç kendiniz strategy modelliyor musunuz?

P1 : Hiç yapmadım. Genelde de okuyup sonuç verince problem olmuyor. Ama hiç anlamıyorlarsa ama main idea yı falan bulmaya yönlendiriyorum.

A : Mesela diyelim ki öğrencilerinize bir reading passage verdiniz nasıl başlarsınız öğrenciler okumaya başlamadan önce?

P1 : Şimdi değişik değişik yapabiliyorum biraz önce de bahsettiğim gibi. Kelimeyle başlayıp parçayla devam edebiliyorum ya da parçayla başlayıp hiç kelime vermeyip bittikten sonra bir kaç genel soru sorduktan sonra da tahtaya kelimeleri yazabiliyorum. Ya da konuyla ilgili farklı sorular sorup konuya bir giriş yapıp ondan sonra readinge de geçebiliyoruz. Bazen direk readinge giriyorum bazen direk girmiyorum soruyorum sıkıcı olmasın diye. Hadi vocabulary hadi reading hadi genel soru vocabulary diye.

A : Onlar okumaya başladıktan sonra herhangi bir strategy öneriyor musunuz?

P1 : Benim ondan sonra soracağım sorulara göre nelere odaklanmaları gerektiğini söylüyorum. Eğer soruları vermişsem şunları yanıtlayın demişsem zaten o zaman ona göre okuyup yanıtlıyorlar.

A : Reading okuduktan sonra uyguladığınız strategy var mı?

P1 : Bittikten sonra reading yaptırıyorum.

P1 : Reading yaptırıyorum derken?

P1 : Sesli okuma yaptırıyorum. Bazen sorulara geçmeden okutuyorum. Mümkün olduğu kadar vakte göre parçayı bir defa ya da iki defa sesli okutuyorum.

A : Okuduktan sonra öğrencilerinizi strateji kullanmaya yönlenditiyor musunuz?

P1 : Answer the questions zaten var. En son aşamada da bir özet gibi ya da beğendikleri bölümü en çok neresi hoşlarına gitti mesela ya da ne anladılar o konudan, ne kaldı akıllarında onları soruyorum.

A : Uyguladığınız strategyleri neye göre seçiyorsunuz?

P1 : Onu parçaya göre yani guessing kolaysa, yapabilecekleri gibiyse, meaning anlaşılıyor gibiyse yaptırıyorum ama değilse zor olacaksa fazla da oyalanmıyorum çünkü süre kısıtlı. Yalnız sözlükten anlam bakmak çok hoşlarına gitti. Tahtaya yazma yerine mesela 3 tanesini ben yazıyorsam 5 tanesini onlar buluyorlar. Ben tahtaya yazarken onlar da öbürlerini bulmuş oluyorlar süreden kazanıyoruz. En azından hangi anlamı olacağını da öğrenmeye başladılar. Şu olmadı bu uymuyor diyebiliyorlar. Kendi kendilerine reading yaparken ya da bir parça okurken yardımcı olması açısından.

A : Strategy modelliyor musunuz diye bir soru vardı. Siz dictionary use modelliyorsunuz diyebilir miyiz?

P1 : Evet o zaman unuttuk onu. Mesela vocabulary öğretirken bazen kelimeyi tahtaya yazıp önce bir okutuyorum anlamını bilmeden okumayı öğreniyorlar. Bazen anlamını da yazıyorum sonra okuyoruz. Gerçi bu daha çok vocabulary öğretimine giriyor olabilir.

A : Başka eklemek istediğiniz bir şey var mı?

P1 : Yok.

A : Teşekkür ederim.

P1 : Rica ederim.

Interview 2

A : Ne kadar zamandır reading öğretiyorsunuz?

P2 : 3 yıl.

A : Reading yaparken öğrenciler ne tür zorluklarla karşılaşılıyorlar?

P2 : Öğrencilerin karşılaştığı zorluklar...kelimeler mesela. Bilinmeyen kelime çok. Veya kelimeleri akıllarında tutamıyorlar. Karmaşık cümleleri anlamıyorlar. Hep basite indirgenmiş cümleleri anlıyorlar.

A : Başka?

P2 : Konun ilginç olması. Gerçi okuttuğumuz kitaplarda konular genelde ilginç. Konular hiçbir zaman sıkılmıyor ama konunun içinde kurulan cümleler bazen seviyelerine ağır geliyor ve genelde okuttuğum coursebookdaki reading pasajları anlatılan gramer konusuna göre 1-2 düzey ağır oluyor genelde. Bunda da çocuk hep zorlanıyor zaten grameri anlatıyoruz bir takım kelimeleri öğrenmekte zorlanıyorlar reading de biraz üst düzey olunca anlatılan konuyla ilgili o zaman iyice kopuyorlar.

A : Peki bu tür sorunlarla karşılaştıkları zaman onlara ne tür çözümler öneriyorsunuz?

P2 : Düşük sınıflara Türkçesini söylüyorum.

A : Bütün parçanın Türkçesini mi?

P2 : Yok, bazı kelimelerin yani zor kelimelerin, onların tahmin edemeyeceği kelimelerin komple reading passage in Türkçesini komple hiç vermedim onlara da zor olur kaybolurlar içinde çünkü. Başka...

A : Mesela karmaşık cümleler dediniz o konuda nasıl bir çözüm öneriyorsunuz?

P2 : Cümleleri translation olarak değil de basit cümleler kurarak söylüyorum ve ezberletmeye çalışıyorum o yapıyı.

A : İngilizce mi basite indirgiyorsunuz yoksa Türkçe mi?

P2 : Türkçe çünkü düşük seviye sınıflardan bahsediyorum.

A : Bir reading passage verdiniz anladıklarından nasıl emin oluyorsunuz?

P2 : Zaten reading passagelerin sonunda konuyla ilgili sorular oluyor. O soruları cevaplayabiliyorlarsa veya şöyle yani pasajı anlamaları İngilizce cevaplayamıyorlar bazen onları Türkçe cevaplıyorlarsa bile konuyu anladıklarını veya konu hakkında fikir sahibi olduklarını gösterir. Ondan sonra İngilizce cevaplamaları üzerine

yoğunlaşıyorum. Bazen soruları anlıyorlar ama cevap vermekte zorlanıyorlar bu sefer İngilizce. Ben Türkçesini istiyorum kısa bir şekilde konuya çok uzak kalmamaları için ki ondan sonra daha farklı şeyde yoğunlaşayım diye.

A : Bir reading dersinin başarısını etkileyen faktörler nelerdir mesela motivation material gibi?

P2 : Reading dersinin başarısını etkileyen...Tabii öğretmen önemli bu konuda. Öğretmen reading dersini yaparken bir defa öğrenciyi sıkmayacak eğlenceli bir şekilde yapacak. Mesela readinge başlamadan önce warm-up kesinlikle olmalı. En azından context ile ilgili ufak bir bilgi sağlıyor, çocuğu oraya yönlendiriyor. Öğretmen bu konuda önemli. Az önce söylediğim gibi pasajlar öğrencinin ilgisini çekecek şekilde olmalı. Bir de seviyesine göre tam uygun bir dille yazılması lazım. Gramer yapısı uygun olması lazım. Çok fazla ağır olduğu zaman olmuyor.

A : Reading dersi nasıl verilmeli, reading dersinin özellikleri neler olmalı?

P2 : Ne bakımdan yani?

A : İdeal bir reading dersi nasıl olmalı?

P2 : Tabii ki konu ilginç olmalı. Bir defa reading pasajında geçen herhangi bir gramer konusunun çok önemli bu herhangi bir gramer konusunun öğrenciye iyi bir şekilde öğretilmesi lazım, bunun üzerinde çalışmalar yapılması lazım ki çocuk reading okurken parçadan çok çok uzaklaşmasın. Bizim Türk öğrenciler çok fazla okumayı sevmediğinden dolayı bir de anlamadığı bir yapıyla karşılaştı mı hepten gidiyor yani sadece kelimelerin anlamını alıyorlar bir tarafa yazıyorlar o da pek bir anlam ifade etmiyor. Konu iyice benimsetilmeli onlara. Ve kelimelerin hepsinin Türkçe anlamının verilmemesi lazım.

A : Kelimelerinin hepsinin anlamı verilmemeli mi yoksa hepsinin Türkçe anlamı verilmemeli mi?

P2 : Hepsi Türkçe verilmesin, bir de şöyle, şöyle toparlayayım. Kelimelerin anlamlarının çok azının Türkçe verilmesi gerekiyor. Çok soyut bir kavram olur anlatılamayacak bir şey olur veya parçadan çıkarılamayacak bir şey olur veya bizim Türkçede kullanmadığımız bir şey olur . Diğer basit kelimeler contextten çıkarılabilecek gibiye guess the meaning yapmalılar çünkü guess yaparlarsa o kelimeyi parçada fotoğrafını çekmiş gibi öğreniyorlar. Türkçesini söyledin mi yazıyor oraya not alıyor orda kalıyor.

A : Bu bölümde de strategy ile ilgili sorular soracağım. Sizce reading strategy nedir neden kullanılıyor?

P2 : Reading strategyler heralde öğrencilerin okudukları şeyi daha iyi anlamasını daha rahat anlamasını geliştirmek için.

A : Siz günlük hayatında strategy kullanıyor musunuz okurken?

P2 : hımmmm

A : Mesela altını çizmek kelimelerin, guess the meaning gibi,,,

P2 : Aslında farketmeden strategy kullanıyorum ama isimlendiremiyorum. En başta okuduğum herhangi bir parçada kolay kolay sözlüğe bakmıyorum zorda kalınca bakıyorum guess olayı oluyor veya zaten bir reading parçasında her kelimenin çok çok çok bir önemi yok ama dili anladığın zaman az çok tahmin edebiliyorsun neden bahsettiğini. O konuda konuşabilirsin de herhangi bir soruyu da yanıtlarsın.

A : Daha çok hangi reading strategyleri kullanıyorsunuz?

P2 : Guessing var, mesela o strategy oluyor mu bilmiyorum ama bir şeyi okurken daha aşağı kısımlarda bir şey çağrışım yaparsa hemen yukarıyı tarama yapıyorum yerini de buluyorum zaten. Başka... sözlük bakma olayı oluyor ama çok sıklıkla değil mesela konunun ağırlığına göre değişir tabii. Başka...tabii başlık önemlidir başlık dikkatimi çekerse başlık beni düşünderecek birşeyse başlık 15-20 saniye de olsa beni düşündürürse okuyacağım konuyu daha rahat anlayacağımı düşünürüm. Veya ilgimi çekerse okurum seçenek varsa.

A : Derste reading strategy öğretiyor musunuz?

P2 : Reading okurken bizim şimdi okuttuğumuz kitapta guess the meaning var, warm-up bunun içine giriyorsa,genelde kitabın önerdiği strategy kullanıyorum kitap dışında şeyler oluyor o yine strategy oluyor mu bilmiyorum ama phrase ler oluyor structure oluyor onların üzerinde duruyorum ezberlemelerini istiyorum o kalıpları. Başka ne yapıyorum şu an aklıma gelmiyor ama yine okuduklarını anlarken okuduklarını anlamlarına yardımcı olması için kelimeler üzerinde yani kelime bilgisinin olması şart artı kelimenin kategorilerine göre ezberlemeleri bilmediği bir kelimeyi sözlüğe baksa dahi onun işte adjective mi noun mu verb mü bu çok önem arzettiği için bunlara dikkat çekmek istiyorum. Mesela hiç bilmediği bir kelimeyi use the dictionary yaptırıyorum.

A : Öğrencilerin daha iyi anlaması için strategy örnekliyor musunuz?

P2 : Örneklediğim bir tek guess the meaning var bir aşağı bir yukarı gitmeleri daha dikkatli okunursa ordaki kelimenin anlamını aşağı yukarı çıkartabileceklerini benim öyle yaptığımı söylüyorum. Ama tabii her zaman buna değinmiyorum ben şöyle yapıyorum böyle yapıyorum çünkü zaten benim anladığımı biliyor öğrenci.

A : Diyelim ki öğrencilere bir reading passage verdiniz başlarken nasıl başlıyorsunuz?

P2 : İlk başta warm-up yapıyorum. Ondan sonra parçayı okuyoruz. Ben kendim okuyorum önce telaffuz açısından yani bir de noktalama işaretlerine uygun okuyorum ki onların da kafalarına yer etsin diye. Daha sonra tek tek önemli gördüğüm kelimeleri bazen bunu kitabın kendi de yapıyor koyu harflerle falan yazıyor onların üstünde duruyorum. Onları tahmin ettirmeye çalışıyorum. Tahmin edemezlerse zaten sınıfta 1-2 kişi çıkıyor kelimeyi bilen onların o koyu yazılmış bazen olmuyor olsa da benim kendi gerekli gördüğüm yani önemli gördüğüm kelimelerin üzerinde duruyorum bunu da öğrenin bunu da yazın bir kenara not alın diye.

A : Şimdi öğrenciler okumaya başladılar bu aşamada bir strategy öneriyor musunuz?

P2 : Okuduktan sonra vocabulary üzerinde duruyorum. Çünkü mutlaka bu ne bu ne diye geliyor bana soru. Guess yaptırdıktan sonra önemli gördüğüm kelimeleri söylüyorum. Çoğunlukla sınıfta bilen çıkıyor ve direkt Türkçesi söyleniyor. Başka...girdiğim sınıfların seviyesi düşük olduğu için hep aynı şeyler oluyor mesela farklı sınıflara girsem farklı şeyler uygulardım. Kitap yeteri kadar yönlendiriyor ilk başta bir warm-up yaptırıyor,sonra parçayla ilgili soruları oluyor, guess yaptırıyor, ondan sonra parçayı okutturuyor senin tahminin doğru olup olmadığına tekrar dönüyorsun falan.

A : Öğrenciler okurken sessiz mi okutuyorsunuz yoksa sesli mi okutuyorsunuz?

P2 : Genelde okutturmuyorum kendi başlarına okumalarını istiyorum çünkü okuyan öğrenci yani biri okurken dinlemiyorlar kopuyorlar ancak ben okurken dikkatli dinliyorlar ben okuduktan sonra kendilerine okutuyorum içlerinden.

A : Okudular, bitti bundan sonra ne yapıyorsunuz, strateji kullanmaya yönlendiriyor musunuz öğrencileri?

P2 : Reading parçalarının sorularını yapıyoruz. Soruların içinde yine soruyu sorarken doğaçlama oluyor bazen benim aklıma başka bir soru geliyor onu da sorabiliyorum acaba anladı mı diye. Ezbere mi cevap veriyor yoksa gerçekten cümlelerin ne demek istediğini anladı mı diye onlar da follow-up question tarzında geliyor. Onun dışında...yok . zaten yetiştirmekte olduğumuz bir program olduğu için ve reading hocası olmadığım için çok çok çok fazla üzerinde duramıyorum.

A : Belli bir strategy seçerken bir kriteriniz var mı?

P2 : Aslında kitap beni nasıl yönlendirirse öyle yapmaya dikkat ediyorum. Çünkü parçaya göre kitap zaten kendisi düşünmüştür diye bir takım şeyleri yaparken aktivitenin içinde yanlış birşeyler çıkar diye çok fazla şey yapamıyorum, cesaret edemiyorum yine tabii yine bu zamandan kaynaklanıyor. Belki sadece reading öğretiyor olsam o yaptığım parçalara daha farklı yaklaşıp farklı şeyler çıkarabilirim.

A : Teşekkürler.

P2 : Başarılar.

Interview 3

A : How long have you been teaching reading?

P3 : I've been teaching reading for 3 years at Çağ University.

A : What are the difficulties that students face in class?

P3 : One thing is they may not have the understanding of vocabulary. If they don't understand the words they don't understand the meaning. And you hope that the reading is at the level of the students whether; pre-intermediate, intermediate or beginner or elementary. They have to find the appropriate reading.

A : Do you think the reading passages are appropriate for the students?

P3 : Well, sometimes the stories are not appropriate because the story might be about an American family or an American issue which is not in the mind set of Turkish culture. I try to relate them to their own world. So reading has to be something that is really international or an international understanding. Not too colloquial or too local.

A : Anything else about the difficulties that students face?

P3 : Difficulty...depends on what they are asked to do after the reading, for example if they are asked to analyze or evaluate, if they are to answer true or false as an assessing. I can't think of any other difficulty because they can either manage it because they understand the words hopefully understand their grammar level they should also know the structure.

A : When students face those kinds of difficulties what kind of solutions do you suggest?

P3 : For one, they should always have a dictionary whether it is an electronic dictionary or pocket dictionary they should have a dictionary to refer to words so they can immediately do a cross reference Turkish to English or vice versa. And certainly I try to encourage them to ask questions but I find students here are a little bit reluctant to ask questions. They might be shy or they don't want to.

A : What do you do to ensure that students understand the reading text?

P3 : Well what you can do... that is why you have some assessment. You have to test them whether an exam or an informal test or on the spot you can ask students what those mean or explain it to me or come to the board and write something. If I get response or they do not ask questions teachers generally assume they understand but

assuming they understand is different from actually their understanding so that is why you have to have quizzes and it has to be frequent. I assess the students every week in some form whether it is an oral presentation whether they have to do a writing quiz or a reading quiz. So that you continually monitor otherwise you can go one month until you get to the final exam and realize that they haven't understood anything. I think continual assessment is necessary.

A : What kind of factors affect the degree of success of a reading instruction?

P3 : I think motivation is the key. If the student is not motivated... Well what factors...there are many factors there are factors from the teacher side and student side. I am from the teaching side I also mean and point out that it is the responsibility of the student if they want to learn if they don't want to learn they are not motivated no mentor, structure and resources can help the students learn. When the students want to learn then the teacher must provide a good learning environment that is ensuring that they have the books and they take notes, teachers' notes on the board should be clear, it is all about the board management. Don't try to teach too much in one lesson. The books should be applicable to their level. I don't know the grammar books we are doing the 'Password' and that is usually structured by a story and it is followed by a true or false and comprehension questions, vocabulary questions and some grammar questions. We hope that the stories are interesting enough and sometimes I feel that they don't understand because of cultural differences so it should be something that global understanding. What else. Well that is all. Appropriate texts for students not too advanced not too easy. It should be at their level.

A : How do you think reading should be taught?

P3 : There is more than one way. I mean the teacher can read, and the students listen. I like student involvement. I like the students to read because when you read something you understand it better, when you are verbalizing the words and you have to pronounce the words correctly so that I can hear you should say this way or that way. I tell them 'when you read something don't read in one monotonous way there is no inflection there is no color in your voice, when you read something the teacher can immediately know if you understand it by your pauses by your emphasis on different words'. Otherwise I can't tell if students don't understand. When you read something and understand you put emphasis in the right places.

A : What are the reasons for using reading strategies? What are reading strategies?

P3 : It is one of the basics, isn't it? We need to encourage students to read, they don't like reading. Reading strategies make students understand better. You can use different strategies for different aims.

A : Do you use reading strategies in your daily life?

P3 : Yes. When you become more proficient in the language you can scan just to find out important information, and actually the strategies I use depend on what I read. When I am asked to summarize I scan to get the important information. When you need to read a lot of material so you don't want to read every word then you know there is a system in the world called speed reading you just pick up some words. Reading for literature is very different from as against technical, or you know a technical manual you may be just looking for numbers or particular information that you can just look for that information but if you are reading literature...

A : Do you teach any strategies in your reading instruction?

P3 : Well I encourage them highlight words, underline words that they don't know and I tell them to summarize. Summarizing is usually done in writing. Definitely reading shouldn't be done just once. You should read something maybe 3 times because if you don't understand at the first time then you must revise it for the second or third time so that you cover what you need to understand.

A : Do you model any strategies to your students to make comprehension easier?

P3 : Yesterday we had a story, it was about driving a car getting your license so I thought to look at some of the vocabulary we need to understand about driving a car. So I sometimes give an overall picture about the terminology. It is good to bring other issues in.

A : Suppose you are giving a text to your students. How would you deal with it as a start before students read it?

P3 : Our book is good that way. It always has a picture and there is a saying 'a picture tells 1000 words.' There is a title and there is a picture. So before we read we try to have a discussion about the picture beforehand and the books do give questions about the text. An example we read about a bakery business what it is like to have your own business. And the picture was of a man holding bread and the question was 'would you

like to have your own business?’ So there will be a discussion before we go on to the reading. They get the general picture.

A : As the students start reading do you suggest them to use reading strategies?

P3 : Well I try to get the students read a paragraph themselves and when they read the paragraph I ask them if they understand. I may even ask them a question to see if they understood. When I ask them if they understood and they say ‘not actually’ I ask them which part then we can pick point. I make them guess the meanings from context.

A : After reading do you encourage your students to use reading strategies?

P3 : Then we answer the questions in the book. And as they answer we write the answers on the board sometimes I might get the vocabulary and I ask them to put the words and make up a sentence. So they use the words to make their own sentences.

A : Do you have any criteria when choosing a strategy for your students?

P3 : Our book continually puts the words into context of the story and then you have to use these words in a completely different context. The book guides you to use which strategy when.

Interview 4

A : Ne kadar zamandır reading öğretiyorsunuz?

P4 : Biz readingi coursebook içinde veriyoruz ama 7 yıldır reading dersi veriyorum.

A : Öğrenciler reading dersinde ne tür zorluklarla karşılaşılıyorlar?

P4 : Kelime bilmeyebiliyorlar bir de konu ilgilerini çekmeyebiliyor. Bazen de karışık yapıları anlamakta zorlanıyorlar.

A : Bu tür sorunlarla karşılaştıkları zaman ne gibi çözümler öneriyorsunuz?

P4 : Kelimenin anlamını tahmin ettirmeye çalışıyorum. Konu ile ilgili sorular sorup konu hakkında fikir edinmelerini veya bildikleri şeylerle bağlantı kurmalarını sağlamaya çalışıyorum.

A : Karışık yapılardan bahsettiniz, bu konuda ne öneriyorsunuz?

P4 : Açıklama yapıyorum. Yapıları anlayacakları düzeye indiriyorum.

A : Texti anladıklarından nasıl emin oluyorsunuz?

P4 : Comprehension sorularına verdikleri yanıtlardan.

A : Her zaman bu yöntem işe yarıyor mu?

P4 : Sorulara doğru cevap veriyorlarsa anlamışlardır ama her zaman değil. Bazı sorulara anlamadan da cevap verebiliyorlar. Sorudaki benzer kelimeleri parçadan alarak cevap budur herhalde diye. Onun için çoğu zaman ben de ekstra sorular soruyorum. Ya da özetleyelim diyorum.

A : Reading dersinin başarısını etkileyen faktörler nelerdir?

P4 : En çok material. Ne kadar ilginçse konu o kadar çok ilgileniyorlar ya da ne kadar güncelse. Öğretmen de önemli. Öğretmen kendi yaşantılarından birşeyler bulup çıkarabilir böylece konu daha çok ilgilerini çekebilir.

A : Reading dersinin özellikleri neler olmalı, nasıl verilmeli reading dersi?

P4 : Reading öncesinde mutlaka öğrencileri konuya hazırlamak lazım sorularla. Strategy de öğretilmeli tabii ki.

A : Reading strategy kavramı sizin için ne ifade ediyor ya da neden reading strategy kullanılıyor?

P4 : Öğrencinin işini kolaylaştırıp olaya hız kazandırmak için.

A : Günlük hayatınızda okurken reading strategy kullanıyor musunuz?

P4 : Benim günlük hayatta amacım just pleasure olduğu için strateji kullanmıyorum.

A : Reading dersinde öğrencilerinizi reading strategy kullanımına yönlendiriyor musunuz?

P4 : Evet. En çok ‘guess what is going to happen next’, guess the meaning, summarize.

A : Kitabın önerdiği stratejileri mi kullanıyorsunuz yoksa kendiniz mi belirliyorsunuz stratejileri?

P4 : Genellikle ben belirliyorum.

A : Reading strategy modelliyor musunuz derste?

P4 : Evet bazen. Kendi kendime brainstorming yaparak onları da yönlendiriyorum sonra onlar da katılıyor bana.

A : Diyelim ki reading text verdiniz öğrencilerinize okumaya başlamadan önce okuma stratejileri kullanmaya yönlendiriyor musunuz?

P4 : Kendi hayatlarıyla ilgili sorular soruyorum. O konuyla ilgili neler bildiklerine dair sorular soruyorum.

A : Okuma esnasında strategy kullanmaya yönlendiriyor musunuz?

P4 : Parçada geçen kelimelerin parçadan anlamını çıkarabiliyorlar mı ona bakıyorum. Anahtar kelimeleri buluyoruz.

A :Daha önce ‘anticipate what is to come’ stratejisini kullandığınızı söylemişsiniz. Onu bu aşamada mı yapıyorsunuz?

P4 : Evet.

A : Okuduktan sonra öğrencilerinizi reading strategy kullanmaya teşvik ediyor musunuz?

P4 : Speaking yapıyoruz. Öğrenciler zaten konuyu anlamışsa ve ilginç bulmuşsa söyleyecek çok şeyleri oluyor.Speakingden önce comprehension sorularını cevaplıyoruz.

A : Öğrencileri belirli bir strateji kullanmaya yönlendirirken belirli bir kriteriniz var mı?

P4 : Texte göre seçiyorum kullanılacak stratejileri.

A : Teşekkür ederim.

P4 : Rica ederim.

Interview 5

A : Ne kadar zamandır reading dersi veriyorsunuz?

P5 : 22 yıldır çalışıyorum. 20 yıldır diyebilirim.

A : Öğrenciler reading dersinde sizce ne tür zorluklarla karşılaşılıyorlar?

P5 : En çok çok yoğun kelime eksikleri olduğu için texti kavramakta zorlanıyorlar. Tabii yanlış taktik uygulayıp herşeyi anlamaya çalıştıkları için oluyor. Detaylı anlama eğilimleri olduğu için daha çok zorlanıyorlar. Levellerına genelde uygun olanları seçiyoruz. Öğrenci farklılıklarından dolayı altyapı veya öğrenme stillerinden dolayı zorlanabiliyorlar. Daha önce reading de taktik uygulamadıkları için de zorlanıyorlar. Strateji bilmedikleri için zorlanıyorlar.

A : Bu tür sorunlarla karşılaştıkları zaman ne gibi çözümler öneriyorsunuz?

P5 : Yani özellikle kelimeye takıldıklarında contextten çıkarmalarına yönlendiriyoruz birebir aşamalarını vermek için öncesine sonrasına bakmalarını söylüyoruz. Bazen de vakit olmuyor hemen söylüyoruz. Eşanlam falan hatırlatmaya çalışıyoruz, cümle içinde kullanarak daha açıklayıcı bir cümleyle dönüştürüyoruz. Çok zorda kalırsak translation. Bazen de araştırmaya yönlendiriyoruz. Sözlük bakabilirler. Teknikler üzerinde duruyoruz. Amacınız ne hangi strateji uygulayabiliyoruz. Oturtmak istediğimiz strateji eksik kalırsa aynı stratejiyi uygulayabileceği ekstra text veriyoruz.

A : Texti anladıklarından nasıl emin oluyorsunuz?

P5 : Yapacakları bir task vardır mutlaka o taskı yapabiliş yapmadıkları oranı kaç tanesini yapabilmiş önemli artı ek sorularla.

A : Reading dersinin başarısını etkileyen faktörler nelerdir?

P5 : En önemli şey motivasyon; neden o texti okuyor, o strateji ona neler getirecek, textin öğrencinin ilgisi çekecek nitelikte olması seviyesine uygun olması. Öğretmenin de etkisi var. Öğretmen hakkıyla uygulamazsa çok ilginç ve güzel text sıkıcı olabilir. Amacımız öğretmen olmadan da textlerle o teknikleri uygulayabilmesi.

A : Reading dersinin özellikleri neler olmalı, nasıl verilmeli reading dersi?

P5 : Bu kadar yıllık deneyimim sonucunda amaç öğrencinin belirli stratejileri öğrenmesi olmalı, niçin okuduğunu bilmesi. Scanning, skimming, motive edici olmalı, öğrencinin hedefine onu götürmesi. Aynı zamanda genel kültürüne katkısı olması önemli.

A : Reading strategy kavramı sizin için ne ifade ediyor ya da neden reading strategies kullanılıyor?

P5 : Daha rahat mı desem daha bilinçli okumamızı sağlıyor, neye ihtiyacımız varsa ona göre okumamızı sağlıyor, zaman kaybını önüyor, her kelimeye bakmak gibi yüklerden de kurtulabiliriz.

A : Günlük hayatınızda okurken reading strategy kullanıyor musunuz?

P5 : Aslında ihtiyacım olmuyor ama kullanıyorum gazete okurken ya da mesleğimle ilgili olduğunda kullanıyorum. Skimming, scanning detaya ihtiyacım varsa o yöne belli bir bilgi arıyorsam onu bulmak amacıyla okuyorum. Okuduğum şeye ve amacıma göre değişiyor.

A : Reading dersinde öğrencilerinizi strategy kullanımına yönlendiriyor musunuz?

P5 : Bizim coursebook ona yönelik zaten. Direkt adını vermesek bile kitap veriyor, ayrı reading dersi varken de veriyorduk. Bağımsız bir okuyucu olmasını sağlamak istiyoruz, sınavımız da ona yönelik, o stratejileri kullanmasına yönelik. Çoktan seçmeli sorularda daha farklı bir okuma gerektiriyor, dikkat etmesi gereken şeyler farklı oluyor.

A : Reading strategy modelliyor musunuz derste?

P5 : Aslında modelleme yapmıyorum ama kitabımız onlara çoğunlukla söylüyor şunu yap bunu yap diye ama öyle olmasa ben bir örnekleme yaparım belki.

A : Diyelim ki reading text verdiniz öğrencilerinize, okumaya başlamadan önce okuma stratejileri kullanmaya yönlendiriyor musunuz?

P5 : Pre-reading aktiviteler yapıyoruz. Konuyla ilgili kendi deneyimleriyle bağlantılı sorular soruyorum . Title a bakarak textin ne konuda olduğunu tahmin etme ya da resimler üzerinde konuşma ya da nadir olarak direkt kendi deneyimleriyle ilgilerini çekiyorum. Bazen önceki konuyla bağlantı kuruyorum ya da güncel bir olayla.

A : Okuma esnasında strategy kullanmaya yönlendiriyor musunuz?

P5 : Hadi okuyun demiyoruz cevaplandıracakları bir soru aramaları gereken bir bilgi bir amaçları oluyor. Sessiz okuma yapılıyor, kendi başlarına okuyorlar. Skimming kullanabilirler mesela. Texte uyarsa sonucunu tamamlamıyor mesela başka sayfadaysa ne oldu sizce diye soruyoruz. Okurken soru soruyorum böylece bir amaçları oluyor.

A : Okuduktan sonar öğrencilerinizi reading strategy kullanmaya teşvik ediyor musunuz?

P5 : Sorulara cevap veriyoruz, summarize yapıyoruz.

A : Öğrencileri belirli bir strateji kullanmaya yönlendirirken belirli bir kriteriniz var mı?

P5 : Aslında yani işine yarayacak nasıl söylesem İngilizce eğitim alacağı için bir çok stratejiyi veriyoruz. Sınav biraz da belirleyici oluyor. Orda daha çok işine yarayacak şeyler, guessing, scanning, skimming gibi her zaman işine yarayacak şeyler öğretiyoruz. Stratejilerin kriteri coursebook oluyor ama coursebook zaten amacımıza uygun, reading strategy konusunda destekliyoruz. Eksik gördüğümüz yerleri de destekliyoruz. Guessing olayı azsa ek material veriyoruz. Open-ended tarz soruların çok fazla üzerinde durmuyoruz sınavımız open- ended değil. Daha yüksek düzeyde olabiliyor. Main idea falan gibi , daha yüksek değilde ama daha çeşitli.

Interview 6

A : Ne kadar zamandır üniversitede reading dersi veriyorsunuz?

P6 : 10 yıl oldu.

A : Sınıfta reading yaparken öğrenciler ne tür zorluklarla karşılaşılıyorlar?

P6 : Yabancı bir dilde okudukları için özellikle noktalama işaretlerine dikkat etmeyerek kelimeleri çok bilmedikleri için telaffuzda sorun yaşıyorlar. Bu da onların anlamaları ya da anlamamalarında etkili oluyor. Başka.... Bilmedikleri kelime tabii ki. Gramer konusunda seviyelerine göre değişebiliyor. Düşük seviyedeysen gramer konusunda da sorun yaşıyorlar cümleyi anlamıyorlar.

A : Öğrenciler düşük seviyedeysen mi?

P6 : Evet. Yani reading parçası kendilerine göre yüksek seviyedeysen anlamakta güçlük çekiyorlar. Konunun içeriği bakımından ilgi çekip çekmemesi onların anlamaları güncel olaylarla ilgili mi yoksa ilgi alanlarına giren bir konuya biraz daha anlamaları kolay olabiliyor. Yorum yapmaları kolay olabiliyor en azından. Ama konu farklıysa hiç bilmedikleri bir konuya yorum yapmakta da zorlanıyorlar.

A : Bu tür sorunlarla karşılaştıkları zaman ne tür çözümler öneriyorsunuz?

P6 : Öncelikle okuma parçasına başlarken genelde ben headingden ya da title dan başlamaya çalışıyorum. Eğer genelde headings olmasa bile resim varsa resimle konuya girmeye başlıyoruz ki bir kaç pre-teach yaparak yani kelime öğretmek onlara konuya birazcık daha ısındırmaya çalışıyoruz. Ondan sonra genelde sessizce bir kere kendilerinin okumalarını istiyorum. Ondan sonra öğrencilerden birine okutturmaya çalışıyorum okurken genelde bilmedikleri kelimelerin altlarını çizmelerini öneriyorum. Bir de kelimeleri verirken cümle yapılarına göre gramer yapılarına göre ne tarzda olduklarını ya da parts of speechlerini vererek anlamlarını onlara anlatmaya çalışıyorum. Bununla beraber tabii ekstrasdan kelimelerle cümleler yapmaya çalışıyoruz.

A : Şöyle söyleyebilir miyiz zorluklarla karşılaştıklarında onları strategy kullanmaya yönlendiriyorsunuz.

P6 : Evet step by step gitmeye çalışıyorum ve reading strategy kullandırmaya çalışıyorum. Direkt comprehension sorularına girmiyoruz.

A : Peki öğrencilerin anladığından nasıl emin oluyorsunuz?

P6 : Anladığından emin olmam...genelde öncelikle paragraf paragraf soru çıkarmalarını ya da ben soru sorarak onlardan cevap almaya çalışıyorum.

A : Onlar mı soru çıkarıyorlar textten?

P6 : Onlar soru hazırlamaya çalışıyorlar. Sorulara doğru cevap verirlerse anladıklarını düşünüyorum.

A : Reading dersinin başarısını etkileyen faktörler nelerdir?

P6 : Öncelikle ilgilerini çekmeyen bir konuyla karşılaştıklarında motivasyonları düşük oluyor, konu hakkında yorum yapamıyorlar. Yani öncelikle ilgi çekici bir material bulmak lazım. Tabii ki öğretmenin işleyiş tarzı da önemli. Ya da konuya girişi önemli.

A : Reading dersinin özellikleri neler olmalı, nasıl öğretilmeli?

P6 : Reading dersi nasıl verilmeli...bir kere özellikle onların seviyesine uygun olması gerekli. Her ne kadar bilmedikleri bir passage da olsa seviyelerine uygun olduğu takdirde anlamaları daha kolay oluyor. Ondan sonra kelimelerini vermek daha ikinci planda kalıyor. Ya da kelimelerden yola çıkarak demeyelim de değişik nasıl sorular sorulabilir...bazı cümleleri ele alıp cümlelerin doğru yanlışlarından giderek yani true false cümleler yaparak.

A : Kelimelerin anlamını vermek derken, bütün kelimelerin anlamını vermekten mi bahsediyorsunuz?

P6 : Definition vermek sıkıcı oluyor. Genelde ya kelimelerin zıt ve eş anlamlarını vererek veya da cümle içerisinden tahmin etmeye çalışarak zaman zaman skimming and scanning yaparak paragraf içerisinden ne anlama geldiğini anlamaya çalışması tüm pasaj için değil ama paragrafta skim ve scan yapmaya çalışmak bir de onlara seçenekler vermeye çalışmak hani anlamı şu olabilir mi bu olabilir mi diye...

Bir kere paragraf paragraf gitmesinin sebebi writing de düşünürsek eğer bir parçanın önce introductionı oluyor arkasından gelecek development partta paragraf paragraf değişik açıklamalarla karşılaşıyor ve conclusionla karşılaşabiliyoruz. O yüzden paragraf paragraf gittiğimiz zaman çocuğun paragraf hakkında fikre sahip olması daha kolay oluyor ama öncelikle yine title veya resimlerle başlamamız gerekiyor, bununla ön kelimeleri vermekte fayda var. Yani mutlaka warm up olmalı, warm up olmadan alıştıramayız.

A : Reading strategy kavramı sizin için ne ifade ediyor?

P6 : Reading strategy özellikle okuduğumuz şeyi daha iyi özümseyebilmek analiz edebilmek için kullanıyoruz. İngilizcede bizim dilimize göre daha farklı referringler var bu kelimelerin neye karşılık geldiğini bilmeleri o konuyu anlamalarını sağlayacaktır. Referler önemli bir nokta. Ondan sonra yabancı kelimeleri anlayabilmek için ipuçları alabileceğimiz noktalar neler olabilir bunları bulabilmeleri açısından punctuation olsun gramer olsun ya da örnekler olsun ya da in other words ifadeleri olsun burdan bilmedikleri bir parçayı nasıl kolaylıkla anlayabileceklerini sağlamak. Biraz daha ileriki zamanda tabii ki skim and scanning yaparak konuyu nasıl daha çabuk kavrayıp aktarabildikleri önemli.

A : Günlük hayatınızda reading strategy kullanıyor musunuz?

P6 : Okurken evet kullanıyorum.

A : Hangi stratejileri ne amaçla kullanıyorsunuz?

P6 : Yani mesela kelimelerin neye refer ettiğini bulmaya çalışıyorum, ne anlama geldiğini bulmak için kelimenin contexti bir kaç defa okuyup tahmin etmeye çalışıyorum. Ya da eğer çabuk bakmam gereken bişe varsa skim ya da detaylı bilgi gerekiyorsa scanning yapıyorum. Yaptığım strategyler texte göre değişiyor.

A : Derste strategy kullanmaya yönlendiriyor musunuz?

P6 : Esp de öğretiyorum. Coursebookda da yönlendiriyorum ama isimlerini vererek değil. Ama tabii ki ben bunları seviyelerine göre verdiğimiz reading passageları okurken öncelikle bu reading strategyleri kullanmaya çalışıyorum. Öncelikle bir warm up yapıyoruz. Genelde coursebooklar da buna yönlendiriyor.

A : Sadece coursebookdaki strategyleri mi kullanıyorsunuz?

P6 : Kendi seçtiklerimi de kullanmaya çalışıyorum.

A : Esp de de öğretiyorum demiştiniz orda nasıl?

P6 : Genelde onda da step by step gidiyorum. Önce strategy belirleyip ona göre texti veriyoruz. Ne amaçla yaptığımızı anlatıp örneklerle pekiştirmeye çalışıyoruz.

A : Strategy modelliyor musunuz derste?

P6 : Yapıyorum.

A : Hangi stratejiler için yapıyorsunuz?

P6 : Özellikle anlam bulma konusunda, opposite ya da synonym bulmaya çalıştıklarında, keyword çalışmalarında yapıyorum. Başka... referringlerde yapıyoruz. Dictionary use da yapıyorum orda parts of speech de önemli bir nokta. Parts of speechine göre, texte göre dictionary de ne anlama geldiğini anlamaya ya da yazmaya çalışmak.

A : Okumaya başlamadan önce strategy uyguluyor musunuz?

P6 : Öncelikle bir kere resim ya da title konusunda warm-up yapmaya çalışıyorum. Ondan sonra mutlaka sessizce okumalarını istiyorum.

A : Okurken hangi stratejileri öneriyorsunuz?

P6 : Neyi gözlemledikleri veya nasıl okuduklarına dikkat etmeye çalışıyorum.

A : Sesli okuma mı yaptırıyorsunuz?

P6 : Önce sessiz okuyorlar sonra sesli o zaman alışmış oluyorlar ya da konuyla ilgili üç aşağı beş yukarı bir fikirleri oluyor. Nasıl okuduklarına odaklanıyorum. O yüzden orda onlara noktalamalara dikkat ederek okumalarını sağlamaya çalışıyorum. Arada onları bölerek noktalamalara dikkat etmeleri konusunda uyarıyorum ya da kelimeleri yanlış söylüyorlarsa arkadan ben tekrar söylüyorum ve tekrar etmelerini istiyorum.

A : Anlamaya yönelik bir şey yapıyor musunuz?

P6 : Okurken anlamaya yönelik birşey yapmıyorum. Kendi kendilerine anlamaya çalışıyorlar.

A : Okuduktan sonra öğrencilerinizi reading strategy kullanmaya teşvik ediyor musunuz?

P6 : Onlar okuduktan sonra paragraf paragraf ne anladıklarını sorular sorarak...

A : Vocabulary ne aşamada veriyorsunuz?

P6 : Paragraf paragraf çalışırken vermeye çalışıyorum çünkü context içerisinde ona göre soruları sorarken o cevapları da almak açısından paragraf çalışmasında veriyorum kelimeleri. Ondan sonra soru sorma ya da soru çıkarma sonra bir kaç true false sorusu ile ne kadarını anlayıp ne kadarını anlamadığını çıkarmaya çalışıyoruz. Summary yapabileceğim bir konu varsa zor değilse istiyorum. Ya da çıkardığınız sonuç nedir gibi sorular soruyorum.

A : Strategye yönlendirirken belirli bir kriteriniz var mı?

P6 : Öncelikle konu önemli. Reading pasajda istenen ne olabilir benim önceden çalışıp ona göre yönlendirme yapmaya çalışıyorum. Herzaman için referringle başlanmıyor ne bilim o anda işlemem gereken neyse amaç neyse ona göre yol almaya çalışıyorum. Belki kelimeler en son olabiliyor bazen, bazen sadece paragraf içerisinde konu içerisinde title a göre amaç ne ona göre yön çiziyorum. Benim kriterim konu ve amaca da bağlı tabii.

A : Kitabın yönlendirdiği stratejilere bağlı kalıyor musunuz?

P6 : Yani kitabın aktiviteleri evet önce kendi çalışmalarımızı yaptıktan sonra kitabın alıştırmaları pekiştirici oluyor. En azından daha rahat anlayıp anlamadıklarını, soruları okudukları zaman daha rahat cevap verebiliyorlar.

A : Teşekkür ederim

P6 : Rica ederim.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Personal Details

Name : Aysun YURDAIŞIK
Date of Birth : 01/11/1975
Place of Birth : Adana
E-mail : aysunyurdaisik@cag.edu.tr
aysunyurd@yahoo.com

Education

2004-2007 : M.A. at Çukurova University
Institute of Social Sciences
English Language Teaching
Adana, Turkey
1993-1997 : B. A. at Hacettepe University
Translation and Interpreting
Ankara, Turkey
1986-1993 : Adana Kurttepe Anadolu Lisesi
Adana, Turkey

Professional Experience

1997-1999 : Adana Güney Giyim Sanayi
Garment Merchandiser
Adana, Turkey
1999-2007 : Çağ University
Mersin, Turkey

Publications

“Visual Semiotics and Interpretation in the Television Commercial”

Applied Semiotics – Volume 6 – December 2005

Professional Development Activities

2002 Certificate of English Language Teaching, Çukurova University, Adana

2003 ‘Content Based Instruction’ Summer Institute, Uludağ University, Bursa

2006 ‘EFL Testing and Evaluation’ TOBB, Ankara

2007 ‘The First Cambridge Dünya ELT Symposium’ Side, Antalya