

**THE APPLICATION OF INTERACTING READER
VARIABLES WITH TEXT VARIABLES IN A READING
LESSON: THE CASE OF DEBRE MARKOS CTE FIRST
YEAR TRAINEES IN 10+3 PROGRAM**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE**

***IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A
FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)***

**BY
HAILE SHIBABAW**

JULY 2007

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE**

**The Application of Interacting Reader Variables with Text
Variables in a Reading Lesson: The Case of Debre Markos Cte
First Year Trainees in 10+3 Program**

**BY
Haile Shibabaw**

JULY 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Nuru Mohammed, my thesis advisor, for his professional and invaluable guidance throughout this research.

I also like to acknowledge EFL instructors and trainees of Debre Markos CTE for providing me with information, which is pertinent to the study.

My heartfelt thanks should also go to Ato Birhanu Alebachew and W/ro Yezina Tegegne for their help in editing and being on my side at all times of difficulties.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement.....	Page i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iv
Definition of Terms and Acronyms	v
Abstract.....	vi

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the Study	2
1.3 Significance of the Study	3
1.4 Delimitation of the Study.....	3

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	4
2.1 What is Reading?	4
2.2 Reading Models.....	5
2.2.1 The Bottom-up Model.....	6
2.2.2 The Top-down Model.....	6
2.2.3 The Interactive Model	7
2.3 Schema-Theoretic View of Reading.....	7
2.3.1 World Knowledge	8
2.3.2 Text Knowledge.....	10
2.3.3 The Effects of Formal and Content Schemata during Reading	11
2.4 Reader Variables Vs Textual Variables.....	12
2.4.1 Reader Variables.....	13
2.4.1.1 Prior Knowledge.....	13
2.4.1.2 Motivation	14
2.4.1.3 Strategies	15
2.4.1.4 Demographics.....	15
2.4.2 Textual Variables	16
2.4.2.1 Structural Features.....	16
2.4.2.2 Cohesion.....	17
2.4.2.3 Content.....	18
2.5 Comprehension Instruction in Content Areas	18
2.5.1 Levels of Comprehension.....	18
2.5.2 Instructional Strategies for Guiding Comprehension.....	19
2.5.2.1 The Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DR-TA).....	20
2.5.2.2 The Directed Reading Activity (DRA)	24

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH METHODS	27
3.1 The Subjects	27
3.2 Instruments.....	28

3.2.1 Questionnaire	28
3.2.2 Interview	29
3.2.3 Classroom Observation	29
3.3 Procedure.....	29
3.4 Data Analysis	30
 CHAPTER FOUR	
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	32
4.1 Instructors' Use of Reading Activities.....	32
4.1.1 Instructors' Use of Reading Activities (as rated by Instructors)	33
4.1.2 Instructors' Use of Reading Activities (as rated by Trainees)	34
4.2 Trainees' Purposes for Reading.....	37
4.2.1 Trainees' Purposes for Reading (as rated by Instructors)	37
4.2.2 Trainees' Purposes for Reading (as rated by Trainees)	38
4.3 Summary of Instructors and Trainees' Response to the Open-ended Questionnaire and to the Interview	39
4.3.1 Summary of Instructors and Trainees' Response to the Open-ended Questionnaire	40
4.3.2 Summary of Instructors and Trainees' Response to the Interview Questions	41
4.4 Features of Reading Texts/ Text Variables.....	45
4.4.1 Summary of Trainees and Instructors' Responses Concerning whether Reading Texts had clear Organizational Structure	46
4.4.2 Summary of Trainees and Instructors' Responses to whether the Level of difficulty of contents of the Reading Texts was Appropriate to the Trainees	48
 CHAPTER FIVE	
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	50
5.1 Summary	50
5.2 Conclusion.....	53
5.3 Recommendation	55
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	57
Appendix 1	62
Appendix 2	65
Appendix 3.....	71
Appendix 4.....	72
Appendix 5.....	74

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: General Features of EFL Instructors in Debre Markos CTE	27
Table 2: General Features of Trainees who Completed the Questionnaire	28
Table 3: Summary of Instructors' Responses Showing the Extent to which they use reading Activities (N =8).....	33
Table 4: Summary of Trainees' Responses Showing the Extent to which Instructors use Reading Activities (N =96).....	34
Table 5: Summary of Instructors' Responses Showing the Extent to which they get Trainees to use Purposes for Reading (N =8)	37
Table 6: Summary of Trainees' Responses Showing the Extent to which Instructors get them to use Purposes for Reading (N =96)	38
Table 7: Trainees' Responses to whether reading texts had clear organizational Structure (N =96).....	46
Table 8: Instructors' response to whether trainees Reading Texts had clear Organizational Structure (N=8).....	47
Table 9: Trainees' Response to Whether the Level of difficulty of Contents of the Reading Texts was Appropriate to them (N=96)	48
Table 10: Instructors' Response to Whether the Level of difficulty of Contents of the Reading Texts was Appropriate to the trainees (N=8).....	49

Definition of Terms and Acronyms

Bottom-up processing: Decoding of a text, step by step, from the smallest elements, for example, sounds or letters, gradually building up to larger units of meaning such as sentences (Hedge, 2000).

Content schemata: The background knowledge of a topic, which a learner holds in his or her mind, and which assists a learner in the interpretation of a text (Hedge, 2000).

Formal schemata: Prior knowledge of the formal structure of different types of texts, which assist readers and listeners in understanding and integrating them (Hedge, 2000).

Meta-cognitive strategies: Strategies used by language learners to plan, regulate, and monitor their learning (Hedge, 2000).

Schematic knowledge: Another term for prior knowledge, gained from experience, knowledge of the way the world is organized, which is held as mental representations in the mind (Hedge, 2000).

Top-down processing: This involves making sense of spoken or written language, primarily by referring to schematic knowledge.

DR-TA _ Directed Reading- Thinking Activity (Ruddell, 2001)

DRA _ Directed Reading Activity (Ruddell, 2001)

CTE– College of Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Reading constitutes much of the work at colleges. For example, they read to study different courses, to do assignments and to write project works. To do all these, efficient reading is an instrument without which success in college studies is not possible. As Hedge (2000) states, the level of reader comprehension of a text is determined by how well the reader variables interact with the text variables. Hence, the main objective of this study is to examine the application of interacting reader variables with text variables in a reading lesson. Accordingly, the specific research questions are designed to see the extent to which EFL instructors used reading activities to activate trainees prior knowledge to create new knowledge; to examine the extent to which EFL instructors got trainees to have purposes of reading that helped them to construct meaning, and to investigate the major problems that trainees faced when interacting with reading texts. Moreover, the other research questions addressed in this research were related to examining whether the reading texts had clear organizational structure, and whether the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts was appropriate to the trainees' level of understanding.

The subjects of the study were all the EFL instructors (8) and 96 EFL trainees at Debre Markos CTE. The 96 EFL trainees were selected using simple random sampling technique; that is, using lot. To gather data for the study, questionnaire, interview, and classroom observation were used. Mean, standard deviation and percentage were employed to analyze the data obtained through close-ended questionnaire whereas qualitative data analysis was used with the data obtained through open-ended questionnaire, interview and classroom observation.

The results from both the quantitative and the qualitative study showed that EFL instructors frequently helped trainees to do pre-reading questions and share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions. However, they did not seem to understand why they let them do the pre-reading questions and share ideas with a partner about the questions. Because, after trainees had finished discussing the pre-reading questions, they were asked to read the passage silently to answer the comprehension questions. They were not asked to read part (s) of the passage to adjust their prediction to link the old knowledge with the new one. The types of purposes of reading used were reading to identify specific and general information. Though these purposes are crucial to reproduce the exact text, they do not enable trainees to maintain coherence. The coherent meaning constructed by the reading will be some how related to the reader's prior experience (world knowledge) and the structures already formed in the reader's mind (textual knowledge). Moreover, inability in English language; shortage of vocabulary knowledge; lack of reading habit; negative belief on the use of doing comprehension questions; lack of exposure to do comprehension questions in the lower grades, and not getting the necessary help and follow-up from instructors were the main problems for the trainees not to be interested in doing comprehension questions. These problems were also causes for trainees' difficulty to express what they know about pre-reading questions in English.

Regarding text variables, the results showed that most of the reading texts that trainees read were related to the trainees' socio-cultural context; had clear organizational structure; introduced abstract concepts by using concrete examples; explicitly stated complex relationships, and included the three levels of comprehension questions. Nevertheless, they seemed to have problems in containing appropriate vocabulary load.

Finally, it is recommended that reading should be taught based on predict-sample text- repredict –resample process. Setting continual individual and group purposes for reading is also crucial to help trainees to construct meaning from reading texts.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

English is spoken as a foreign language in Ethiopia and is a medium of instruction in the education system from grade seven to tertiary level. The bulk of the teaching and learning materials used in different levels are written in English. Since reading constitutes much of the work at Colleges, a high degree of demand is placed on trainees to read academic texts. They, for example, read to do assignments, to pass tests and examinations, and to write term papers. Efficient reading is, therefore, an instrument, without which success in College studies is not possible. As Hedge (2000) states, the level of reader comprehension of the text is determined by how well the reader variables (interest level in the text, purpose for reading the text, knowledge of the topic, knowledge of the genre, foreign language abilities, awareness of socio-cultural context, and prior knowledge) interact with the text variables (text type, structure, syntax, and vocabulary). However, the question that often arises is “How well do the trainees in Colleges of Teacher Education interact with reading texts?”

My experience as English language teacher in three high schools and one College of Teacher Education has been that most students and trainees in these institutions have trouble in reading texts in their reading lessons. My information about this comes partly from my observations of students in my classrooms and partly from the students’ low scores on the reading part of tests and examinations. Furthermore, from the discussions I have had with colleagues from other colleges, I have learned that their students too have difficulty in reading. It is difficult for me to specify accurately what the nature of these difficulties is. However, when I read literature on reading, I understand that interacting reader variables with text variables is crucial for successful reading.

Concerning difficulties in relation to topic and genre, Harmer (2001:205) notes, “Many reading activities prove less successful than anticipated because the topic is not appropriate or because students are not familiar with the genre they are dealing with.” This means if learners are not interested in a topic or if they are unfamiliar with the text genre they are asked to work on, they develop resistance to engage themselves fully with the activity. This shows that the learners’ lack

of schematic knowledge, which is the combination of knowledge of the topic, of the genre, and of socio-cultural context, may be a major hindrance to successful reading.

Regarding text variables, Paran (1996) and Wallace (1992) state that sentence length, word length, and percentage of unknown words play their part in a text's comprehensibility; that is, texts with longer sentences and words, and with more percentage of unknown words will be more difficult to understand than those with shorter sentences and words and less percentage of unknown words.

To resolve problems related to systemic or language difficulty, Harmer (2001) recommends that we need to think about pre-teaching, using extensive reading, and considering alternatives to authentic language.

To resolve problems related to lack of schematic knowledge, Harmer (2001) recommends that practitioners need to think about how they choose and use topics and how they approach different reading genres. Moreover, to activate the learners' prior knowledge and to bring their schemata to the text, practitioners can give predictive tasks and interesting activities (Cook 1989).

If the language, topic, genre, and socio-cultural context of a text are familiar with learners, and if learners are given tasks, which raise their expectations, help them tease out meanings, and provoke an examination of the reading passage, then learners can be in a dynamic relationship with a text (Hedge 2000).

In this research, therefore, the researcher will try to examine the application of interacting reader variables with text variables during a reading lesson in relation to the first year trainees at Debre Markos College of Teacher Education in 2006/2007 academic year.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

Although the importance of reading remains unquestionable, the approach in conducting reading in the teaching learning process has never been an easy task in Colleges of Teacher Education. As mentioned in the statement of the problem part, experience tells us that there are considerable difficulties in the teaching learning of English reading. Therefore, the main objective of this research is to study the application of interacting reader variables with text variables in a reading lesson. Accordingly, the main specific research questions for this study are:

1. To what extent do EFL instructors use reading activities to activate trainees' prior knowledge to create new knowledge?
2. To what extent do EFL instructors give trainees purposes for reading that help them to construct meaning?
3. What major problems do trainees face when interacting with reading texts?
4. Do the reading texts have clear organizational structure?
5. Is the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts (sentence complexity, vocabulary) appropriate to the trainees' level of understanding?

1.3. Significance of the Study

The researcher believes that the result of the study is crucial for course designers to improve the courses specially the reading part of the courses. Moreover, the research is thought to be vital for learners in general and for College of Teacher Education trainees in particular by pinpointing aspects which are very helpful in making meanings from reading texts. The results of the study might also create awareness on the part of English language instructors on how to help trainees make meaning from reading texts. Furthermore, this research may initiate other researchers to do detailed research on similar issues that will not be addressed by this research.

1.4 Delimitation of the Study

The study is delimited to Debre Markos College of Teacher Education among the four regional colleges of Teacher Education found in the Amhara region. Although conducting the research on the four colleges of Teacher Education can strengthen the findings, it is beyond the time and the budget available to the researcher.

English language instructors and first year trainees majoring English language together with Amharic and social science (every trainee should major three fields) of 10+3 program were the population in the study. Debre Markos College of Teacher Education was selected a study site for it was the researcher's place of work that would make building rapport with the subjects of the study easier. The first year trainees were selected since the second year (10+2) trainees were at filed work (practicum) and the third year (10+3) trainees did not have courses in relation to reading skills.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents related literatures that are crucial to the issue under discussion. Hence, in this chapter, research results together with the information given by different scholars are included.

2.1 What is Reading?

Several people have defined reading in different ways. The definitions presented by various scholars usually range from equating reading with the recognition and decoding of words to taking reading as a creative and thinking process. Williams (1984), Widdowson (1979), Ruddell (2001) and Goodman (1967) are among the scholars who state about the what of reading. Williams (1984:2) defines reading as, “. . . a process where by one looks at and understands what has been written”. In this definition, emphasis is given to the effort of the reader to get the meaning of what he/she reads. According to Widdowson (1979), reading is a kind of dialogue between the reader and the text, or even between the reader and the author. In this statement, the reader’s intention is to construct personal interpretation of a text. Moreover, Ruddell (2001:28) defines reading, as it “is the act of constructing meaning while transacting with text”. In this case, the assumption is that the reader makes meaning through the combination of prior knowledge and previous experience; information available in text; the stance he or she takes in relationship to the text, and immediate, remembered, or anticipated social interaction and communication (Ruddell, 2001).

Goodman (1967) refers reading as a “Psycholinguistic guessing game”. It is principled guessing, which draws upon two sources to guide it. The first source is the text itself, and what the reader brings to the text is the second. Hedge (2000) points out readers bring to the text their knowledge of the world, the topic, the genre, the socio-cultural context, and the target language.

It is generally recognized now that the efficient reader versed in ways of interacting with various types of text, and chooses appropriate reading strategies depending on the particular text in question (McDonough and Show 1993). Skimming and scanning are clearly useful strategies for learners to operate; however, their usefulness has limitation in the sense that the learner scans for

particular information and then does not actually have to do anything with it. Nowadays, there is a general accepted view that efficient readers are not passive and do not operate in a vacuum; they react with the text by having expectations and ideas about the purpose of the text as well as ideas about possible outcomes (McDonough and Show, 1993).

As McDonough and Show (1993) Point out, classroom teachers often complain that students view reading as tedious and therefore, low priority simply because they do not feel challenged or involved in the text. This can be overcome if they can be encouraged to ‘dialogue’ with the writer by expecting questions to be answered, reflecting on expectations at every stage, anticipating what the writer will say next, and so on (ibid).

In many cases, an efficient reader appears to use what are called ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ strategies. This means that the reader will not just try to decipher the meaning of individual lexical items but will also have clear ideas about the overall rhetorical organization of the text. The essential features of the bottom-up approach are that the reader tries to decode each individual letter encountered by matching it to the minimal units of meaning in the sound system to arrive at a meaning of the text. Whereas with the top-down approach, the interaction process between the reader and the text involves the reader in activating knowledge of the world, plus past experience, expectations and intuitions, to arrive at a meaning of the text (for detail understanding please look at 2.2 below).

Another major contribution to our knowledge of reading, with many implications for the classroom, is provided by Schema theory. This theory takes the idea of the interactive reading process a stage further by proposing that efficient readers are able to relate ‘texts’ to their background knowledge of the world (for detail understanding please look at 2.3).

2.2 Reading Models

Many scholars have proposed various models of reading to deal with ways of processing a text. Based on the view they give emphasis, the models are generally known as bottom-up, top-down, and interactive (Harmer 2001).

2.2.1 The Bottom-up Model

The essential features of the bottom-up approach as indicated above are that the reader tries to decode each individual letter encountered by matching it to the minimal units of meaning in the sound system to arrive at a meaning of the text (McDonough and Shaw 1993). Ruddell (1971) and Gough (1972) are among the followers of the bottom-up model. Ruddell (1971) considers the reading process as a process in which a reader progresses serially from a morphophonemic level through a syntactic and then to a semantic level. Likewise, Gough (1972) regards a reading process, as it is a serial process where the reader recognizes every word through phonemic decoding; and understands meanings through understanding meaning of individual sentences.

Regarding the importance of the bottom-up model, Nuttall (1996) states that it helps the reader to build up a meaning from the black marks on the page by recognizing letters and words and working out sentence structure. When an initial reading leaves us confused due to perhaps our world knowledge is inadequate or the writer's point of view is very difficult to understand, it is necessary to scrutinize the vocabulary and syntax to make sure we have grasped the plain sense correctly.

Generally, in bottom-up model or processing, the reader focuses on individual words and phrases, and achieves understanding by stringing these detailed elements together to build up a whole (Harmer 2001).

The bottom-up model has its own shortcomings. Eskey (1988) points out the inadequacies as it fails to recognize the use of background knowledge and other cognitive and meta-cognitive skills such as predicting and anticipating.

2.2.2 The Top- down Model

In top-down model or processing, the reader gets a general view of the reading passage by absorbing the overall picture rather than looking at its elements (Harmer, 2001). Similarly, Hedge (2000) states that in top-down model comprehension strategies involve knowledge that a reader brings to a text as opposed to the information that is available within the text itself. As Hedge (2000) notes, in this model, the reader's background knowledge and his/her knowledge of the language and of the content are more important than the visual display-the text.

Smith (1978:78), one of the followers of the top- down model, describes meaning from a text:

Put simply the meaning of a text is some kind of relation to what is already known. The kind of relation is one of matching or correspondence that relates textual answers to the question posed by the predictions that are themselves motivated by what the reader knows or wants to know.

The top-down model has its own limitations in that it disregards the view that sometimes it is the individual details that help us understand the whole; without a good understanding of a reasonable proportion of the details gained through some bottom-up processing, we will be unable to get any clear general picture of what the text is about (Harmer, 2001).

2.2.3 The Interactive Model

The term ‘interaction’ refers to the interplay among various kinds of knowledge that a reader employs in moving through a text (Hedge, 2000). Two of these, syntactic and morphological knowledge, are to do with the language itself. These kinds of knowledge, as indicated above, help a reader to decode the language of a text. They can together be called linguistic, or systemic, knowledge. As stated by Hedge (2000), general world knowledge, socio cultural, topic, and genre knowledge together referred to as schematic knowledge. Schematic knowledge enables a reader to work with the language of the text to interpret its meaning. According to the view in the interactive model, the reading process involves the interaction and mutual influence of reader’s background knowledge and textual sources. Theorists have attempted to account for the effect of background knowledge using the schema theory of reading.

2.3 Schema-Theoretic View of Reading

Bartlett (1932), Adams and Collins (1979) and Cook (1989) are among the scholars who defined schema. According to Bartlett (1932), a schema is the organization of a subject’s past experiences that directly influence current perception. A schema has also been defined as “a description of a particular class of concepts and is composed of a hierarchy of schemata” (Adams and Collins (1979:3).

Cook (1989) notes that in order to make sense of any text we need to have pre-existent knowledge of the world, which is referred to as schema (plural schemata). When we are stimulated by particular words, discourse patterns, or contexts, such schematic knowledge is

activated and we are able to recognize what we see or hear because it fits into patterns that we already know.

Shank and Abelson (1977) point out that schemata are acquired, extended, and refined as a result of both direct and vicarious experience, and they carry with them cognitive maps, which tell us what to expect and how to behave in specific situations. Similarly, Wadsworth (1971) notes that we continually extend and refine schemata through the process of assimilation (adding new information to old schemata) and accommodation (creating new schemata or changing old ones with new information). Wadsworth (1971) also states that the sum of our schemata can be thought of as our knowledge of the world. The more experience we have and the more accurately and precisely we classify, generalize, differentiate, and predict, the more likely we are able to function successfully in many different contexts.

The relevance of schema theory to reading comprehension is that it acknowledges semantic constructivity. Adams and Collins (1979) described the role of semantic constructivity:

A fundamental assumption of schema-theoretic approaches to language comprehension is that spoken or written text does not in itself carry meaning. Rather, a text only provides directions for listeners or readers as to how they should retrieve or construct the intended meaning from their own, previously acquired knowledge. The words of a text evoke in the reader-associated concepts, their past interrelationships and their potential interrelationships.

(Adams and Collins, 1979:3)

As noted in Ruddell (2001), residing in schemata, at least two types of prior knowledge are critical to the reading process. The first is world knowledge, which is the total amount of information a person has accumulated through day-to-day living experience. The second is text knowledge, which is information accumulated from reader's experiences with print.

2.3.1 World Knowledge

World knowledge includes information within individual schemata, information involving networks of relationships between and across schemata, and information about embedded characteristics of schemata (Rumelhart, 1981). As exemplified in Rumelhart (1981), the "library" schema has within it a large number of schemata we could enumerate: "desk", "chair", "classification system", and "book", to name a few. These schemata are related to, and in fact

embedded in, various other schemata. Think about a library desk, a school desk, an office desk, a computer desk, and so forth and you begin to get the idea. Each of these world knowledge schemata carries with it the scripts, as well as procedural knowledge that makes it possible for the reader to organize information, allocate attention, draw inferences, carry out orderly memory searches, edit and summarize information, and remember information (Anderson, 1994).

During reading, world knowledge serves as both the foundation for and the building blocks for constructing meaning- that is, the amount, type, and kind of prior knowledge a reader has about a given topic and the manner in which the reader links known and new knowledge affects the meaning he or she constructs for the immediate text. Hartman (1995) describes this process as “mobilization of potential knowledge fragments” in which the reader engages in “transposing texts into other texts, absorbing one text into another, and building a variety of intersecting texts” that lead to a reader’s construction of meaning (1995:526). World knowledge is thus constantly changing as the result of our on going transactions in the world around us and perceptions of incoming information; as a result, no two readings of the same text are ever the same (Weaver, 1994). Generally, the greater the reader’s world knowledge, the greater the likelihood that he or she will construct meaning congruent with the author’s intended meaning. Rumelhart (1981:22) suggests three explanations to account for lack of concurrence between reader text and author text.

1. The reader may not have the appropriate schemata. In this case, amount of world knowledge is the critical feature in that reader simply has no basis for constructing meaning. The reader could not make meaning of ideas for which he or she had no world knowledge.
2. The reader may have the appropriate schemata, but the information available in text may not suggest them. Here, the reader constructs incomplete or inappropriate meaning but could possibly construct meaning given addition textual information to direct attention to the intended schemata.
3. The reader may construct a consistent interpretation of text, but not the one intended. In this instance, the reader “understands text” but misunderstands the author. This situation can occur when prior knowledge is inaccurate; when stylistic devices signaling author intent, such as irony or exaggeration, are not perceived; or when reader linkages are significantly different from author linkages (Anders and Lloyd, 1989).

Hartman (1995) makes the important point that prior knowledge is not some static “thing” that readers bring to reading events and “unload” before they read; rather, prior knowledge is constantly changing- and creating change-throughout reading, so that it influences and is influenced by all of the elements of the reading event.

2.3.2 Text Knowledge

In addition to using world knowledge, readers also employ prior knowledge about text while reading. Text knowledge is a subject of world knowledge .It contains all that the individual knows about how text is organized, how one processes text, how the language of text functions, what expectations are reasonable when approaching print, what procedures are useful interaction with text, and countless other conventions of text (Ruddell, 2001).

Ruddell (2001) further notes that knowledge about text information becomes increasingly sophisticated and complex as we have correspondingly wider experience with written text. This information forms a set of assumptions and expectations about text that operates each time we begin to read and continue throughout the reader- text interaction.

Ruddell (2001) states that the reader’s ability to construct meaning congruent with the author’s intended meaning depends on the content of his or her prior knowledge and previous experience, on her or his ability to access that prior knowledge base, and on the type and content of the linkages he or she makes between available texts. The reader’s ability to construct meaning also depends on her or his ability to use information available in text.

As Ruddell (2001) points out, text and world-knowledge are available in text; whether or not the reader’s prior knowledge base makes their meaning accessible, when information in text is already known, that is considered redundant and readily processed. In other words, the things in text that the reader knows before entering that text are redundant and, because of their redundancy, require less mental energy and cognitive processing time.

World-knowledge information in text may be redundant as well. For example, the degree to which individuals have experienced reading history books and suspense novels is the degree to which the information is redundant for each person. We create “slots” in our history book and suspense novel schemata for redundant elements that allow us to encounter them in text and process them with very little mental effort; thus, the amount of redundancy present in text

determines, to some degree, the amount of mental energy we have to concentrate on new information (Anderson, 1994).

When readers use information both from their own prior knowledge base and from information available in text, they are thus able to enter text with expectations or predictions that assist in constructing the intended meaning. New, or non-redundant, information available in text is understood to the degree that the reader is able to create linkages between the new information and his or her prior knowledge base. New information is the information for which we literally have no slots; therefore, when text is highly abstract or obscure, creating cognitive links between the new and the known is difficult (Sadosk and Paivo, 1994). As readers working independently, they frequently give up or seek help constructing meaning for text with large amounts of new information. In school, instruction and/or social interactions often assist readers in creating links that allow understanding of new information.

2.3.3 The Effects of formal and Content Schemata During Reading

In seeking to understand the role of background knowledge in reading comprehension, it is often useful to draw a distinction between formal schemata (background knowledge of the formal, rhetorical organizational structures of different types of texts) and content schemata (background knowledge of the content area of a text) (Carrell 1983).

Carrell (1983) notes the possible causes for a reader's failure to activate an appropriate schema. One possible cause of the failure to activate an appropriate schema may be the writer is not having provided sufficient clues in the text for the reader to utilize effectively a bottom-up processing model to activate schemata the reader may already possess. The other cause can be the fact that the reader does not possess the appropriate schema anticipated by the author and thus fails to comprehend. In both instances, there is a mismatch between what the writer anticipates the reader can do to extract meaning from the text and what the reader is actually able to do.

As Carrell (1983) has stated one of the most obvious reasons, why a particular content schema may fail to exist for a reader, is that the schema is culturally specific and is not part of particular reader's cultural background. Study by Carrell (1981a) has shown that the implicit cultural content knowledge presupposed by a text interacts with the reader's own cultural background knowledge of content to make texts whose content is based on one's own culture easier to read

and understand than syntactically and rhetorically equivalent texts based on a less familiar, more distant culture.

Other research has shown general effects of content schemata on EFL/ESL reading comprehension. Johnson (1982) has shown that EFL/ESL readers had better recall a text on a familiar topic than a similar text on an unfamiliar topic. Moreover, Hudson (1982) reports a study showing an interaction between overall linguistic proficiency in EFL/ESL and content induced schematic effects in EFL/ESL reading comprehension. Specifically, that study demonstrates the facilitating effects on comprehension of explicitly inducing content schemata through pre-reading activities, especially at the beginning and intermediate proficiency levels, as compared to two other methods of inducing content schemata (through vocabulary activities and read-reread activities).

Several recent studies have shown the effects of formal, rhetorical schemata in EFL/ESL. In a study by Carrell (1981b), two groups of university bound, intermediate-level ESL subjects each read a different type of simple story-one type well structured according to a simple story schema structure and the other type deliberately violating the story schema structure. Results showed that when second language learners process stories violating the story schema, both the quantity of recall and the temporal sequences of recall are affected. In other words, when the content is kept constant but the rhetorical structure is varied, second language reading comprehension is affected.

2.4 Reader Variables Vs Textual Variables

Reader variables are what the reader brings to the reading text including reading skill, goal, purpose and strategy used in reading, prior knowledge, interest, motivation, culture, and gender. Whereas text variables include such things as font size and style, white space, amount of words on the page, bullets, numbering key points, and the like; but also include cohesiveness of the text, content density, readability, and placement of key ideas within the paragraph (local coherence) or with the entire text (global coherence) (Doak et al, 1996). Proper use of these variables, help make the text more considerate to the reader by providing coherence and structural clues that act as guideposts when reading (Goldman and Rakestraw, 2000). Thus, reading comprehension is hampered if the reader fails to bring adequate knowledge to the text, and if textual feature impede

the reader's ability to make connections between new and accessed information from the readers prior knowledge (Langer, 1990).

2.4.1 Reader Variables

Reader variables that will be described in this section include prior knowledge, motivation, use of reading strategies, and demographic characteristics such as age, gender and culture.

2.4.1.1 Prior knowledge

Comprehension is the “use of prior knowledge to create new knowledge” (Adams and Bruce, 1982). The author has initial responsibility for comprehensibility of text, but the major factor related to reading comprehension is the goodness of fit between reader and text. This includes prior knowledge, motivation, cultural background, age, and interest of the reader. Prior knowledge can be gained from informal sources, like family, the home environment, or peers; or more formal sources like school, where subject matter and topic knowledge are learned (Alexander et al, 1994). Aspects of prior knowledge that influence reading comprehension include previous use of reading strategies, life experience, culture, language knowledge or conceptual knowledge. Any of these aspects offer a good fit or a mismatch between reader and text (Gordon, 1992).

According to Harmer (2001), language knowledge enables readers to work on the reading text. A fluent reader has a good knowledge of language structure and can recognize a wide range of vocabulary automatically. It is clear that foreign language readers are going to have difficulties in processing texts, which contain unfamiliar aspects of the English language. For example, inability to understand the cohesive devices in a text will impede understanding of the functional relationships of sentences. Cohesive devices include such things as reference items (for example, ‘they’, ‘these matters’ ‘the latter’); lexical cohesion through a chain of synonyms (for example, ‘funding ... financing ... resourcing), or deletion of items such as relative pronouns (for example, ‘which’ and ‘that’). Berman (1984) has suggested that deletion, another cohesive device, can make a text ‘opaque’ to the reader.

A reader may also use discourse signals of various kinds to get through a text. These may be connectives such as ‘moreover’, which signals addition, or ‘whereas’, which signals contrast, ‘because’ which signal reason, or ‘therefore’, which signals result (Harmer 2001).

A concern that students should exploit their knowledge of language effectively implies a number of points for the methodology of the reading class (Harmer 2001). First, encouraging extensive reading may help some students to build knowledge of vocabulary and an awareness of the features of written texts. Second, texts need to be chosen and tasks designed to provide support for what the learner already knows. Third, there might be value in regular use of analytical activities, which draw students' attention explicitly to some linguistic features of texts. Finally, when students deal with a particular reading text in class, the teacher will need to prepare them for any specific language difficulty they might encounter in it.

2.4.1.2 Motivation

Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) defined reading motivation as the interaction of individual goals, values, and beliefs with the topics, processes, and outcomes of reading. Motivated readers do so with purpose, a desire for understanding, a sense of self-efficacy and ownership. Internal desires (intrinsic reasons) or external (extrinsic) forces are factors that motivate readers to read and comprehend text (Ibid).

Intrinsic motivation comes from within the reader. Intrinsically motivated readers have a learning-goal orientation: they read for its own sake, to satisfy curiosity, or for challenge or involvement (Alexander and Jettson, 2000). This sense of self-determination encourages readers to engage more deeply, take risks, create their own learning opportunities, and to keep plugging along in the face of reading challenges (Ibid).

Extrinsic motivations for reading include recognition, competition, and work avoidance (the reader uses strategies to reduce the amount of reading) (Guthrie, 1996). Extrinsically motivated readers do so to accomplish a performance goal rather than a learning goal. The strongest extrinsically motivating factors are grades, approval, incentives, and recognition (Guthrie and Wigfield, 2000).

Motivations develop and evolve within individual readers and increase as the reader develops a sense of agency over his/her reading and purposes for reading. Guthrie and Alao (1997) suggest eight principles that increase motivations for reading. They relate to conceptual themes, real-world interactions, self-direction, interesting text, social collaboration, self-expression, cognitive strategy instruction, and curricular coherence.

2.4.1.3 Strategies

Reading strategies are the purposeful use of procedures to facilitate deeper and better understanding (Alexander and Jettson, 2000). Pritchard (1990:280) elucidates the following taxonomy of processing reading strategies:

1. Developing awareness (awareness of the task, recognizing a loss of concentration, acknowledging a failure to understand a portion of the text).
2. Accepting ambiguity (in terms of skipping unknown words, suspending judgment, formulating questions, and considering alternate inferences).
3. Establishing intrasententialties (gathering information, re-reading, paraphrasing, using context clues to interpret words or phrases, and reacting to the author's style or the surface structure of the text).
4. Establishing intresententialties (reading a head, relating the stimulus sentence to a previous portion of the text, extrapolating from information presented in the text, and confirming/disconfirming on inference).
5. Using background knowledge (of the discourse format, referring to a previous passage, responding affectively to text content, visualizing, relating the stimulus sentence to personal experience, and speculating beyond information presented in the text).

In the Pritchard (1990) study, reading strategies were used more frequently when passages were culturally unfamiliar. When readers did not possess the correct schema for a passage, they relied on inferences to try to make sense of the material.

Meyer (1985) found that more proficient adolescents and adult readers were likely to use strategies, while less proficient readers did not. This finding would seem to indicate that reading strategies should be explicitly taught, and that strategy suggestions could be offered to the reader before trying to unpack difficult text.

2.4.1.4 Demographics

Demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, and culture influence reading comprehension by way of the prior knowledge that one brings to the reading event, the type of strategies, and

motivations used for reading (Alexander and Jettson, 2000). Pritchard (1990) found that comprehension was increased when passages were culturally familiar.

2.4.2 Textual Variables

Textual features provided by the author help the reader make connections within the text, and influence the way text is interpreted. These features include structure, content, and cohesion of the text, and how the letters and words are placed on the page. They facilitate reading comprehension by providing clues in the text. In this section, textual variables such as structure, content and physical features (Cohesion) will be described.

2.4.2.1 Structural Features

Reading comprehension is facilitated if the text is well organized, and the structure is apparent to the reader (Armbruster, 1984). This is especially important if text content is unfamiliar to the reader (McKeown et al., 1997). Readers use text structure to find key ideas, but depending on content schema and text schema of the reader; some structures are easier to read than others are. Structural features include coherence and rhetorical relationships.

According to Armbruster (1984), the most important structural characteristic is textual coherence. The more coherent the text, the more likely the reader is to make the necessary connections between ideas at the sentence level with the overall ideas in the text. Armbruster (1984) classifies coherence as local and global. Global coherence is the term used to describe the integration of ideas across the entire text. Local coherence means that ideas are tied together both within and between sentences. Readers spend more time and expend more cognitive energy trying to make sense of an in-cohesive text (ibid). The premise behind Armbruster's classification of coherence is that the reader must construct meaning at the sentence level in order to make sense of the overall meaning of the text.

Rhetorical relationships (use of titles, headings, a preview, and repetition of content) play an important role in content structure (Meyer, 1985); they help the reader make associations within the text at a global level (Goldman and Rakestraw, 2000). They inter-relate sentences, and give the text its structure. Rhetorical devices help guide the reader's processing of the text, but a reader must realize their significance in order to use them effectively (Goldman and Rakestraw,

2000). Rhetorical devices include organization or structural clues, linguistic clues, and signaling devices (Alexander and Jettson, 2000).

Comprehension is enhanced with the repeated and consistent use of these devices, but readers need to know what they are and how to use them effectively (Meyer, 1985).

Understanding basic organizational and syntactic rules in a text will help the reader find the location of main ideas within the text on both a local and global level. For example, the reader must understand how to generalize global concepts into a single proposition, and to draw conclusions or make inferences about these propositions. Since placement of main ideas within the text and the paragraph will affect reading comprehension, readers should tend to read for important information at the beginning and end of a passage (Kieras, 1985).

Signaling devices are among the elements of the rhetorical relationships. They emphasize content or structure, and help the reader attend to important content. Examples include the use of titles, headings, a preview, or repetition of content (Goldman and Rakestraw, 2000). Signaled information is processed longer and recalled better by making the reader more aware important points at a local and global level (ibid). Major concepts and important key ideas can be highlighted by using number lists; underlining, changing the font, color or size, bolding or italicizing; bullets, arrows or tables.

2.4.2.2 Cohesion

Linguistic cues are another type of signaling device, and provide a sense of cohesion within the text. Halliday and Hason (1976) describe the interdependent nature of words, sentences, and paragraphs within the text, and define cohesion as a set of semantic resources for linking sentences. Cohesion is “the set of possibilities that exist in the language of making the text hang together” (Halliday and Hason, 1976:18).

The integrative cues or connectives that help link ideas together to create a more cohesive text are words such as also, for instance, because, nevertheless, finally, furthermore, and consequently (Goldman and Bakestraw, 2000). These explicit cues help the reader relate one idea to another and add to textual cohesion. Armbruster (1984) refers to these connectives as a form of local coherence; a “linguistic mortar” used to help hold ideas together.

2.4.2.3 Content

The content of a text is an important variable in reading comprehension, but the most important aspect is that the text be a good match with the reader's prior knowledge, skills, interests, learning goals, and culture (Alexander et al., 1994). Unfortunately, there are texts, which make incorrect assumptions about the reader's prior knowledge, and fail to provide adequate additional information or explicit links to help the reader make meaning of the text (Beck et al., 1998).

2.5 Comprehension Instruction in Content Areas

In this section, levels of comprehension, and certain instructional strategies for guiding comprehension are described.

2.5.1 Levels of Comprehension

Ruddel, (2001), notes that scholars have generally identified three or four levels of comprehension except six levels of Bloom's taxonomy. Herber (1978) and Vacca and Vacca (1999) call the levels of comprehension as "Literal, Interpretive, Applied"; Readence, Bean and Baldwin (1998) call them as "Text- Explicit, Text- Implicit, Experience- Based", and Roe, Stoodt and Burns (1995) identify them as "Literal, Interpretive, critical and creative).

As Ruddel (2001) states that although the labeling terminology changes, the descriptions of these levels are remarkably similar. Hence, Ruddel (2001:113) describes Herber's (1978) Literal, Interpretative and Applied comprehension levels as follows:

Literal comprehension refers to meaning derived from "reading the lines", in which the reader constructs meaning that accurately reflects the author's intended message. Literal comprehension is text explicit; that is, answers to literal questions require the reader understanding of ideas stated directly in text. The second level of comprehension- interpretive comprehension- refers to meaning derived by reading "between the lines", in which the reader perceives author intent or understands relationships between text elements that are not stated directly. Interpretive comprehension is text implicit; answers to interpretive questions require the reader to draw conclusions in response to unstated cause-effect relationships or comparisons, and symbolic use of language and ideas.

The highest level of comprehension- applied comprehension-refers to meaning derived by reading “beyond the lines”, in which the reader understands unstated relationships between information in text and information in his/her prior knowledge base. “Applied comprehension is schema implicit (experience based); answers to questions at this level require integration of new information into the reader’s previous fund of knowledge, from which new relationships emerge” (Ruddel, 2001).

Literal, interpretive, and applied levels of comprehension constitute a hierarchical arrangement of the quality of meaning a reader constitutes during and after encounters with text. At the lowest level, the reader understands the author’s intended meaning; at the second, the reader draws conclusions and sees implied relationships, and at the highest, the reader perceives new relationships. The goal of comprehension instruction is to teach students how to achieve all three levels (Ruddel, 2001).

2.5.2 Instructional Strategies for guiding Comprehension

Pearson, Roehler, Dole, and Duffy (1990) summarized a body of comprehension research about what strategies good readers use to construct full, rich meaning from text. From the many studies reviewed by Pearson and his associates, the following profile of proficient readers has merged. Pearson and his associates call the proficient readers “expert” or “thoughtful” readers. According to Pearson and Colleagues, thoughtful readers:

- constantly search for connections between what they know and what they encounter as new information in the text.
- constantly monitor the adequacy of the models of text meaning they build.
- take steps to repair faulty comprehension once they realize that they have failed to understand something.
- learn very early to distinguish important from less important ideas in the text they read.
- are especially adept effectively that synthesizing information within and across texts and reading experiences.
- make inferences during and after reading to achieve a full, integrated understanding of what they read.

- sometimes consciously (usually unconsciously) ask questions of themselves, the authors they encounter, and the text they read.

To provide ongoing developments of students' comprehension abilities, teachers need to teach in such a way that the characteristics of thoughtful or strategic readers described above are taught and encouraged as students encounter classroom text. In this section two strategies, which are renewed in the course of time and recommended as an effective means for facilitating students' comprehension, are described. These strategies are the Directed Reading- Thinking Activity (DR-TA) and the Directed Reading Activity (DRA).

2.5.2.1 The Directed Reading- Thinking Activity (DR-TA)

The Directed Reading- Thinking Activity (DR-TA) was introduced by Russell Stauffer in 1969 as a means of developing reading comprehension. It has received renewed attention and recommendation as an effective means of facilitating students' comprehension over the years (Gillett and Temple, 2000). Essentially, the DR-TA guides students through text by having the teacher ask students to make and support predictions before reading and then examine their predictions, conclusions, and logic as reading progresses (Ruddell, 2001).

Smith (1994: 19) makes a strong argument for DR-TA and DR-TA like instruction that focuses on students' predictions and subsequent reading of text;

Now at last prediction and comprehension can be tied together. Prediction means asking questions, and comprehension means being able to get some of the questions answered. Comprehension, basically, is the absence of confusion. As we read, as we listen to someone talking, as we go through life, we are constantly asking questions, and then we comprehend. . . In addition, the person who does not comprehend a book or newspaper article is the one who cannot find relevant questions and answers concerning the next part of the text. There is a flow to comprehension, with new questions constantly being generated from the answers that are sought.

According to Ruddell (2001), DR- TA is an important instructional strategy due to several reasons. The first reason is that it replicates the predict-sample text- repredict-resample process as a critical component of comprehension; it encourages the behaviors of thoughtful and strategic readers; and it stimulates full, rich understanding of text with its emphasis on prediction and discussion. The second reason is that it is adaptable to many different text styles. Third, the DR-TA is particularly useful for accommodating the wide cultural, language, and literacy differences

students bring to classrooms and for supporting students in constructing new knowledge. Furthermore, it encourages students to construct meaning collaboratively and stimulates a great deal of student talk and verbal interchange, thus bringing into the classroom the real-life interaction and mutual sharing of knowledge and ability that are characteristic of everyday learning. Most importantly, the wide-ranging, rich classroom discussion of a DR- TA exposes speakers with limited English to the very language they are trying to learn. Stauffer (1980) points out five steps in the DR-TA.

The 1st step is identifying purposes for reading. The underlying view in this step is the DR-TA begins with students setting individual and group purposes for reading as they create inter textual links by combining prior knowledge with information in text to predict what the text is going to be about. Purpose setting continues throughout the reading each time students repredict, raising new questions, and then sample increasing amounts of text. In discussion, new links occur and students therefore return to text repeatedly with a purpose for reading; to get answers to questions arising from their predictions or to see whether new information will cause these predictions to be revised.

The 2nd step is adjusting rate to purposes and material. According to Stauffer (1980) rate adjustment occurs along two dimensions in a DR- TA: (1) rate and flow of information (teacher-determined) and (2) reading rate (student-determined). The teacher determines the amount of text to be revealed between stop- points and the length of discussion time at each. The first stop-point should occur immediately following a title or opening line (ibid). Here, students are invited to speculate about all the possible contexts into which the title (line) might fit. Predictions will vary from literal to highly abstract. As they share predictions in class, students examine a variety of experiences- their own and others'- that not only present a range of possibilities but also raise question, "which of these will it be?"

The second stop-point- one paragraph, and sometimes two-usually provides partial answers to this question. Stopping at this point to discuss and make predictions launches students into the cycle of predicting-sampling text-repredicting- resampling that is so important to comprehension.

Decisions, regarding how much text is to be read between stop- points, should be based on text difficulty, concept density within the text, and students' familiarity with the topic (Ruddell, 2001). Generally, stop-points should occur at logical places- at the end of sections, following

highly abstract passages, at the end of a page, or at points of high suspense-and should not exceed four or five stops per DR- TA lesson to allow ample opportunity for discussion, refinements of ideas, and guidance during reading without undue interruption (ibid).

Critical to the guidance provided is the amount of discussion time at each stop-point. The amount of time allowed determines how long students will have to think and make predictions about what they are reading. It depends, in part, on the amount of information available and the degree of student participation. Of prime importance is the teacher's sensitivity to student needs and willingness to wait for ideas to occur (Ruddell, 2001).

Step 3 is observing the reading. For instruction to be effective, a certain amount of guided silent reading needs to be done in classroom. Teacher observation during that reading yields much valuable information about students' silent reading abilities and allows the teacher to assist those students who do need help. Whether in small groups or with an entire class, the teacher can quickly learn, which students are faster readers and which are slower, which students are actually reading and which are not, which students exhibit signs of series reading problems (inattention, extreme slowness, stress symptoms, and so on), what strategies students use to get meaning from text or figure out on unknown word, and many other details (Stauffer, 1980).

Step 4 is related to developing comprehension. By now, it should be clear that developing comprehension is an integral part of all phases of the DR-TA (Stauffer, 1980). It occurs as students combine prior knowledge and new information to make predictions, read to confirm or adjust their predictions, and then draw conclusions and speculate during class discussion. It also occurs during the periodic discussions as students compare their knowledge base with others' ideas and view points to their thinking (Ruddeel, 2001). During this process, it is the teacher's responsibility to see that new concepts are developed and reinforced and that students can anchor them within the framework of their prior knowledge base (Ibid).

As Stauffer (1980) states, the questioning strategies that teachers use to initiate and extend discussion are critical to developing comprehension in the DR-TA. The standard DR-TA has essentially two types of questions:

1. Questions that require speculation and prediction:

“With a title like that, what do you think the chapter (or story or article or passage) will be about? ”

“Now what do you think?”

“What information do you think we’ll find in this chapter (paragraph)?”

“What do you think will happen next?”

2. Questions that require drawing conclusions and/or providing support:

“What makes you say that?”

“Why?”

“How do you know that?”

The final step-**step 5**-pointed out by Stauffer (1980) is developing fundamental skills. When the reading is completed, the teacher directs the class in developing skills that are appropriate to student needs and instructional goals. Activities should not require students to write answers to literal questions about what they have just read and discussed. The quality of the discussion and the level of understanding students have achieved have gone well beyond literal comprehension already (ibid). Activities should extend student response to text in some important way and may include vocabulary study, various activities to organize and combine information, or any of numerous writing activities (Ibid).

Hartman (1995) states the purpose and outcome of DR-TA. The purpose of DR-TA, as stated by Hartman, is to promote disciplined inquiry in which students use prior knowledge and evidence from text to arrive at new linkages, insights, and understandings, whether these new ideas come from within the immediate text or across multiple texts.

One of the greatest values of a DR-TA is the sharing of diverse individual experiences and perceptions. This, however, does not mean that DR-TA lessons compromise the integrity for precision of what is to be learned; they do not. Rather, it acknowledges that students may take very different paths toward that understanding. Understanding of text information is the outcome of a DR-TA lesson (Hartman, 1995).

The teacher's role during a DR-TA lesson is to accept student predictions, making no judgment about how "correct" the predictions are, and to concentrate on follow-up probe questions after reading that assist students in making linkages between what they predicted and what they find and in articulating the reasons, logic, and evidence for the predictions that are made (Ruddell, 2001). Teachers interject information only when student comments indicate misinformation or misunderstanding. Critical to this point is that the teacher's role involves much listening than it does talking (Ibid).

Good DR-TA teachers quite often find themselves standing in front of a class calling on students, nodding, and saying, "Why?", "What makes you say that?" "Um-hmm", "Really?" and "Any other ideas?". The teacher encourages students to support predictions and opinions through Metacognitive thought- that is, to examine aloud how they know something or reveal their line of reasoning and to clarify the logic of their thinking (Ruddell, 2001).

2.5.2.2 The Directed Reading Activity (DRA)

Betts introduced the Directed Reading Activity (DRA) in 1946. He designed it originally for the purpose of increasing students' comprehension of text, and embedding skill development into lessons focusing on conceptual understanding (Ruddell, 2001). Herber (1978) introduces the five steps of the DRA (1) preparation of reading, (2) guided silent reading, (3) comprehension development, (4) skill development and application, and (5) extension and follow-up activities.

Step 1 Preparation for Reading: Herber (1978) states that the DRA begins with two types of reader preparation. First is vocabulary presentation, in which selected words from the text are pre-taught for the purpose of reducing or removing barriers to comprehension. This is based on two very important assumptions: (1) that the identified words are critical to comprehension of the passage, and (2) that the words, as they appear in the passage, are unfamiliar to the students.

Presentation of the vocabulary words must be done in context so that students will have sufficient information to understand how each word is used in the text and to draw on their prior knowledge base for speculating about possible meanings. Students are invited to contribute ideas they have about each word's meaning in this context (prior knowledge and previous experience combined with information available in text), and discussion continues until a satisfactory definition is reached (ibid).

According to Herber (1978), the pre-reading vocabulary presentation should be short and to the point and it should at most take no longer than 5 to 10 minutes since the purpose of vocabulary study during preparation for reading is to help students comprehend text by giving them information about new words and new concepts they will encounter in the text.

The second part of preparation for reading focuses student attention on the content of the text and engages student interest and participation. It begins with the teacher's focusing statements and questions: "Today we are going to begin our . . .; what do you already know about . . .?" or "How many of you know about . . .?" The discussion following such questions activates students' prior knowledge and previous experience by allowing them to recall both direct and vicarious experience related to a given topic (Herber, 1978). Further, it creates a pool of shared knowledge that becomes the basis for new learning- in essence, the collective class schema will help students to sensitize the information they will encounter in text. This discussion is valuable for all students since it uses as a means for bringing into play diverse viewpoints, perceptions, and cultural experience; it stimulates interest in learning as students perceive points of commonality across various sets of knowledge and experience, points of difference, and unresolved questions (Ibid).

Step 2 Guided silent Reading: Herber(1978) notes that guided silent reading begins with a statement of purpose for reading given by the teacher; for example, "Read pages. . . to find out how. . ." or "Read the text to find out how. . .".this statement of purpose shapes the reader's stance in relationships to text. The purpose statement should be prepared in advance and should correspond directly to the teacher's instructional objectives.

When the text is particularly long or difficult, the teacher may provide more guidance by dividing the reading text into sections, stopping at the end of each section for discussion, and then suggesting another purpose for continued reading (Ruddell, 2001). This allows the teacher to monitor student progress a bit more carefully and see the development of concepts that are important to comprehend subsequent information.

Step 3 Comprehension Development: Purpose-setting statements teach students how to enter text with focused intent and increase the possibility that all students will construct purposeful meaning from text. Following response to the purpose- setting question, discussion then should be focused on exploration of many aspects of the reading and application of that information to students' (Herber, 1978).

Step 4 Skill Development and Application: Skill development and application should follow logically and reasonably from discussion that has taken place and from the lesson objectives. The intent of this part of the DRA is to give students opportunity to practice doing what they have just learned to do, whether it is observing and recording, solving or reading and interpreting. The answer to the questions in relation to the practices mentioned above allow you to decide if your skill development and application activity should be some sort of drill, vocabulary study, expository/narrative writing, group mapping with discussion and analysis, individual or group projects, or some combination of the above.

Step 5 Extension and follow-up Activities: For extension and follow-up activities Ruddell (2001) recommends the Three- Minute write, in which students are asked to write about what they learned, what they didn't learn, what they understood, what they didn't understand, what they want more of, and what bothered them. These may be signed or anonymous and are turned into the teacher. The wise teacher reads these writings carefully, noting where confusion/non comprehension occurred, looking to see what should be repeated and what should not, checking to see if damage-control efforts need to be launched, and facing honestly his/her own strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the students.

The DRA has been criticized as being too focused on teacher talk and not focused enough on student thinking (Stauffer, 1969) and as being too closely connected with direct reading instruction rather than emphasizing content learning (Herber,1978). Ruddell (2001) argues that although the biggest problem with the DRA is that teachers misuse it, it is a solid, useful instructional strategy when it is used intelligently and appropriately.

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter focuses on describing the samples, the instruments used, the procedure and the methods of data analysis.

3.1 The Subjects

There are four Colleges of Teacher Education (CTE) in the Amahra Regional State namely Debre Markos, Debre Birhan, Gondar and Dessie. These colleges are responsible to train teachers in 10+1 and 10+3 programs. As indicated in the first chapter, the research site was Debre Markos CTE. Therefore, the subjects of the study were EFL instructors and trainees of Debre Markos CTE. In Debre Markos CTE there were eight EFL instructors (7 male and 1 female). All of them were involved in the study. Table 1 below summarizes the features of EFL instructors in Debre Markos CTE.

Table 1: General Features of EFL Instructors in Debre Markos CTE

Sex	Qualification			Total
	Diploma	First Degree	Second Degree	
Male	-	6	1	7
Female	-	1	-	1
Total	-	7	1	8

Regarding EFL trainees, only first year EFL trainees of the 10 +3 program were the subjects of the study because second year trainees in 10+3 program were in fieldwork (practicum), and third year trainees in the same program were not taking a course in relation to reading.

According to the information obtained from the office of the registrar of Debre Markos CTE, there were 321 EFL (92 male and 229 female) first year trainees in the college in the 2006/2007 academic year. Ninety- six of them were subjects for the study (36 male and 60 female) as shown in Table 2 below. They were selected using simple random sampling technique.

Table 2: General Features of Trainees who completed the Questionnaire

Sex	Age			Grade completed		Total	Total in %
	15-20	21-25	26 and above	10	12		
Male	24	12	-	24	12	36	37.5
Female	56	4	-	51	9	60	62.5
Total	80	16	-	75	21	96	100

3.2 Instruments

Questionnaire was the main tool used in this study to gather data from both instructors and trainees. Interview and classroom observation were also used to supplement the data collected through the questionnaire. Trainees' questionnaire was provided in Amharic, and interview with the trainees was conducted in Amharic in order to avoid problems caused by the inability to understand English, which could hinder getting pertinent data.

3.2.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire for instructors and trainees had a covering letter to introduce the purpose of the study to the respondents. Both the instructors and the trainees' questionnaire had four parts. Part one dealt with the respondents' personal data. Part one of the instructors' had 4 questions aimed at eliciting information on the instructors' sex, level of education, number of years in teaching and number of years in teaching in the college. Part one of the trainees' had three questions aimed at getting information about the trainees' sex, age and level of grade they completed. Part two of the questionnaire of both the instructors and the trainees comprised 14 questions. These questions were adapted from Hedge (2000) and the available literature. They were based on 5 point likert scale. They were used to investigate the extent to which EFL instructors used the stated reading activities to activate trainees' prior knowledge and create new knowledge, and to which EFL trainees practice them to activate their prior knowledge and add new information to what they already had. They were also used to examine the extent to which instructors got trainees to use purposes of reading that helped them to make meaning. The scale ranges from always (5) to never (1) for both instructors and trainees. Here, "always" means always when necessary. Part three of the questionnaire of both the trainees and the instructors comprised 9 questions. They were used to investigate whether reading texts that trainees read had clear

organizational structure, and whether the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts was appropriate to the trainees' level of understanding. They were also ended with 5-point scale. However, the mode of the questionnaire was "strongly agree", "agree", "uncertain", "disagree" and "strongly disagree".

Moreover, questionnaire with open-ended item was developed for both instructors and trainees under part four to examine the major problems trainees faced when interacting with reading texts.

3.2.2 Interview

A set of follow up interviews was used for confirmation of some replies obtained through the questionnaire. It was implied to seek clarification as to whether the data regarding what readers brought to the text (prior knowledge) interact with the new information they got in the text. Twenty trainees were selected randomly for the interview. The number of instructors randomly selected for the interview was three. The questions for the interview were related to what trainees should do before and while reading; causes for not understanding reading texts; types of comprehension questions trainees did; which types were difficult, and how they did comprehension questions.

3.2.3 Classroom observation

Classroom observation is an effective instrument in that it helps one to gather information that he/she cannot collect through the other instruments. In this study, observation was conducted for the same reason. Among the eight sections selected as a sample, three sections were randomly selected for the classroom observation and in each section; observation took place for 50 minutes in a reading class session. In the observations, no predefined checklists were used. The researcher used video and transcribed the activities observed.

3.3 Procedure

Prior to the actual administration of the instruments, the initial version of the trainees questionnaire (part 2 and part 3) was first administered as part of a pilot study to 30 first year trainees, who were not included as sampled subjects, in Debre Markos CTE. The reliability of the questionnaire (part 2 and part 3) in the pilot study was found using Cronbach's Alpha that helps to see the internal consistency of the items. The reliability of trainees' questionnaire was found to

be .7803. The instructors' questionnaire was found commented on by five instructors from Debre Birhan CTE for appropriateness and validity. This was done since the number of instructors in the pilot study was very few.

Before administering the questionnaires to instructors and trainees, a short explanation was given on the purpose of the questionnaire. The questionnaires were collected one day after the day they were administered. That is, the subjects filled in the questionnaire at home so that it would not affect their studies during lesson hours and so that it could be given thorough attention.

The questionnaire was administered to 96 subjects from eight sections. The subjects were thus 30% of the target population. They were selected using simple random sampling technique.

Three instructors and 20 trainees were selected using simple random sampling technique for the interview. The interview for instructors was conducted in English on individual instructors base whereas panel mode discussion in Amharic for trainees. Since some instructors felt unease to be recorded, the mode of the interview was on note-taking base but on recorded base for trainees. Trainees' data were translated and summarized.

Finally, classroom observation took place in three randomly selected sections. To minimize observant effect, the researcher first observed each instructor, in the selected sections, twice while he/she was teaching other language skills/components. Then, in each section, observation took place for 50 minutes in a reading session. The classroom activities were videotaped and transcribed.

3.4 Data Analysis

This descriptive survey study employed both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. The data obtained through close-ended questionnaire were quantified. Mean and standard deviation were calculated to examine the extent of the application of the pre-and while-reading activities, which are crucial for trainees to use their prior knowledge to create new knowledge in a reading lesson and to examine the extent of purposes trainees had while reading texts. The expected (ideal) mean was three. Zero standard deviation means there was no variation among instructors in using those reading activities whereas the highest variation would be two. Hence, if in the statistical figure for a particular activity was above the expected mean, it showed that the instructors were using that particular activity to interact trainees with texts.

Percentage was used to see if topics of the reading texts were interesting for the trainees, if reading texts had clear organizational structure, if the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts (sentence complexity and vocabulary) was appropriate to the trainees, and if reading texts included different levels of comprehension questions. Open-ended questionnaire was used to examine the major problems trainees faced when interacting with reading texts. In connection with the data gathered through open-ended questionnaire, interview, and classroom observation, qualitative method was employed to both instructors and trainees' data.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The objectives of the study, as mentioned in chapter one, were to examine the extent to which EFL instructors of CTE used reading activities to activate trainees' prior knowledge to create new knowledge; the extent to which EFL instructors got trainees to use purposes of reading that helped them make meaning; to examine the major problems trainees faced when interacting with reading texts; to see whether reading texts had clear organizational structure ,and whether the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts was appropriate to the trainees' level of understanding. To meet these ends, the instruments mentioned in chapter three were administered and the results of the study are presented as follows.

To examine the extent to which EFL instructors of CTE used reading activities to activate trainees' prior knowledge to create new knowledge in a reading lesson and the extent to which EFL instructors got trainees to use purposes of reading that helped them construct meaning ,questionnaire was designed in relation to pre- and while-reading activities. To see the extent of instructors of using those activities, mean and standard deviation were used while percentage was employed to see the feature of texts in relation to their level of appropriacy, sentence complexity, and vocabulary load. Moreover, to examine the major problems trainees faced when interacting with reading texts, open-ended questionnaire was used.

The data obtained through open-ended questionnaire, interview and classroom observation were analyzed using qualitative description. Each result of the study is followed by brief discussion.

4.1 Instructors' Use of Reading Activities to help Trainees Activate their Prior Knowledge to create new Knowledge

This sub-section is devoted to presenting the statistical findings that show the extent to which instructors used various reading activities in EFL reading lessons to help trainees use their prior knowledge to create new knowledge. It is obtained from both instructors and trainees as shown in Tables 3 and 4 below.

4.1.1 Instructors' use of Reading Activities (as rated by Instructors)

Table 3 below presents the mean ($\bar{x}$) and standard deviation (SD) of the scores to see the extent to which instructors used reading activities. The ideal mean and standard deviation are 3 and 0 respectively. Hence, if the mean is above 3, it shows a tendency of using that particular activity; and if the mean is below 3, it means teachers do not use that particular kind of activity to help trainees use their prior knowledge to create new knowledge. Higher standard deviation shows higher variation among instructors in using that particular activity.

Table 3: Summary of Instructors' Responses Showing the Extent to which they use reading Activities (N =8)

S/N	Before trainees read a reading text, I	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation (SD)
1	encourage them to do pre-reading questions.	4.37	0.74
2	get them to share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions.	3.87	0.64
3	get them to exchange ideas with members of their group about what will be included in the passage.	2.75	0.88
4	encourage them to guess what the passage is about using their prior knowledge about topics.	2.50	0.92
5	explain them about the passage.	3.50	1.06
	When trainees read the reading text (while reading), I		
9	inform them to discuss the questions in-group.	3.87	0.83
10	get them to read silently.	4.62	0.51
11	get them to draw conclusions during class discussion.	3.12	1.12
12	get them to share individual experiences.	4.50	0.92
13	acknowledge their different paths to understand texts.	1.87	1.12

As shown in Table 3, instructors reported that they more frequency encourage trainees to do pre-reading questions ($\bar{x}$ = 4.37), get them to read silently ($\bar{x}$ =4.62) and get them to share individual experiences during class discussion with little variation among them (SD= 0.74, 0.51 and 0.92 respectively). They also get trainees to share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions ($\bar{x}$ = 3.87), and inform them to discuss the questions in group in a significant way ($\bar{x}$ = 3.87) with little variation among them (SD=0.64, 0.83, respectively)

Moreover, in a significant way but with a relatively high variation among them, instructors explain passages before trainees read a reading text ($\bar{x}$ =3.50 and SD= 1.06). Instructors some

times get trainees to draw conclusions during class discussion ($x= 3.12$) with a relatively high variation among them ($SD= 1.12$). To some extent instructors also tend to get trainees to exchange ideas with members of their group about what will be included in the passage ($x=2.75$) and to encourage trainees to guess what the passage is about using their prior knowledge about topics ($x =2.50$) with little variation among them ($SD=0.88$ and 0.92 , respectively).

However, instructors revealed that they do not tend to acknowledge trainees different paths to understand texts ($x =1.87$).

4.1.2 Instructors' Use of Reading Activities (as Rated by Trainees)

Table 4 below shows the mean (x) and standard deviation (SD) of the score to see the text to which instructors used pre-reading and while reading activities to help trainees use their prior knowledge to create new knowledge.

Table 4: Summary of Trainees' Responses Showing the Extent to which Instructors use Reading Activities ($N =96$)

S/N	Before we read reading texts, the instructor	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation (SD)
1	encourages us to do pre-reading questions.	4.00	.99
2	gets us to share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions.	4.03	1.04
3	encourages us to guess what the passage is about using our knowledge about the topic.	2.58	1.22
4	gets us to exchange ideas in-group about what will be included in the passage.	2.44	1.20
5	explains us about the passage.	4.05	1.15
	When we read a reading passage/while reading/ the instructor		
9	gets us to discuss different questions of the passage in-group.	4.08	1.03
10	instructs us to read silently.	3.33	1.11
11	asks us to draw conclusions during class discussion.	3.80	1.05
12	gets us to share individual experiences during class discussion.	3.38	1.24
13	accepts our different ways of understanding texts.	1.96	1.10

As Table 4 depicts, the trainees reported that their instructors more frequently encourage trainees to do pre-reading questions ($x=4.00$) with little variation among them ($SD=.99$); get them to share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions ($x=4.03$); get them to discuss different questions of the passage in group ($x=4.08$), and explain them explicitly about the passage ($x=4.05$) with relatively high variation among them ($SD=1.04, 1.03$ and 1.15 respectively). Furthermore, in a significant way, instructors get trainees to read the passage silently ($x=3.83$); to draw conclusions during class discussion ($x=3.80$), and to share individual experiences during class discussion ($x=3.38$) with relatively high variation among them ($SD=1.12, 1.24, 1.11, 1.05$ and 1.24 respectively).

However, trainees rated that their instructors infrequently get them to guess what the passage is about using their prior knowledge about the topic ($x=2.58$), and to exchange ideas in-group about what will be included in the passage ($x=2.44$). Trainees also rated that their instructors very rarely accept their different ways of understanding texts ($x=1.96$) with relatively high variation among them ($SD=1.10$).

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, instructors in Debre Markos CTE frequently help trainees to do pre-reading questions and share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions. Although explaining a passage explicitly for trainees may cause them to be very dependent, instructors in the college mentioned frequently used it.

In the interview with trainees conducted in a panel mode and with instructors conducted in individual base, almost all respondents' response to the question related to what trainees do before they read a text was that they do pre-reading questions. In the classroom observation, it was also seen that instructor 1 and instructor 3 let the trainees do pre-reading questions before they get them to read a passage. They get also trainees to discuss the pre-reading questions in-group.

Instructors' frequent effort to get trainees to do pre-reading questions and discuss them implies that they have awareness in helping trainees to activate their prior knowledge about the text before they read it.

As noted in Ruddell (2001), at least two types of prior knowledge are critical to the reading process. The first is world knowledge, which is the total amount of information a person has

accumulated through day-to-day living experience. The second is text knowledge, which is information accumulated from reader's experiences with text. From this perspective, the instructors' pre- reading questions were designed to activate trainees' world knowledge about topics of texts.

The amount and kind of prior knowledge a reader has about a given topic and the manner in which the reader links known and new knowledge affects the meaning he or she constructs for the immediate text. Regarding this process, Hartman (1995:526) describes on "mobilization of potential knowledge fragments" in which the reader engages in transposing texts into other texts, observing one text into another and building a variety of interesting texts that lead to reader's construction of meaning. Our prior knowledge is thus constantly changing as the result of our ongoing transactions in the perceptions of incoming information. For this instructors are expected to activate the second type of prior knowledge- text knowledge- by encouraging trainees to guess what the passage is about and what will be included in the passage. However, as indicated in Tables 3 and 4, instructors did not tend to do so. It seems that they helped trainees to get meaning rather than to make meaning from reading texts. Not willing to accept their different ways of understanding texts might also be a sign of teaching reading to get meaning.

In the classroom observations, which take place in the three sections, no effort is made by the three instructors to help trainees activate their text knowledge by getting them to do pre- reading questions to predict the next part of the text from various clues in the paragraph (s) discussed. Moreover, in the panel mode interview with trainees all the respondents said that such questions were not presented. . For example, a trainee in the panel mode interview said:

In grades 9 and 10, we used to do pre-reading questions to predict the next part of the text from clues in the paragraphs discussed. However, here in this college we do pre-reading questions only before we read the passage. Then, we read the whole passage silently and do comprehension questions, first individually then we discuss the questions either in pair or in small group and finally with our instructor.

What the trainee said in the above statement is indicated in Tables 3 and 4. In the while reading, instructors frequently instruct them to read silently, let them discuss different questions of the passage in-group, let them share individual experiences and draw their own conclusions during class discussion.

As seen from classroom observation, in all the three sections, instructors ask trainees to read the passages silently and do the comprehension questions first individually, then compare their answers in small groups. Trainees are reading texts sharing one module for 3 or 4 and attempt to discuss the questions. In the time of discussion with their instructors, many trainees are pretending as though they were writing answers while a few trainees are trying to answer questions. Especially, when they are asked to share individual experiences and draw their conclusions during class discussion, few trainees are attempting to participate in the discussion. The question, “Other than points mentioned in the passage, do you have anything to say about the causes and effects of environmental problems?”, raised by the first instructor during the class observation, and the question, “What shall be done to avoid war between the two countries?”, raised by the third instructor, were typical examples in which very few trainees attempted to answer (please see Appendix 5).

4.2 Trainees’ Purposes for Reading

This sub-section is devoted to presenting the statistical findings that show the extent to which instructors get trainees to use different purposes of reading in EFL classes to help trainees make linkages between what they predicted and what they found in texts. Tables 5 and 6 below depict what is obtained from both instructors and trainees respectively.

4.2.1 Trainees’ Purposes for Reading (as Rated by Instructors)

Table 5 below presents the mean ($\bar{x}$) and standard deviation (SD) of the score to see the extent to which instructors got trainees to use different purposes of reading to link what they predicted with what they found in texts.

Table 5: Summary of Instructors’ Responses Showing the Extent to which they get Trainees to use Purposes for Reading ($N=8$)

S/N	While Trainees read the Reading text (while-reading), I	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Standard Deviation (SD)
6	inform them that their purpose of reading is to adjust their predictions.	2.37	0.91
7	get them to scan the passage to identify specific ideas.	3.87	0.83
8	get them to skim the passage to identify general ideas.	3.87	0.83

14	get them to predict the next part of the text from various clues.	2.25	1.03
----	---	------	------

As shown in Table 5, instructors get trainees to scan the passage to identify specific ideas ($x = 3.87$) and to skim the passage to identify general ideas ($x = 3.87$) in a significant way with little variation among them ($SD = 0.83$ for both cases). However, they rarely informed trainees that their purpose of reading is to adjust their predictions ($x = 2.37$), and get them to predict the next part of the text from various clues ($x = 2.25$).

4.2.2 Trainees' Purposes for Reading (as Rated by Trainees)

Table 6 below depicts the mean (x) and standard deviation (SD) of the score to examine the extent to which instructors got trainees to use different purposes of reading to link what they predicted with what they found in texts.

Table 6: Summary of Trainees' Responses Showing the Extent to which Instructors get them to use Purposes for Reading ($N = 96$)

S/N	When we read a reading passage (while-reading), the instructor	Mean (x)	Standard Deviation (SD)
6	informs us that our purpose of reading is to adjust our predictions.	2.55	1.77
7	gets us to scan the passage to get specific ideas.	3.61	1.12
8	gets us to skim the passage to identify general ideas.	3.48	1.24
14	asks us to predict the next part of the text from various clues.	2.64	1.20

As indicated in Table 6, to some extent with an average score, instructors get trainees to scan passages to get specific ideas ($x = 3.61$), and skim passages to identify general ideas ($x = 3.48$) with relatively high variation among them ($SD = 1.12$ and 1.24 respectively). However, trainees rated that their instructors infrequently get them to be aware that their purpose of reading is to adjust their predictions ($x = 2.55$), and to predict the next part of the text from various clues ($x = 2.64$) with relatively high variation among them ($SD = 1.77$ and 1.20 respectively).

In the two tables (Tables 5 and 6), it is indicated that instructors are getting trainees to scan and to skim passages to identify specific and general information in passages. This is also observed in the three reading lesson classes. In these classes, most of the lessons are covered in getting

trainees to read for the purposes of identifying specific information and general information from the passages of the then periods.

The two tables (Tables 5 and 6) show also that trainees infrequently read to adjust their predictions. This implies that instructors do not assist trainees in making linkages between what they predict and what they find in texts, and in articulating the reasons, logic, and evidence for the predictions that are made. After discussing on pre-reading questions, trainees are expected to read part of a text for getting answers to questions arising from their predictions or to see whether new information will cause those predictions to be revised.

Moreover, it is also indicated in the Tables that instructors infrequently get trainees to predict the next part of the text from various clues. In the classroom observation, it is seen that instructors do not give the trainees chance to read for adjusting their predictions and to predict the next part of the text. The interview result with trainees also show that trainees do not read for adjusting their prediction and do not predict the next part of the text to examine their predictions, conclusions, and logic as reading progress. This implies that trainees do not get the access to replicate the predict- sample text- re-predict- resample process, which, as Ruddell (2001) states, stimulates full, rich understanding of text with its emphasis on prediction and discussion. Learning reading in such process helps learners to create meaning. However, as shown in Tables 5 and 6, as seen in the classroom observation and in the interview, trainees read for identifying specific and general information from passages. This implies that their purpose of reading is to receive meaning. Such purpose of reading results in passive or inactive readers who will not be able to interact with texts (Ruddell, 2001). For example, during classroom observation, in instructor 1 class, trainees are asked if they have anything to say about causes and effects of environmental problems other than points mentioned in the passage. One student replies “drought”. The instructor claimed that ‘drought’ is related to the passage. Then, no more discussion is going on regarding the issue.

4.3 Summary of Trainees’ Problems when Interacting with Reading Activities (Open-ended Questionnaire and Interview)

This sub-section is devoted to examine the problems that trainees faced when interacting with reading texts. Both trainees and instructors were asked to write their responses for the open-ended questionnaire and were interviewed.

4.3.1 Summary of Instructors and Trainees' Responses to the Open-ended Questionnaire

In the open-ended questionnaire, both trainees and instructors were asked whether most of the trainees were interested in doing comprehension questions. All the instructors except two said 'No'. The stated reasons were inability in all the skills of English language, poor in the area of vocabulary knowledge, no habit of reading, and their negative belief on the use of doing comprehension questions. Regarding this question, for example, one instructor said:

Most of the trainees are not interested in doing comprehension questions because of several reasons. One reason is limitations of understanding texts due to inability in the English language. The other reason might be that they believe doing comprehension question does not bring change in their learning of English.

For the same question, above one-fourth of the trainees response was also 'no'. The reasons noted were inability in using English language, lack of exposure to do comprehension questions in the lower grades, not getting the necessary help and follow-up from instructors, inability to understand comprehension questions, limited knowledge of vocabulary and being discouraged by instructors when they made mistakes.

The trainees who said 'yes', for the same question, were many in number. The reason for most of them was that doing comprehension questions helped them to prepare for the final examination. This implies that many trainees in the college did comprehension questions may be for grades. That is, they were not intrinsically motivated to do comprehension questions. As Alexander and Jettson (2000) point out, intrinsically motivated readers have a learning goal orientation: they read for its own sake, to satisfy curiosity, or for challenge or involvement.

In the open-ended questionnaire regarding whether trainees were able to express what they know about pre-reading questions in English without difficulty, the response of a large number of trainees was "No". Their reasons for saying "No" were inability in English language, shortage of knowledge of vocabulary, lack of confidence, not getting the exposure to do such questions in the lower grades, expecting everything from the instructors since they believe that their answer was simple guessing, and lack of practice.

For the same open-ended question, all the instructors except two said “No”. The reasons noted were lack of knowledge of vocabulary, lack of confidence, inability in using English to express what they know, and problem of understanding the pre-reading questions. One instructor, for example, stated his reasons:

In the first place, majority of the trainees are not willing to express what they feel about pre-reading questions even in the group discussion. The reasons behind this unwillingness might be not understanding the questions and lack of confidence due to shortage of vocabulary in particular and inability in English language in general. Even those trainees who tried to give response for the pre-reading questions are not free from difficulty. They have had shortage of vocabulary to express what they know. They also have problem of understanding the questions.

Concerning whether reading texts were related to the trainees socio-cultural context, almost all the instructors said ‘yes’. According to the respondents, examples of texts, which were familiar with trainees’ socio-cultural context, were texts about education, environment, health, family life, culture, and current affairs. On the other hand, one instructor said “No” and his/her example was the reading text entitled with “culture and value”.

For the same question, many trainees said “yes”. They noted that the texts were about environment, population, health, current affairs, culture and values, family life, and education. On the contrary, some trainees said “No”. They claimed that most of the texts were based on personal opinion of the writers and were difficult to understand. All of them exemplified the text entitled with “culture and values”. They said that the text reflected culture and values of the Europeans, which were not related to their socio-cultural context.

4.3.2 Summary of Instructors and Trainees’ Responses to the Interview Questions

The interview with trainees was conducted in a panel mode and was recorded in tape-recorder. This summary is the translation of the Amharic version.

The interview with instructors was conducted in individual base in English and their response was written in note form.

In the interview, both trainees and instructors were asked regarding the activities done before reading. Almost all trainees’ response for this question was that they did pre- reading question

and guessed meanings of words. For the same question, instructors' response was similar to that of the trainees'. For example, one instructor in the interview said, "Before trainees read a text, I get them to do pre-reading questions and I also encourage them to guess meanings in sentences". The other instructors seem to share the view expressed above in different wordings. For example, one respondent said, "Before reading, I forward pre- reading questions and get them guess meanings of unfamiliar words to activate their prior knowledge". For the question in relation to what trainees and instructors should do during reading, instructors' response was almost the same but with different wordings. For example, the first interviewee said, "I get them to read quickly to identify specific and general ideas of the passage. I also inform them to read silently. Then, I move round to give them help. I also let them guess the meaning of unfamiliar words from context."

The second interviewee also said, "While trainees read a text, first I will tell them why they read, that is, to identify specific ideas and to identify the main idea of the passage, to guess the meanings of new words; then I will tell them to read silently". The third interviewee replied to the same question saying, "During while-reading, I will tell trainees that their purpose of reading is to scan the passage for specific information and to skim the passage for general information. I will also tell them to read silently and guess meanings of unfamiliar words. Then I monitor what they do, and ask them if they face unfamiliar things in the text".

Trainees' response for the above question in general was that they read silently, identify main ideas of passages, identify specific information, and do vocabulary and comprehension questions.

Regarding the interview question in relation to the causes for trainees not understanding reading texts, trainees' response focused on shortage of vocabulary, language problem and poor interest, teachers' tendency towards grammar, not giving attention to reading skill, and considering reading as a very difficult skill. For example, one of the interviewees said that she had a problem of understanding reading texts due to her shortage of vocabulary knowledge and inability in English language. Hence, she said she did not have interest in reading. For the same question, from the instructors the first interviewee said, "Causes for trainees not understanding reading texts may be not having habit of reading and problem of understanding key words, so they believe that they do not understand texts. And I think the main problem can be inability in English language."

The second interviewee said, “Trainees not understanding reading texts may be caused by the strategy they use- they do not understand how to scan and how to skim. Their poor reading habit and language problem can also be other causes. Not giving much attention for reading and being grammar oriented may be additional causes.”

The third interviewee also said, “Causes for trainees in not understanding passages can be problem in the ability of English language, poor background of reading and poor interest in reading.”

Regarding the kinds of comprehension questions trainees were asked to do and which kind (s) of questions were difficult for them to answer, both trainees and instructors’ answer was the same. That is, questions whose answers were in the passage and questions, which required trainees’ opinion, were the two types of comprehension questions. According to both trainees and instructors’ responses, comprehension questions, which required trainees’ opinion, were difficult for the trainees to answer.

Concerning the ways trainees do comprehension questions, their answer was that they did individually, in pair, in small groups and with their instructors; that is, in class discussion. For example in the panel mode discussion, one trainee said that they did comprehension questions according to the instruction from the instructor. That is, according to the instructors’ instruction they would do individually, compared their answers in pair, discussed in small groups, and discussed the questions with their instructor. Finally, the interviewee said, their instructor would give them summarized answer.

For the same interview question, the first interviewee from the instructors said, “First I get them to do comprehension questions individually, then I get them to compare their answers in pair or small groups; finally I direct whole-class discussion.”

The second interviewee’s response was, “some times I get them to do individually, and some times I get them to do individually then in pair or in small groups.” The response of the third interviewee for the same question was, “I get trainees to do comprehension questions some times individually, some times I get them to discuss in pairs or small groups, sometimes I get them to compare their answers with other groups, and sometimes I let them discuss and report.”

For the interview question related to trainees interest in doing comprehension question, instructors response was “no”. The first interviewee said, “No, because they felt that it is tiresome or boring.” The second interviewee replied, “No, because of lack of background knowledge and due to language problem, they feel that comprehension questions are very difficult.” The third interviewee also said, “No, because they feel they may not answer the questions correctly; therefore, they are not interested to do comprehension questions”. Trainees interview question for item 7 was whether they did pre-reading questions to predict what the next part of the text would be about based on the various clues they saw in the paragraph (s) discussed. All the trainees response was ‘no’. They explained what they did in the same way but with different wordings. For example, one interviewee said, “No, we do pre-reading questions only before we read the passage. Then, we read the whole passage and do comprehension question.” Another interviewee said the thing with different wordings as follows:

In grades 9 and 10, we used to do pre-reading questions to predict the next part of the text from clues in the paragraphs discussed. However, here in this college we do pre-reading questions before we read the passage only; then, we read the whole passage silently and do comprehension questions.

As depicted in the instructors and trainees’ responses from the open-ended questionnaire and interview, the English language ability of trainees do not seem well enough to interact with reading texts. This is indicated in the response of both instructors and trainees to the open-ended questionnaire (item 1) and to the interview questions (item 3). In the open-ended questionnaire, all except two instructors and a large number of trainees respond that due to shortage of knowledge of vocabulary and inability in English trainees do pre-reading questions with difficulty. Likewise, in the interview question in relation to the causes for trainees not understanding texts, almost all the interviewee trainees and instructors’ response was the same. That is, shortage of vocabulary and language problem or inability in English language, are seen as causes of trainees’ problem of understanding texts.

Moreover, regarding trainees’ interest in doing comprehension questions, the response of many trainees and instructors was negative. That is, they responded that most of the trainees are not interested in doing comprehension questions. The reasons listed by the subjects were negative belief about their ability in doing comprehension questions, their negative belief on the use of

doing comprehension questions and lack of reading habit in addition to shortage of vocabulary and inability in English language.

The responses given by both trainees and instructors to the open-ended questionnaire in relation to the interest of trainees in doing comprehension questions, and their difficulty in expressing what they know about pre-reading questions in English is partly related to inability in the use of English language to interact with reading texts. According to Harmer (2001), language knowledge enables readers to work on the reading text. A fluent reader has good knowledge of language structure and can recognize a wide range of vocabulary. Hence, with poor knowledge of language structure and with shortage of vocabulary it is difficult to work on a reading text.

As indicated in the summary of instructors and trainees' response to the open-ended questionnaire regarding whether reading texts were related to the trainees socio-cultural context, almost all instructors and most of the trainees answered positively. They also provided examples to show how the texts were related to their socio-cultural context.

However, as depicted in the responses for the open-ended questionnaire and the interview, trainees were in problem of answering comprehension questions and understanding questions. This case might be related to what Rumelhart (1981) suggests. Rumelhart (1981:22) notes, "The reader may have the appropriate schemata (socio-cultural context), but the information available in text may not suggest them." Here, the reader constructs incomplete or inappropriate meaning.

Knowledge of socio-cultural context is an element of prior knowledge. Thus, knowledge of socio-cultural context in particular and prior knowledge in general is not some static "thing" that readers bring to reading events and "unload" before they read; rather, it is constantly changing – and creating change-throughout reading so that it influences and is influenced by all the elements of the reading event (Hartman, 1995).

4.4 Features of Reading Texts/Text Variables

Nine close-ended items were administered to instructors and trainees to see the features of reading texts (text variables). For the purpose of discussion, the 9 items were grouped under two categories. Table 7 deals with trainees' responses concerning whether reading texts had clear organizational structure. Table 8 is concerned with instructors' responses to whether reading texts had clear organizational structure. Table 9 is regarding trainees' response to whether the level of

difficulty of contents of the reading texts was appropriate to the trainees. Table 10 deals with instructors' response to whether the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts was appropriate to the trainees.

4.4.1 Summary of Trainees and Instructors' Responses Concerning Whether Reading texts had clear Organizational Structure

Table 7 below indicates trainees' responses regarding whether reading texts had clear organizational structure in relation to abstract concepts, complex relationships and having different types of reading questions.

Table 7: Trainees' Responses to whether reading texts had clear organizational Structure
(N =96)

S/ N	Questionnaire item Most texts that we read in a reading lesson:	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
15	introduce abstract concepts by accompanying them with many concrete examples.	32	33.3	43	44.8	8	8.3	9	9.4	4	4.2
18	explicitly state important complex relationships (e.g. causality, conditionality, etc) rather than always expecting the reader to infer them from the context.	25	26.0	41	42.7	21	21.9	7	7.3	2	2.1
20	have problems or questions in relation to the intention of the writer.	19	19.8	33	34.4	22	22.9	15	15.6	7	7.3
21	have problems or questions that require us to predict.	17	17.7	52	52.3	13	13.5	6	6.3	8	8.3
22	have problems or questions that require us to draw conclusion.	21	21.9	50	52.1	11	11.5	10	10.4	4	4.2
23	have problems or questions that require us to share individual experiences.	25	26	41	42.7	12	12.5	14	14.6	4	4.2

f= frequency

Table 7 depicts that more than $\frac{3}{4}$ (78%) of the respondent trainees agreed that most of the texts they read in a reading lesson introduce abstract concepts by accompanying them with many concrete examples. This item (item 15) is supported by item 18 where 68% of the respondents agreed that most texts explicitly state important complex relationships (e.g. causality, conditionality, etc) rather than always expecting the reader to infer them from the context.

Regarding reading activities included in most texts trainees read in a reading lesson, more than half of the respondents (54.2%) replied that texts have questions in relation to the intention of the writer. Nearly three-fourth of the trainees (70%) answered that the texts have also questions that require trainees to predict. Moreover, those who agreed that most texts have questions that require trainees to draw conclusion and to share individual experiences are 74% and 68.7% respectively.

Table 8 below depicts instructors' responses concerning whether reading texts that trainees read had clear organizational structure in relation to abstract concepts, complex relationships and included different types of reading questions.

Table 8: Instructors' response to whether trainees Reading Texts had clear Organizational Structure (N=8)

S/ N	Questionnaire item Most texts that Trainees read in a reading lesson:	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecid ed		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
15	introduce abstract concepts by accompanying them with many concrete examples.	2	25	3	37.5	-	-	3	37.5	-	-
18	explicitly state important complex relationships (e.g. causality, conditionality, etc) rather than always expecting the reader to infer them from the context.	-	-	4	50	-	-	3	37.5	1	12.5
20	include questions in relation to the intention of the writer.	-	-	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25	-	-
21	include questions that require trainees to predict.	1	12.5	4	50	-	-	2	25	1	12.5
22	include questions that require trainees to draw conclusion.	1	12.5	3	37.5	2	25	2	25	-	-
23	include questions that require trainees to share individual experiences.	1	12.5	3	37.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	-	-

Table 8 shows that five (62.5%) instructors replied that most texts that trainees read in a reading lesson introduce abstract concepts with many concrete examples. Half (50%) of the respondents also agreed that the texts explicitly state important complex relationships rather than always expecting the reader to infer them from the context.

Concerning reading activities texts included, most of the respondents (62.5%) agreed that they include questions in relation to the intention of the writer. The same percent (62.5%) of instructors answered that the texts also include questions that require trainees to predict.

Moreover, the instructors who agreed that texts include questions that require trainees to draw conclusion and to share individual experiences are 50% in each case.

As can be seen from Tables 7 and 8, the observed findings are that the reading texts have clear organizational structure since abstract concepts in the texts are introduced with many concrete examples. The important complex relationships such as causality and conditionality are also explicitly stated. Moreover, Tables 7 and 8 show that the reading texts include questions that require trainees to predict (pre-reading questions); questions in relation to the intention of the writer (literal comprehension); questions that require trainees to draw conclusion (Interpretative comprehension), and questions that require trainees to share individual experiences based on the passage (Applied comprehension).

4.4.2 Summary of Trainees and Instructors' Responses to Whether the level of Difficulty of Contents of the Reading texts was Appropriate to the Trainees

Table 9 below shows trainees response regarding whether the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts was appropriate to them.

Table 9: Trainees' Response to Whether the Level of Content of the Reading Texts was Appropriate to them (N=96)

S/ N	Questionnaire item Most texts that Trainees read in a reading lesson:	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
16	have appropriate level of sentence complexity for us.	23	24.0	47	49.0	18	18.8	5	5.2	3	3.1
17	have interesting topics.	26	27.1	36	37.5	18	18.8	13	13.5	3	3.1
19	contain appropriate vocabulary load. For example, usually only one new vocabulary item per paragraph occurs through out a text.	7	7.3	19	19.8	38	39.6	22	22.9	10	10.4

Table 9 shows that nearly three-fourth (73%) of the trainees agreed that most texts that they read in a reading lesson have appropriate level of sentence complexity. Sixty-two (64.6%) trainees answered that most texts have interesting topics. Regarding appropriate vocabulary load, almost forty percent (39.6) of the respondents could not decide whereas thirty-two (33.3%) trainees claimed that most reading texts do not contain appropriate vocabulary load.

Table 10 below indicates instructors' response to whether the level of content of the reading texts is appropriate to the trainees.

Table 10: Instructors' Response to Whether the Level of difficulty of Contents of the Reading Texts was Appropriate to the trainees (N=8)

S/ N	Questionnaire item Most texts that Trainees read in a reading lesson	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecide d		Disagre e		Strongly Disagree	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
16	have appropriate level of sentence complexity for them.	-	-	5	62.5	-	-	2	25	1	12.5
17	have interesting topics.	3	37.5	3	37.5	1	12.5	-	-	1	12.5
19	contain appropriate vocabulary load. For example, usually only one new vocabulary item per paragraph occurs through out a text	1	12.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	2	25	1	12.5

Table 10 depicts that five (62.5%) instructors replied that most texts have appropriate level of sentence complexity for the trainees. Three- fourth of the respondents (75%) answered that most of the texts have interesting topics. Concerning the appropriacy of vocabulary load, three (37.5) instructors could not decide and the other three (37.5%) claimed that most of the texts do not contain appropriate vocabulary load.

As shown in Tables 9 and 10, the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts in relation to sentence complexity is appropriate to the trainees. Most of the texts have also interesting topics. However, as indicated in the two tables (Tables 9 and 10), the reading texts that trainees read do not seem to contain appropriate vocabulary load. This implies that texts contain a number of unknown words. Wallace (1992) states that texts with more percentage of unknown words will be more difficult to understand than those with less percentage of unknown words.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter presents the summary and conclusions of the research and suggests possible recommendations.

5.1 Summary

The research carried out was meant to see the extent to which EFL instructors use reading activities to activate trainees prior knowledge to create new knowledge, to examine the extent to which EFL instructors get trainees to have purposes of reading that help them to make meaning, to investigate the major problems that trainees face when interacting with reading texts, to examine whether the reading texts have clear organizational structure, and to see whether the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts is appropriate to the trainees level of understanding.

In order to attain the first objective of the study, two sets of close-ended questionnaire consisting of ten items are prepared for both instructors and trainees. The answering mode was from always (5) to never (1). The analysis was done using mean and standard deviation to see the extent of instructors used reading activities to activate trainees' prior knowledge to create new knowledge.

In order to examine the extent to which instructors get trainees to have purposes of reading that help them make meaning, another two sets of close-ended questionnaire consisting of four items were prepared for both instructors and trainees. The answering mode was also from always (5) to never (1). The analysis was done using mean and standard deviation.

To see the major problems that trainees face when interacting with reading texts, open-ended questionnaire consisting of three items was prepared for both instructors and trainees. The open-ended questionnaire and the interview questions for instructors and trainees, and the classroom observation were also used to support the data obtained through close-ended questionnaire. To analyze these sources of data, qualitative method was used.

To examine whether the reading texts have clear organizational structure and whether the level of difficulty of contents of the reading texts is appropriate to the trainees, two sets of close ended

questionnaire were prepared for both instructors and trainees. To examine whether the reading texts have clear organizational structure, six items were prepared. Three items were prepared to examine whether the level of content of the reading texts is appropriate to the trainees level of understanding. The items in the two issues were analyzed using percentage. The mode of responding the items was ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

After analyzing the data, the following results are obtained. The responses obtained from both instructors and trainees revealed that instructors' attempt to interact reader variables with text variables in a reading lesson seems not promising.

Instructors frequently help trainees to do pre-reading questions and share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions. However, they do not seem to understand why they let them do the pre-reading questions and share ideas with a partner about the questions. Because, after trainees had finished discussing the pre-reading questions, they were asked to read the passage silently to answer the comprehension questions. They were not asked to read part (s) of the passage to adjust their prediction to link the old knowledge with the new one.

Both instructors and trainees rated that instructors frequently explain about a passage before trainees read it. As indicated in chapter four, this might cause trainees to be dependent. It might also affect trainees' effort to link known knowledge with new knowledge in the reading process.

Trainees revealed that their instructors infrequently get them to guess what the passage was about using their prior knowledge about topics, and to exchange ideas in-group about what will be included in the passage. They also rated that their instructors very rarely accept their different ways of understanding texts.

Both instructors and trainees rated that instructors are getting trainees to read passages for identifying specific information and general information of passages. This is also observed in the three reading classes. However, as revealed by instructors and trainees, trainees are not let to read for adjusting their predictions. This shows that instructors do not help trainees make linkages between what they predict and what they find in texts.

Instructors and trainees also rated that instructors infrequently get trainees to predict the next part of the text from various clues. In the classroom observation, instructors are not seen to get trainees to predict the next part of the text based on various clues from the part of the passage already

discussed. The interview result with trainees also indicates that trainees do not read for adjusting their prediction and do not predict the next part of the text to examine their predictions, conclusions, and logic as reading progress.

Predicting the next part of the text using various clues and reading for the purposes of getting answers to questions arising from predication, are crucial to stimulate full, rich understanding of text. Learning reading in such process helps trainees to create meaning (Ruddell, 2001).

All instructors except two revealed that most trainees are not interested in doing comprehension questions. The problems mentioned for not doing comprehension questions are inability in all the skills of English language; poor in the area of vocabulary knowledge, no habit of reading, and their negative belief on the use of doing comprehension questions.

Some trainees on their part revealed that they are not interested in doing comprehension questions due to: inability in using English language, lack of exposure to do comprehension questions in the lower grades, not getting the necessary help and follow-up from instructors, inability to understand comprehension questions, and limited knowledge of vocabulary.

Many trainees answered that they are interested in doing comprehension questions. The reason for most of the trainees is that it helps them to prepare for the final examination. This shows that many trainees in Debre Markos CTE do comprehension questions in order to gate good grades in the final examination. This implies that they are not intrinsically motivated to learn reading-they do not read to satisfy curiosity or for challenge.

A large number of trainees revealed that they are in difficulty to express what they know about pre-reading questions in English. The major problems depicted are inability in English language, shortage of knowledge of vocabulary, lack of confidence, not getting the exposure to do such questions in the lower grades, expecting everything from the instructors since they believe that their answer was simple guessing, and lack of practice.

All the instructors but two revealed that trainees are in difficulty to express what they know concerning pre-reading questions in English. Shortage of knowledge of vocabulary, lack of confidence inability in using English language to express what they know, and problem of understanding the pre-reading questions are indicated as reasons for the problem mentioned.

Almost all the instructors and most trainees responded that the reading texts that trainees read are related to the trainees' socio-cultural context. The examples provided are education, health, environment, culture and value, current affairs, family life and population.

Regarding text variables, both instructors and trainees revealed that most texts that trainees read in a reading lesson have clear organizational structure. They introduce abstract concepts by using concrete example. They also explicitly state important complex relationship. Moreover, they include questions in relation to the intention of the writer, questions that require trainees to predict, to draw conclusion, and to share individual experiences (literal comprehension, pre-reading question, interpretative comprehension and applied comprehension respectively).

Concerning the level of content of the reading texts, most of the instructors and trainees responded that most reading texts that trainees read in a reading lesson have interesting topics with appropriate level of sentence complexity for the trainees. Nevertheless, most of them claimed that most of the texts do not contain appropriate vocabulary load.

The text variables such as clear organizational structure, having interesting topics and appropriate level of sentence complexity are included in most of the reading texts. Moreover, in the open-ended questionnaire, both instructors and trainees revealed that most of the reading texts are related to the trainees' socio-cultural context. However, as depicted in the open-ended questionnaire and in the interview, the English language ability of trainees do not seem well enough to interact with reading texts.

5.2 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are given.

- As can be observed from both instructors and trainees' responses, instructors let trainees do pre-reading questions only before reading. Although this might help to activate the world knowledge (known knowledge) of trainees, there was no chance for trainees to link the activated known knowledge with new knowledge in the text. As depicted by both trainees and instructors, trainees did not read for adjusting their prediction.
- The types of purposes of reading used in Debre Markos CTE were reading to identify specific and general information. Though these purposes are crucial to reproduce the

exact text, they do not enable trainees to maintain coherence. The coherent meaning constructed by the reading will be some how related to the reader's prior experience (world knowledge) and the structures already formed in the reader's mind (textual knowledge).

- Instructors did not get trainees to predict the next part of the text from various clues and read for getting answers to questions arising from predictions. This purpose of reading is important since it helps readers to maintain coherence and make meaning.
- Instructors stated that most of the trainees were not interested in doing comprehension questions due to inability in their English language, shortage of vocabulary knowledge, no habit of reading, and their negative belief on the use of doing comprehension questions. Both trainees and instructors also noted that trainees had difficulty in expressing what they know about pre-reading questions due to shortage of knowledge of vocabulary, inability in using English language, lack of confidence, and problem of understanding the pre-reading questions. From the above statements, we can deduce that the English language ability of most of the trainees did not seem well enough to interact with reading texts.
- Trainees did comprehension questions since they felt that it helped them to prepare for final examination. This shows that their drive motive for doing comprehension question was getting good grade. They were not intrinsically motivated; that is, they were not reading to satisfy curiosity or for challenge.
- Instructors and trainees stated that most reading texts included interesting topics, appropriate level of sentence complexity, clear organizational structure and socio-cultural context related to the trainees. Nevertheless, they claimed that most of the texts did not contain appropriate vocabulary load.

5.3 Recommendation

Taking the results of instructors and trainees' responses and the conclusions given as bases, the researcher recommends that the following measures should be considered in a reading lesson to help trainees make meaning.

1. Trainees need to learn reading based on prediction and discussion in relation to predict-sample text-repredict- resamples process.

Regarding a reading lesson, both instructors and trainees explained that trainees first did the pre-reading questions and discussed them. Then, without getting chance to read for adjusting their prediction, they read to do the comprehension questions in which most of the questions were based on reproducing the exact text. The few reference comprehension questions were not given emphasis as due attention was given to getting meaning rather than making meaning.

To make meaning and stimulate full, rich understanding of text, trainees need to learn reading based on prediction and discussion in relation to predict- sample text-repridict- resample process.

2. Trainees need to set continual individual and group purposes for reading.

Purpose setting continues throughout the reading; that is from the first prediction up to the last prediction. Generally, trainees read a text after every prediction for the purposes of getting answers to questions arising from their predictions or to see whether new information will cause these predictions to be revised.

3. The reading lesson should be given due emphasis in the lower grades.

Trainees stated that they did pre-reading and comprehension questions with difficulty due to lack of practice in the lower grades. They also claimed that emphasis was given to grammar. Although grammar is crucial for language learning, the reading lesson should also be given due emphasis.

4. Course designers should consider the English language ability of trainees when preparing reading texts.

As revealed by instructors and trainees due to inability in English language and shortage of vocabulary, trainees got difficult to interact with reading texts. Moreover, as depicted by both instructors and trainees, most of the texts did not seem to contain appropriate vocabulary load. Since it might be difficult to conduct a reading lesson with trainees having such problems, I recommend that course designers should consider the English language ability of trainees when preparing reading texts.

5. Course designers need to design reading activities based on predict-sample text-repredict-resample process.

In the prediction stage, trainees have only a title and their prior knowledge. Therefore, in this stage, predictions rely heavily on prior knowledge and various interpretations of title words. In the second stage, first-stage predictions are confirmed or discarded as textual links and information warrants.

6. Instructors need to get training on how to interact reader variables with text variables.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, M. J, and Collins, A. 1979. 'A Schema – Theoretical View of Reading'. In Roy O. Freedle (ed), *New Directions in Discourse Processing*. Norwood, N. J.: Albert Publishing Corporation.
- Adams, M., and Bruce, B. 1982. 'Background Knowledge and Reading Compression'. In J. A. Langer and M. T. Smith- Burke (eds), *Reader Meets Author: Bridging the Gap (pp. 2-25)*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Alexander, P. A., and Jetsson, T. L. 2000. 'Learning From Text: A Multidimensional and Developmental Process'. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, and R., Barr (eds), *Handbook of Reading Research (vol. 111, PP.285-310)*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Alexander, P. A., Kulikowich, J. M., and Jetton, T.C. 1994. The Role of Subject- Mater Knowledge and Interest in the Processing of Linear and Non-Linear text. *Review of Educational Research*, 64/2, 201-252.
- Anders, P.L., and Lloyd, C. V. 1989. 'The Significance of Prior Knowledge in the Learning of New Content- specific Instruction'. In D. Lapp, J. Flood, and N. Farnan (eds), *Content Area Reading and Learning: Instructional Strategies (pp.258-269)*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice- Hall.
- Anderson, R. C. 1994. 'Role of the Reader's Schema incomprehension, Learning and Memory'. In R. B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, and H. Signer (eds.), *Theoretical Models and Process of Reading (4th ed, PP. 469- 482)*. New York, DE: International Reading Association.
- Armbruster, B.B. 1984. 'The Problem of 'Inconsiderate Text''. In G.G. Duffy, L. R. Roehler, and J, Mason (eds), *Comprehension Instruction: Perspectives and Suggestions (PP. 202-217)*. New York: Longman.
- Bartlett, F. C. 1932. *Remembering Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Beck, I. L., Mckeown, M. G., Hamilton, R. L., and Kucak, L. 1998. Getting at the Meaning: How to Help Students Unpack Difficult Text. *American Educator*, 22 (1), 66-71.
- Berman, R. A. 1984. *Syntactic Components of the Foreign Language Reading Process*. In J.C. Alderson and A. Urquhart (eds), pp.139-156.
- Carrell, P. L. 1983. Some Issues in Studying the Role of Schemata, or Background Knowledge, in Second Language Comprehension. *Reading in a foreign Language*, 1(2), 81-92.
- _____. 1981a. **Cultural- Specific Schemata in L2 Comprehension**. In Selected Papers from the ninth Illinois TESOL/.BE annual Convention, The First Midwest TESOL Conference, Richard Orem and John Haskell (eds), 123-132. Chicago: Illinois TESOL/BE.
- _____. 1981b. **The Role of Schemata in L2 Comprehension**. Paper Presented at the 15th Annual TESOL Convention., Detroit, Michigan, March, 1981.
- Cook, G. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doak, C.C., Doak, L. G., and Root, J. H. 1996. *Teaching Patients with Low Literacy Skills (Vol I, 2nd ed.)*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.
- Eskey, D. E. 1988. **Holding in the Bottom: An Interactive Approach to the Language Problems of Second Language Readers**. In P. L. Carell, J. Devine, and D. E. Eskey (eds), pp. 93-100.
- Gillet, J. W., and Temple, C. 2000. *Understanding Reading Problems (5th ed.)*. New York: Harper- Collins.
- Goldman S. R., and Rakestraw, J. A. 2000. Structural aspects of Constructing meaning from Text. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R., Barr (eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research (Vol. III, pp. 311-335)*.
- Goodman, K. S. 1967. Reading: A Psycholinguistics Guessing Game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist* 6(4), 126-135.
- Gordon, C. 1992. The Role of Prior Knowledge in narrative and Expository Text. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service*.

- Gough, P. B. 1972. One Second Reading. In Kavanagh, J. F. and Mattingly, J. G. (eds), *Language by Ear and by Eye*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Guthrie, J. T. 1996. Educational Contexts for Engagement in Literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(6), 432-445.
- Guthrie, J. T., and Wigfield, A. 2000. Engagement and Motivation in Reading. In M. L. Kamil, P.B Pearson, and R. Barr (eds), *Handbook of Reading Research (Vol. III, pp. 403-422)*. Mahwah, N.J. : Erlbaum.
- Guthrie, J.T., Alao, S. and Rinehart, J.M. 1997. Engagement in Reading for Young Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 40(6), 438-446.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hason 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd ed.)* London: Longman.
- Hartman, D. K. 1995. Eight Readers Reading. The Intertextual Links of Proficient Readers Reading Multiple Passages. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 520-561.
- Hedge, T. 2000. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herber, H. L. 1978. *Teaching reading in the Content Areas (2nd. ed)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hudson, T. 1982. The Effects of induced Schemata on the “Short Circuit” in L2 reading: non-decoding factors in L2 reading performance. *Language Learning*, 32(1): 1-31.
- Johnson, K. 1982. *Communicative Syllabus Design and Methodology*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kieras, D. W. 1985. ‘Thematic Processes in the Comprehension of Thematic Prose’. In B. Britton and J. Black (eds.), *Understanding Expository Prose*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Langer, J. A. 1990. Process of Understanding: Reading for Literary and Informative Purposes. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24 (3), 229-260.

- McDonough, J. and Show, C. 1993. ***Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teachers Guide***. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mckeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., Sinatra, G. M., and Loxerman, J. A. 1997. Contribution of Prior Knowledge and Coherent Text to Comprehension. ***Reading Research Quarterly*, 27,79-93.**
- Meyer, B. J. F. 1985. Organizational Aspects of Text: Effects on Reading Comprehension from Printed Versus Computer-Displayed Text. ***Educational Gerontology*, 23(8), 789-807.**
- Nuttall, C. 1996. ***Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language***. Great Britain: Bath Press.
- Paran, A. 1996. Reading in EFL: Factors and Fictions. ***ELT Journal* 50/1.**
- Pearson, P. D., Roehler, L. R., Dole, J. A and Duffy, G.G. 1990. ***Developing Expertise in Reading Comprehension: What should be taught? How should it be taught?*** (Tech. Rep. No.512). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign, Center for the Study of Reading.
- Pritchard, R. 1990. The Effects of Cultural Schema on Reading Processing Strategies. ***Reading Research Quarterly*, 25(4), 273-295.**
- Readdence, J.E., Bean, T.W., and Baldwin, R.S. 1998. ***Content area literacy: An integrated approach*** (6th ed). Dubuque, IA: Kenall/ Hunt.
- Roe. B. D., Stoodf, B.D., and Burns, P. C. 1995. ***Secondary School Reading Instruction*** (5th ed). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ruddell, M.R. 2001.*Teaching Content: Reading and Writing* (3rd ed.). United States of America: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Ruddell, R. B. 1971. Language Acquisition and the Reading Processes. In Ruddell, R. B. and Singer, H. (eds), ***Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading***. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Rumelhart, D.E. 1981. Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition. In J.T. Guthrie (ed), Comprehension and Teaching. ***Research Reviews*** (pp.3-26). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Sadoski, M., and Paivio, A. 1994. A Dual Coding View of Imagery and Verbal Processes in reading Comprehension. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, and H. Singer (Eds.). ***Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*** (4th ed , pp. 582-601). Newark DE: International Reading Association.
- Shank, R. C and Abelson, R. P. 1977. ***Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding***. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Smith, F. 1978. ***Reading***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.
- _____. 1994. ***Understanding Reading*** (5th ed). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stauffer, R. G. 1969. ***Directing Reading Maturity as a Cognitive Process***. New York: Harper and Row.
- _____. 1980. ***The Language- Experience Approach to Teaching Reading*** (2nd ed). New York: Harper and row.
- Vacca, R. T., and Vacca, J. L. 1999. ***Content Area Reading*** (6th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.
- Wadsworth, B. J. 1971. ***Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development***. New York: David Mckay.
- Wallace, C. 1992. ***Reading***. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weaver, C. 1994. Parallels between New Paradigms in Science and in Reading and Literacy theories: an Essay Review. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, and H. Singer (eds), ***Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*** (4th ed, PP. 1185-1202). Newark,. DE: International Reading Association.
- Widdowson, H. G. 1979. ***Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, E. 1984. ***Reading in the Language Classroom***. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.

APPENDIX 1

**Addis Ababa University
Institute of Language Studies
Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Graduate Program**

A Questionnaire to be filled by Instructors

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to gather relevant information regarding the interaction between trainees and reading texts in a reading lesson in Debre Markos CTE and to suggest possible recommendations based on the findings. So, you are kindly requested to respond to all statements or questions based on the instruction given. Your information is used only for research purpose and is, therefore, kept confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation

Part I: General Information

Write your answer about yourself in the space provided

1. Sex _____
2. Level of education _____
3. Total number of years in teaching English _____
4. Total number of years in teaching English in the college _____

Part II: For each of the following statements about the pre-reading and while-reading activities, show how often you use them by putting (✓) in one of the boxes in the scale

No	Before trainees read a reading text, I	Scale				
		Always	Usually	Some times	Rarely	Never
1	encourage them to do pre- reading questions.					
2	get them to share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions.					
3	get them to exchange ideas with members of their group about what will be included in the passage.					
4	encourage them to guess what the passage is about using their prior knowledge about the topic.					
5	explain them about the passage.					

	When trainees read the reading text (while reading),I					
6	inform them that their purpose of reading is to adjust their predictions.					
7	get them to scan the passage to identify specific ideas.					
8	get them to skim the passage to identify general ideas.					
9	inform them to discuss the questions in group.					
10	get them to read silently.					
11	get them to draw conclusions during class discussion.					
12	get them to share individual experiences during class discussion.					
13	acknowledge their different paths to understand the text.					
14	get them to predict the next part of the text from various clues.					

Part III: For each of the following statements about reading texts used in a reading lesson, please indicate your agreement or disagreement by putting (✓) in the box according to the following scale. SA (strongly Agree), A (Agree), U (undecided), D (Disagree), SD (Strongly Disagree)

No	Most reading texts that trainees read in a reading lesson	SA	A	U	D	SD
15	introduce abstract concepts by accompanying them with many concrete examples.					
16	have appropriate level of sentence complexity for the trainees.					
17	have topics, which are interesting.					
18	explicitly state important complex relationships (e.g. causality, conditionality, etc.) rather than always expecting the reader to infer them from the context.					
19	contain appropriate vocabulary load. For example, usually only one new vocabulary item per paragraph occurs throughout a text.					
20	have problems or questions in relation to the intention of the writer.					
21	have problems or questions that require trainees to predict.					
22	have problems or questions that require trainees to draw conclusion.					
23	have problems or questions that require trainees to share individual experiences.					

Part IV: Open-ended Questionnaire

Answer the Following questions briefly

1. Do most of the trainees express what they know about the pre-reading questions in English without difficulty?

Could you list reasons for your answer?

Are reading texts related to the trainees' socio-cultural context?

Could you list examples that are related to your answer?

Are most of the trainees interested in doing comprehension questions?

Could you write reasons for your answer?

APPENDIX 2

Addis Ababa University
Institute of Language Studies
Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Graduate Program

A Questionnaire to be filled by Trainees

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to gather relevant information regarding the interaction between trainees and reading texts in a reading lesson in Debre Markos CTE and to suggest possible recommendations based on the findings. So, you are kindly requested to respond to all statements or questions based on the instruction given. Your information is used only for research purpose and is, therefore, kept confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation

Part I: General Information

Show your response about yourself by putting (✓) in one of the boxes in each case

1. Sex : Male ☐ Female ☐
2. Age: 17-19 ☐, 20-22 ☐, 23-25 ☐, 26 and above ☐
3. Level of grade you completed: Grade 10 ☐ Grade 12 ☐

Part II: For each of the following statements about the pre-reading and while-reading activities, show how often you practice them by putting (✓) in one of the boxes in the scale

No	Before we read reading texts, the instructor	Scale				
		Always	Usually	Some times	Rarely	Never
1	encourages us to do pre-reading questions.					
2	gets us to share ideas with a partner about the pre-reading questions.					
3	encourages us to guess what the passage is about.					
4	gets us to exchange ideas in group about what will be included in the passage.					
5	explains explicitly about the passage.					

	When we read a reading passage (While reading), the instructor					
6	informs us that our purpose of reading is to adjust our predictions.					
7	encourages us to scan the passage to get specific ideas.					
8	gets us to skim the passage to identify the general idea of a passage.					
9	lets us discuss different questions of the passage in-group.					
10	instructs us to read silently.					
11	asks us to draw conclusions during class discussion.					
12	informs us to share individual experiences during class discussion.					
13	accepts our different ways of understanding the text.					
14	asks us to predict the next part of the text.					

Part III: For each of the following statements about reading texts used in a reading lesson, please indicate your agreement or disagreement by putting (✓) in the box according to the following scale. SA (strongly Agree), A (Agree), U (undecided), D (Disagree), SD (Strongly Disagree)

No	Most reading texts that trainees read in a reading lesson	SA	A	U	D	SD
15	introduce abstract concepts by accompanying them with many concrete examples.					
16	have appropriate level of sentence complexity for the trainees.					
17	have topics that are interesting.					
18	explicitly state important complex relationships (e.g. causality, conditionality, etc.) rather than always expecting the reader to infer them from the context.					
19	contain appropriate vocabulary load. For example, usually only one new vocabulary item per paragraph occurs throughout a text.					
20	have problems or questions in relation to the intention of the writer.					
21	have problems or questions that require trainees to predict.					
22	have problems or questions that require trainees to draw conclusion.					
23	have problems or questions that require trainees to share individual experiences.					

Part IV: Open-ended Questionnaire

Answer the following questions briefly

1. Do you express what you know about the pre-reading questions in English without difficulty?

Could you state your reasons for your answer?

Are reading texts related to your socio-cultural context?

Could you give examples, which are related to your answer?

Are you interested in doing comprehension questions?

Could you write reasons for your answer?

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
የቋንቋዎች ጥናት ተቋም
የውጭ ቋንቋዎችና ስነ-ጽሑፍ ትምህርት ክፍል
ድህረ ምረቃ መርሃ ግብር

በሰልጣኞች የሚሞላ የጽሑፍ መጠይቅ

የዚህ መጠይቅ ዋና ዓላማ ሰልጣኞች ከእንግሊዘኛ ምንባቦች ጋር ያላቸውን መስተጋብር (Interaction) ለማጥናትና የተገኙ ግኝቶችን መሰረት ያደረገ የመፍትሄ ሃሳብ ለማቅረብ የሚያስችል መረጃ ለመሰብሰብ ነው። የምትሰጡት መረጃ ለጥናትና ምርምር ብቻ እንደሚውል በመገንዘብ፣ የራሳችሁን አመለካከት ብቻ መሰረት በማድረግ ሁሉንም መጠይቅ በትዕዛዙ መሰረት እንድትመልሱ ስጠይቅ፣ ስለትብራችሁ ከወዲሁ በማመስገን ነው።

ክፍል አንድ፡- አጠቃላይ መረጃ

ለሚከተሉት አጠቃላይ መረጃዎች የ (✓) ምልክት በማድረግ ይግለጹ።

1. ፆታ፡- ወንድ ☐ ሴት ☐
2. እድሜ፡- ከ15 - 20 ☐ ከ21- 25 ☐ 26 እና ከዚያ በላይ ☐
3. ሁለተኛ ደረጃ ትምህርት ያጠናቀቁበት የክፍል ደረጃ፡- 10ኛ ☐ 12ኛ ☐

ክፍል ሁለት፡- የሚከተሉትን ቅድመ የእንግሊዘኛ ምንባብና (pre-reading) በእንግሊዘኛ ምንባብ ጊዜ (while-reading) የሚደረጉ ክንዎኔዎችን የሚያትቱ ዓረፍተ ነገሮችን በመተግበር ጉዳይ ከተሰጠው ደረጃ በአንዱ የ(✓) ምልክት በማድረግ ያሳዩ።

	በቅድመ የእንግሊዘኛ ምንባብ (pre-reading) ወቅት፣ መምህራችን	ደረጃ				
		ሁልጊዜ	በተደጋጋሚ	አንዳንድ ጊዜ	በጣም አልፎ አልፎ	ምንም ጊዜ
1	ቅድመ ምንባብ ጥያቄዎችን እንድንሰራ ያበረታቱናል።					
2	በቅድመ ምንባብ ጥያቄዎች ላይ እግግተኛነት ያደርጉናል።					
3	ምንባቡ ስለምን እንደሆነ እንድንገምት ያበረታቱናል።					
4	ምንባቡ ምን ምን ሊያካትት እንደሚችል በቡድን በመሆን ሃሳብ እንድንለዋወጥ ያደርጉናል።					
5	ስለምንባቡ ግልፅ በሆነ መንገድ ያስረዱናል።					
	ምንባቡን በምናነብበት ጊዜ (while reading)፣ መምህራችን					
6	የምናነብበት አላማ ስለምንባቡ የገመትነውን ለማስተካከል መሆኑን ይነግሩናል።					
7	የምንባቡን ውስን ሃሳቦች (specific ideas) ለማግኘት የተጠየቁ ጥያቄዎችን ለመመለስ የአሰሳ (scanning) አነባብብ ዘዴን እንድንጠቀም ያበረታቱናል።					
8	የምንባቡን አጠቃላይ ሃሳብ ለመለየት እንችላለን ዘንድ ፈጠን ያለ					

	አሰሳ አነባበብ (skimming) ዘዴን እንድንጠቀም ያደርጉናል።					
9	ምንባቡን መሰረት ባደረጉ የተለያዩ ጥያቄዎች ላይ በቡድን እንድንወያይ ያደርጉናል።					
10	ፀጥ ብለን እንድናነብ ትዕዛዝ ይሰጡናል።					
11	በጠቅላላ የክፍል ውይይት ወቅት ስለምንባቡ ያለንን የተጠቃለለ ግንዛቤ (conclusion) እንድንገልፅ ይጠይቁናል።					
12	በጠቅላላ የክፍል ውይይት ወቅት የምንባቡን ሃሳብ ከየግል ልምዳችን አንፃር እንዴት እንደምናየው ሃሳብ እንድንለዋወጥ ያደርጉናል።					
13	በተለያዩ መንገድ የምንባቡን ዋና ሃሳብ መረዳታችንን ስንገልፅ ይቀበሉናል።					
14	የሚቀጥለው የምንባብ ክፍል ስለምን ሊሆን እንደሚችል እንድንገምት ይጠይቁናል።					

ክፍል ሦስት፡- በሚከተለው ሰንጠረዥ መካከለኛ አምድ በእንግሊዘኛ የንባብ ትምህርት ወቅት ያነበባችኋቸው ምንባቦች ሊያሟሏቸው የሚገቡ ጉዳዮች፣ በቀኝ አምድ ደግሞ የእርስዎን የስምምነት ደረጃ አመልካቾች ተቀምጠዋል። ስለዚህ ለእያንዳንዱ ዝርዝር ያላችሁን አስተያየት የ(✓) ምልክት በማድረግ መስማማትዎን ወይም አለመስማማትዎን ይግለፁ።

	በምንባብ ትምህርት ወቅት ያነበባችኋቸው ብዙዎች ምንባቦች፣	የስምምነት ደረጃ				
		በባም እስማማለሁ	እስማማለሁ	መውሰን አልችልም	አልስማማም	በባም አልስማማም
15	ግልፅነት የጎደላቸው ፅንሰ ሐሳቦችን በዛ ባሉ ተጨባጭ ምሳሌዎች ያስተዋውቃሉ።					
16	የአረፍተ ነገሮች የክብደት ሁኔታ ከእናንተ የዕውቀት ደረጃ ጋር የተመጣጠኑትን የሚጨምር ነው።					
17	የማንበብ ፍላጎታችሁን ያካተቱ ርዕሶች አሏቸው።					
18	አንባቢው ከምንባቡ ሁኔታ ሁልጊዜ በመነሳት በምንባቡ ውስጥ ያሉ ጠቃሚ የሆኑ ውስብስብ ግንኙነቶችን ለምሳሌ ምክንያትና ውጤት፣ የመሆንና ያለመሆን፣ ወዘተ በራሱ ግምገማዳረዳ ጫና ከመፍጠር ይልቅ በግልፅ በተብራራ ሁኔታ ይገልፃሉ።					
19	የከባድ ቃላት ብዛት ከአንድ አንቀፅ አንድ ቃል በሆነ መልኩ የተዘጋጁ ናቸው።					
20	ከደራሲው ሃሳብ ጋር የተዛመዱ የንባብ ጥያቄዎችን አካተዋል።					
21	የኛን ግምታዊ መልስ የሚሾ ጥያቄዎችን ይዘዋል።					
22	የራሳችንን ግንዛቤ መሰረት ያደረገ ማጠቃለያ እንድንሰጥ የሚያደርጉ ጥያቄዎችን ይዘዋል።					
23	የእያንዳንዳችንን ልምድ እንድናካፍል የሚጋብዙ ጥያቄዎችን አካተዋል።					

ክፍል አራት፡- ሃተታዊ መጠይቅ

ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች መልስ ይሆናሉ የምትሏቸውን በተሰጠው ክፍት ቦታ ዓፍ፡፡

1. ከምንባቡ በፊት የሚሰሩ ጥያቄዎችን በተመለከተ የምታውቁትን በእንግሊዘኛ ያለምንም ችግር መግለፅ ትችላላችሁን?

ለመለሳችሁት መልስ ምክንያት ይሆናሉ የምትሉትን በተሰጠው ክፍት ቦታ ዘርዝሩ፡፡

2. የእንግሊዘኛ ምንባቦች ከእናንተ ማህበራዊና ባህላዊ ሁኔታዎች ጋር የተዛመዱ ናቸውን? መለሳችሁን መሰረት በማድረግ ለመረጃ ያህል ምሳሌዎች ይሆናሉ የምትሉትን ዓፉ?

3. ከእንግሊዘኛ ምንባብ ጋር የተያያዙ ጥያቄዎችን መስራት ደስ ይላችኋል? ከሰጣችሁት መልስ አንፃር ምክንያታችሁን በአጭሩ ግለፁ፡፡

APPENDIX 3

Instructors' Interview Questions

In a reading lesson:

1. what do you do before trainees read a text?
2. what do you do when trainees read a text?
3. what do you think are the causes for trainees not understanding reading texts?
4. what kind of comprehension questions are trainees asked to do?
5. which kinds of questions are difficult for trainees to answer?
6. how do trainees do the comprehension questions? Do they do them first individually, then in pair or small group before they discuss them with you?
7. do you think trainees are interested in doing comprehension questions?

APPENDIX 4

Trainees' interview questions conducted in a panel mode

Initial Discussion Questions

In a reading lesson:

1. what do you do before you read a text?
2. what do you do when you read a text?
3. what do you think are the causes for not understanding reading texts?
4. what kind of comprehension questions are you asked to do?
5. which kinds of questions are difficult for you to answer?
6. how do you do the comprehension questions? Do you do them first individually, then in pair or small group before you discuss them with your instructor?
7. do you do pre-reading questions to predict what the next part of the text will be about based on the various cues you see in the paragraph(s) discussed?

በፓናል መልክ የሚቀርብ የሰልጣኞች ቃለ መጠይቅ ጥያቄዎች

ለውይይት መነሻ ጥያቄዎች

1. ከምንባብ በፊት ምን ታደርጋላችሁ?
2. በምንባብ ወቅት ምን ታደርጋላችሁ?
3. የእንግሊዘኛ ምንባቦችን መረዳት እንዳ ትችሉ የሚያደርጉ ምክንያቶች ምንድን ናቸው?
4. ምን ዓይነት ከምንባቡ የውጡ ጥያቄዎችን እንድትሰሩ ነው የምትጠየቁት?
5. የትኞቹን አይነት ጥያቄዎች መስራት ነው የሚያስቸግራችሁ?
6. እንዴት ነው ጥያቄዎችን የምትሰሩት? ማለት በጥያቄዎች ላይ ከመምህራችሁ ጋር ከመነጋገራችሁ በፊት መጀመሪያ በግላችሁ እንድትሰሩ ከዚያ በጥንድ ወይም በቡድን በመልሱ ላይ እንድትነጋገሩ ይሆናል?
7. ውይይት የተደረገባቸውን ምዕራፎች መሠረት በማድረግ ስለቀጣይ ምዕራፎች ምንነት ለመገመት የሚያስችሉ ጥያቄዎችን ትሠራላችሁ?

APPENDIX-5

Transcripts of classroom observation in reading lessons

The transcription conventions are given below.

I= teachers/ instructor

S= a student/ a trainee

SS= students/trainees

Reading lesson observation in instructor 1 (Tl) class

Tl: We will start our lesson with unit 4. It is about environment (writes on blackboard)

What does environmental problem mean?

SS: (together) desertification

Tl: Any other?

S: Deforestation

Tl: (writes on board) pre-reading: Discuss the measure causes of environmental problems and the possible solutions sitting in groups of three.

SS: (discuss sitting in group of three or four)

Tl: (writes on the black board) while-reading questions

1. Scanning

Answer the following questions by reading the passage quickly

1. What was the number of population in 1830?
2. How many people live with water scarcity?
3. How many square kilometers becomes desert in Nigeria each year?
4. In 1990, what percentage of Ethiopia was covered by forest?

2. Skimming

Identify the main points of each paragraph

SS: (Read the passage silently sharing one module for two or three four about five minutes)

Tl: (pointing to what was written under scanning on the black board) your answer to question one

SS: one billion

Tl: Question two (pointing to the blackboard)

SS: 434 million

Tl:L Question three (pointing to the blackboard)

SS: 3500 square kilometers

TI: Question 4

SS: 40%

TI: Good. How many paragraphs are there in the passage?

SS: Seven

Tl: What is the main point of paragraph one?

S: The increasment of population from time to time

Tl: What is the main point of paragraph two?

S: The problems caused by population.

Tl: Paragraph 3

SS: Water scarcity

Tl: Very good. Paragraph 4

S: Each year coverage of desertification in Gobi and Nigeria

Tl: Ok, Good. Paragraph 5

SS: Scarcity of food

Tl: Very good. Paragraph 6

S: Countries with low level of forest cover

Tl: Ok, the last paragraph

S: The growth of population is a world problem

Tl: Very good. Now, read the passage carefully and silently and answer the following questions according to the passage. (writes the questions on the black board)

1. Why do over 1.8 billion people live in 36 countries with critically low level of forest?
2. Is population problem only a national problem? Why?
3. What does the writer want to tell us?

SS: (Read the passage sharing one module for two or three)

Tl: (after about eight minutes) compare your answers in pair

SS: Discuss their answers in groups rather than in pairs

Tl: (reads the first question and explains it) what is your answer?

S: Because of over population

Tl: Any other?

S: Because there is no policy that prevents forests from distribution.

Tl: Good. Your answer to the second question (pointing to the blackboard)

S: No, because it is a world wide problem.

Tl: Very good. It is not only a national problem but also a world wide problem.

What is your answer to the third question?

S: Effects of environmental problem

Tl: Good. Any other?

S: The causes of environmental problem.

Tl: Very Good. The writer wants to tell us about the causes and effects of environmental problems.

Other than points mentioned in the passage, do you have anything about causes and effects of environmental problems?

S: Drought

T1: Drought is related to the passage- scarcity of water or rain

After discussing meanings of certain vocabulary words

T1: Homework (writes on the blackboard) make your own sentences using the words we have already discussed.

Reading Lesson Observation in Instructor 2 (T2) Class

T2: (writes the topic on the black board) unit five- current affairs

T2: What is a current affair? Read the passage on page 29 to answer this question

SS: (Read the passage sharing one module for two or three for around 10 minutes)

T2: (moves around and asks trainees if they need help)

SS: (discuss the question in their group)

T2: have you finished answering the question?

SS: yes

T2: What is a current affair?

S: Current activities about politics, economy and social affairs.

T2: Any other?

S: Current activities transmitted through radio, TV and newspaper.

T2: Good. How often do you read a newspaper?

S: Sometimes because I am not interesting.

T2: Any other?

S: Always

T2: Any other?

S: sometimes because I don't have time

T2: How often do you listen to radio and watch TV?

S: Sometimes.

T2: What have you listened to currently?

S: The election of the French leader

T2: Any other?

S: the dispute between Israel and Palestine

T2: Very good. Now read the article entitled with 'Menace of war stirs between Ethiopia and Eritrea.' On page 29 and identify the main idea of the text.

SS: (read the article for 10 minutes)

T2: (moves round and checks if trainees have finished reading)

T2: We read the passage for general information. What information do you get from this article?

S: The war between Ethiopia and Eritrea

T2: Thank you; have you listened to what he said?

SS: Yes

T2: Was the war good or bad?

SS: Bad

T2: How many people were killed during the previous fighting?

S: 100,000 people

T2: When did the two countries previously fight?

S: Between 1998 and 2000

T2: Whose decision brought about the present situation?

S: The decision of international boundary commission.

T2: which country has refused to accept the decision?

S: Ethiopia

T2 what was Eritrea until 1942?

S: Italian Colony

T2: Good. As time is over, we will do the other activities next time

Reading lesson Observation in Instructor 3 (T3) Class

T3: What did we do last week?

S: We discussed current affairs

T3: Can you mention some of the points of current affairs?

S: Nuclear weapons

T3: Any other?

S: Drought

T3: Any other?

S2: war

T3: That is enough. To day, we are going to look at an article entitled with 'Menace of War stirs between Ethiopia and Eritrea (writes on the blackboard) sit in group of six and answer the following question.

Pre-reading (writes on the blackboard)

Does Ethiopia have good relationship with Eritrea? Elaborate on your answer (writers on the black board)

SS: (Discuss the question sitting in group of six for 10 minutes)

T3: (moves round and checks the participation of the students) (After 10 minutes) what is your answer?

S: No, because they were fighting each other due to boundary conflict.

T3: Ok, good. Any other?

S: No, because they disagree due to owning Badme. Due to this conflict, many people were killed.

T3: Good. Any other answer?

S: No, there is no smooth relationship between Ethiopia and Eritrea

T3: Good you have a good picture of the article. Now, read the article on page 27. As you read the article, try to answer the question, which are on page 30. You can use either scanning or skimming technique to read the article.

While reading (writes on the blackboard).

SS: (read silently for 10 minutes sharing one module for three or four)

T3: (moves around)

T3: (after eight minutes) increase your speed please. You will have two minutes.

T3: (After ten minutes) we shall discuss your answer sometime after, but now you are going to discuss the following two questions in your previous group

Post-reading activity (writes on the blackboard)

1. What will happen to the two countries if a war breaks out?
2. What shall be done to avoid war between the two countries?

SS: (discuss the questions in their groups for six minutes)

T3: (Moves round) (after six minutes) now, let us discuss the while reading questions.

T3: Which two countries does the writer think may be about to go to war?

S: Ethiopia and Eritrea

T3: What are the names of the two leaders of these countries?

S: Melese Zenawi and Esayas Afeworki

T3: What is the argument about?

S: Ethiopia says Badme belongs to me and Eritrea says Badme belongs to me

T3: Good. It is a dispute for Badme

T3: Which town is the dispute focused up on?

S: Badme

T3: How many people were killed during the previous fighting?

SS: 100,000 people

T3: When did the two countries previously fight?

SS: Between 1998 and 2000

T3: Good. Whose decision brought about the present situation?

S: International boundary commission

T3: Ok, good what were the leaders in the 1980s?

S: Haile Silassie

T3: Please read and understand the question

S: They were in piece

T3: Good. They were comrades. Which country had refused to accept the decision?

S: It is not accepted by Ethiopia.

T3: What was Eritrea until 1942?

S: Colony of Italy

T3: Very good. Now let us do the post reading questions. (reads the first question written on the blackboard) what is your answer?

S: There will be economic crisis

T3: Very good. Any other?

S: Many people will die.

T3: Any other?

S: There will be destruction of resources

T3: Very good, (reads the second question) what is your answer?

S: Half of Badme should be for Ethiopia and the other half for Eritrea.

T3: Any other?

S: The two countries should be governed by the international Boundary commission.

T3: Any other?

S: They should solve the problem peacefully

T3: How? Time is over. We will continue our discussion tomorrow.

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE**

**THE APPLICATION OF INTERACTING READER VARIABLES WITH
TEXT VARIABLES IN A READING LESSON: THE CASE OF DEBRE
MARKOS CTE FIRST YEAR TRAINEES IN 10+3 PROGRAM**

**BY
HAILE SHIBABAW**

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Advisor

Signature

Examiner

Signature

Examiner

Signature

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this is my own work and all sources used for the study have been duly acknowledged.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Place- Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Institute of Language
Studies, Addis Ababa University.

Date: _____