READING PRACTICES OF FIRST YEAR NATURAL SCIENCE STUDENTS: THE CASE OF BONGA COLLEGE OF TEACHERS EDUCATION

TESHALE AYALEW

JANUARY, 2012
READING PRACTICES OF FIRST YEAR NATURAL SCIENCE STUDENTS: THE CASE OF OF BONGA COLLEGE OF TEACHERS EDUCATION

A Thesis presented to the Department of English Languages and Literature (Graduate Programme)

In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

By Teshale Ayalew Advisor Yemanehbirhan Kelemework

January, 2012
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank people who are involved, directly or indirectly, in this research project. Among them, I am indebted to my advisor Yemanehbirhan Kelemework for his valuable advice and constructive comments. Without his unreserved support, it would have been entirely impossible to get the present shape of the paper.

I would like to extend my grateful to Teshome Bekele, the Department Head, of English Language at Bonga College of Teachers Education and the rest English department staffs for their full cooperation as I have carried out the study.

I am also thankful of none department staffs who involved during pilot study, and who helped me in printing and duplicating instruments.

My sincere thank further goes to the Department of English Language and Literature of Jimma University for facilitating all necessary things to carry out this research project including the financial expense for the study.

The last thank but not the list goes to my adoring better half Fikirte Mulat and the rest of my family for the love and care they have offered me throughout my life and a moral support I deserve as I have carried out this study.
ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study is to examine students’ classroom reading practices in relation to the theoretical framework of the reading practices. Hence, a descriptive survey method with both qualitative and quantitative design was made use of.

The study was conducted at Bonga College of Teachers’ Education. The subjects of the study were first year natural science stream students and teachers who offered them the course Communicative English skills-I. In the study 104 students and four (4) teachers were involved. The selection of students was made random using simple random sampling technique in order to give equal chance for all participants to be selected. For teachers, purposive sampling technique was employed. To collect the necessary information from the subjects, two data collection instruments: Classroom observation and questionnaire were used.

The findings showed that most students employed word level meaning processing as they read the text. In other words, they didn’t use strategy based processing including reading for gist, reading for specific information, and guessing meanings from context and the like.

In addition, students’ limited linguistic knowledge and lack of commitment from teachers’ side were the major problems that hampered students’ effective reading practices. Among the challenges that influenced the teaching of reading was the tradition of teaching and learning reading in which students passed through and lack of awareness about contemporary theories and practices of reading.

Based on the findings, it was concluded that students reading practices appear to be inconsistent with the theoretical framework of reading practices suggested by experts. Subjects of the study did not employ approaches, procedures and strategies suggested by scholars and researchers of reading. Thus, it is suggested that inability to employ inputs from research findings may lead to failure unless the actual practices should be harmonious with theoretical assumption and framework of teaching and learning reading.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Among the four major language skills, reading is one of the most important and extensively studied skills. ESL has appeared in the field of language study in the early 19th century, in the time of Grammar Translation Method, reading has got prominence together with grammar. In the time, the goal of language learning was to master the rules of the target language and to read and enjoy foreign language and literature. Hence, in ESL classroom, reading would have played crucial role where it had certain limited advantages such as emphasizing on word and sentence knowledge to construct meaning out of literary genres like prose and verse and finding its equivalent in the first language (Kritzinger, 1995; Richard and Rodgers, 2000).

As time went by, the focus given to reading has increased. A number of researches have been carried out and some theories were developed to direct practitioner towards better performance of reading (Bernhardt, 2006). With the commencement of the field of SLA in the 1970s which was greatly influenced by psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics, the field of second-language reading started to flourish and began to introduce different approaches such as bottom-up/text-based perspectives, and latter on more socially-oriented approach, which focuses on readers’ background knowledge, top-down were introduced (Razi, 2004). The introduction of top-down model diverted the attention of practitioners in to a new direction i.e. to focus on readers’ schematic knowledge. Gradually, researchers came up with criticism of both aforementioned reading processing and launched alterative processing called interactive which gives equal weight for both text and readers’ background knowledge. Since, it is believed that it fills the gap existed in the former processing models (Bernhardt, 2006).

Despite the introduction of alternative approaches to practice the skill, the way it is practiced is not promising in many EFL classrooms. Gardner (1979, as cited in Nuttall, 1996) stated that, even if, reading is one of the four major language skills, it has been given inadequate emphasis in many language classroom; and its handling is also fragmentary rather than sustained. She said, “What is practiced in reading session is not exactly reading rather it is either grammar or
writing” (Nuttall, 1996, P. 149). From this, one can deduce that the way reading is practiced in EFL classrooms are not appropriate. As a result, most students do not practice reading effectively.

For students who are learning English as foreign language, where there is no enough exposure to practice the language, reading is a substantial tool to master the target language. That is why, Nuttall (1996, P. 128) said, “The best way to improve your knowledge of foreign language is to go and live among its speakers. The next best way is to read extensively in it.” Despite assuring academic success or failure of students in EFL classrooms, reading improves students’ language skills, and helps them access different information through. With regard to this, Atkins and et al (1996, P.39) underline, “In high school and tertiary colleges in Ethiopia, reading is by far the most important of the four skills.”

Furthermore, effective reading helps students to overcome the academic challenges and to become successful in all their walk of life. This is not the only truth for English language but also for all other disciplines. In any field of study, students are required to carry out vast reading to quire necessary knowledge and skills which help them to solve life challenges. So, their reading becomes meaningful and purposeful if and only if they have fundamentals of reading.

Even though reading has countless importance for academic career and in all walks of life, the current students’ reading practice at college level is below standard. Particularly, first year Natural Science Students of Bonga College of Teachers Education who take the course Communicative English Skills-I showed low performance in their reading comprehension. This is quite contradictory with what the government is thinking about. Currently, the government pays attention towards natural science field of study; hoping that students who are graduated from this field of study believed in lifting up the country from the bottom line of poverty to the level of middle income economy i.e. changing the picture of the nation and misery of the society. This dream is realized through students of the stated field of study who are expected to equip the coming generation with knowledge and skills of science and technology. Consequently, 70 to 30 ratio (i.e.70% natural science and 30% social science) was implemented nationwide for the enrolment of students at tertiary level years back. Since then, all higher institutes including the
college under the study have materialized the policy and accepting students on the basis of the principle.

After all, the researcher intended to conduct this descriptive survey to assess and describe the actual practices of trainees' of the stated stream. In the study, the researcher examined the approach that has been dominantly used by readers; the information processing strategies that have been commonly employed by the subjects of the study. In addition, the researcher examined the reading texts and activities that have been used in the reading classroom. Shortly, the researcher examined the reading practices of students in relation to the theoretical framework suggested by reading researchers.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Many research findings confirmed that reading plays important role in determining academic success or failure of learners at different levels. It is because knowledge is highly dependent on how much a person reads. In country like Ethiopia, mainly where English is used in few places such as a medium of instruction in secondary and tertiary educational levels, and as a medium of communication in few offices like airlines and embassies, the role of reading to expose learners to wide range of language input is far-reaching; because students have little exposure to the target language outside the classroom. The only means they have to improve their language is to read extensively (Nuttall, 1996). Getachew (1996, as cited in Atkins et al, 1996, p.39) stated that in academic contexts of Ethiopian high schools and tertiary colleges, reading plays the most crucial role. Furthermore, Atkins et al, (1996, P. 39) state, “...many high school students lack reading proficiency in English which exhibit itself slow and difficult reading and poor comprehension. This ineffective reading hinders their broader studies and inevitably limits their academic performance.”

Students who join colleges for their further education as soon as their completion of their high school education face challenges in their academic competence. In which, students are put in a situation where they should carry out massive reading tasks and accomplish a lot of activities by themselves with little guidance of their teachers. To equip students with the intended reading skills, the most important thing that has to be done is to materialize suitable reading approach and strategies. In addition, providing students interesting texts with rich content and carefully designed
activities are crucial. Because the researcher is convinced that the current students reading skills problem might be caused by a cumulative effect i.e. wrong reading practices such as using inefficient reading approach and ineffective reading strategies; using ineffective texts and activities, that couldn’t arouse students motivation and interest; lack of appropriate support(scaffolding). Moreover, in reading classroom teachers expose students to various reading texts and take them through different reading phases by encouraging them to read and construct meaning as they read.

As a language teacher, the researcher has taught communicative English skills courses to different batches of natural science students, for pre-service and in-service trainees, at different time. From which, he has learned that most trainees’ do not develop reading skills. Most of the time, in reading session, a lot of time was consumed and the actual time was ended up dealing with some part of the lesson and postponed the remaining part of it to the next class. Except few participants, the majority of students remains passive and wants the teacher to explain everything for them. When their exam scores were examined, there is variation among different skills and very low result in reading comprehension items. Similarly, other teaching staffs who have offered the course with him shared similar problem in their reading classroom. Hence, such situation urged him to assess the level of the problem in the stated setting.

We know that reading is highly individualized activity. However, it requires effective learning strategies and careful instructional decision; because, it is highly dependent on learner interest and motivation. In order to meet learners’ interest, teachers should, first, assess students need and background knowledge which influences one’s reading practice. Then, they should carefully select texts and activities which can fit learners need and prior knowledge and bring it to reading session. After that, they can employ suitable reading approach and strategies that are recommended by reading scholars and show students how to make use of them as they read the text and do activities.

The researcher tries to assess the approach/approaches used; the strategy/strategies employed by the students in their reading practices i.e. whether it is bottom-up or top-down or interactive; whether they effectively employ: scanning, skimming and intensive reading whenever necessary as they read the passage including activities that were used in the three phases of reading to enforce the implementation the stated strategies.
Few studies have been carried out by local researchers to examine students reading comprehension skills and issues related the skill. All findings revealed that students have poor reading comprehension skills. For instance, Mesfin (2008), Sisay (2009), and Teshome (2010) have conducted studies at different grade levels to investigate students reading comprehension skills, to see factors that cause differences on students reading ability, teachers’ theoretical belief and their actual practices in the reading classroom respectively. Mesfin (2008) conducted his research in two governmental primary schools located in Addis Ababa namely Medhaniale and Minilik primary schools to investigate how the teaching learning process of reading has taken place. Finally, he came up with findings that showed students poor reading comprehension skills. Likewise, Sisay (2009) has carried out similar study in governmental schools (Minilk II and Deraretu Tulu senior secondary preparatory schools) and nongovernmental (Abader and Cathedral senior secondary preparatory schools) located in Addis Ababa. His research findings revealed that students poor reading comprehension ability though there is discrepancy among the two compared schools. That means, even if there is differences in reading performance among government and private schools, overall students’ reading performance is below standard. In addition, the research that has been carried out by Teshome (2010) is to assess teachers’ theoretical belief and their actual classroom practices in secondary schools of Kaffa Zone revealed that students reading competence is very low.

All the aforementioned research works, however, different from this study in the following manner: those studies are different from this research is that they have focused on teachers practices in the reading classrooms. Perhaps, the focus of this study is on students reading practices with special emphasis to their favored approach and strategies as they practice reading; texts and activities that are used in the three phases of reading; and the performances of students in reading throughout the three stages of reading. In addition, this research is different from the aforesaid studies in grade levels and setting.

Therefore, the study attempted to address issues such as approaches mostly favored by students as they practice reading, strategies utilized in the three phases reading; reading texts and activities put in to practice in the three phases of reading are the major one. To achieve these, the following objectives are set.
1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. Main Objective

The main objective of this study is to assess the actual classroom reading practices of students.

1.3.1. Specific Objectives

To attain the main goal of the study, the following specific objectives are set:

- to identify which reading approach students use as they practice reading
- to explore what reading strategies students dominantly use while practicing reading
- to examine type of reading texts and activities that are used in the three phases of reading—pre, while, and post reading phases
- to describe the students’ reading practices and recommend possible solutions

1.4. Research questions

The study addressed the following questions:

- Which reading approach/approaches do/does students prefer to employ as they carry out reading?
- What strategies do students make use of to obtain information they need?
- What type of reading texts and activities are presented in a reading classroom?

1.5. Significance of the study

The findings of this study are believed to have the following significance:

- it may help teachers to learn why students’ reading practices becomes poor. And initiates them to consider recent research outputs as they plan their teaching to improve their students’ reading practices.
- could provide informative feedback for teachers training institute to give considerable attention to approaches and strategies in teaching and learning reading skills
- the findings of this research can also serve as a springboard to make further investigation in the area.
1.6. Scope of the Study

The study is delimited to Natural Science Stream Students of BCTE. In the stream, there are six departments such as Biology, Chemistry, Math, Physics, Health and physical Science, and Math and Natural Science Cluster. Hence, boundary is made around these departments.

1.7. Limitation of the Study

The study was limited to Bonga College of Teachers Education first year Natural Science Stream students who have taken the course communicative English skills-I. It was based on 104 sample students who were selected from 208 population and four teachers who offered the stated course to the aforesaid stream students. The result obtained from the study is not generalized to social science students who took the same course as they would have not been made part of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. What is Reading?

The definition given for reading may be diverging depending on the readers’ perception and knowledge they have towards the skills. Due to this reason, different definitions are offered for reading and reading comprehension. Some definitions given for reading includes terms like articulate, speak, pronounce etc. These definitions exactly refer to loud reading. In contrast, there are definitions offered for reading using words like understand, respond, and infer etc. such definitions mark silent reading in which comprehension and meaning construction is the center (Nuttall, 1996).

The term reading, of course, has been given numerous interpretations. For one thing, reading may mean that reading aloud, and it is primarily an oral matter. This meaning of reading is closer to pronunciation; particularly, for people who study reading as a matter of proper pronunciation of letters, words and the like. With regard to this, only few people are required to study and practice it as a matter of daily routine such as radio and TV newscasters, actors, and clergymen. For the other, it may mean ‘silent reading’. It is the most likely interpretation for the term. This is, perhaps, the nearest approach to the essence of reading because greatest amount of reading practice is silent reading. It is this reading mostly performed by intermediate and advanced EFL and ESL students of (Geoffrey et al, 1978; Nuttall, 1996).

Hedge (2000) defines reading as a dialogue between the reader and text, and the reader and author. Ur (1991), in his part, defines reading as means of understanding. Adding on this, he said that a student of foreign language who says, he can read the words but he doesn't know what they mean is not reading. Instead, he/she is simply doing decoding - translating written symbols into equivalent sounds. Scholars like Klinger and et al (2007) define reading as it is a complex process of meaning construction using a number coordinated skills. These include: decoding, word reading, background knowledge, vocabulary, and the like.
Mostly, when reading is discussed, comprehension is made its center. Indeed, comprehension makes reading an active meaning processing skill. To which, the reader brings his or her individual attitude, interest, and outlook. In addition, in this meaning processing activity, the reader involves his knowledge of the language and knowledge of the world. He builds up expectations, he makes predictions about what is to come next and check the accuracy of his predictions etc (Klinger et al, 2007).

Nuttall (1996) again defines reading as it is the transfer of meaning from mind to mind or the transfer of massage from writer to reader. Scholars like Inmon and Lenier (1992) also define reading as the process of rephrasing words and restructuring of meaning from the written text. Scholars like Macdonough and Shaw (1993) viewed reading as a multileveled and interactive process between the reader and the text wherein the reader uses his/her background knowledge and the information given in the text to construct meaning. Therefore, from most definitions given above, one can learn that reading is a complex and meaning making process wherein many skills are involved in.

Furthermore, reading refers to understanding of written texts. It is a complex activity that includes both perception and thought. Reading involves two related processes from which the above definitions evolve. These are word recognition and comprehension. Word recognition refers to the act of perceiving how written symbols correspond to one’s spoken language, whereas, comprehension implies the process of making sense of words, sentences and connected text. In the process of reading, readers typically make use of background knowledge, vocabulary, grammatical knowledge, experience with text and other strategies to help them understand a written text.

2.2. Nature of Reading

Basically, language skills are sub-divided into productive and receptive skills. These skills do have their own peculiar features that make them either similar or different. As a skill, reading is put under receptive skills. It has special features that make it different from its corresponding skill-listening. It is because, in most cases, reading bases itself on written text which is relatively
permanent. Listening, on the other hand, bases itself on spoken language which is volatile and temporary (Geoffrey et al, 1978).

It has just said before, reading is a complex skill. That is to say, it involves a series of lesser skills such as word recognition, background knowledge, world experience, and so on. When we think of reading, particularly, efficient reading in which various sub-skills are involved in- skills like literal comprehension, inferential reading, critical reading and the like. So, a reader needs to know such complex nature of reading to have a better understanding of what s/he reads (Geoffrey et al, 1978).

As receptive skill, reading helps a reader to access information from a writer who is physically absent. Indeed, it is both active and interactional process in which three entities are involved in-a reader, text, and writer. In this process, three of them do have roles to play. For instance, a reader decodes information, a writer encodes information and a text plays middling role (Nuttall, 1996).

By and large, good reading always requires analysis of text, evaluation of it, and generation of new ideas on the bases of what has been read and overall experiences. Readers shouldn’t restrict themselves only on a writer assumption and outlook; rather they should go further beyond what is explicitly stated and make their own effort to fill what is missed, try to correct what is wrongly stated based on their life experience and background knowledge etc. To perform all these, readers first recognize the nature of reading and what it requires from them.

2.3. Purpose of Reading

Reading has a great value for all readers. Good reading ability opens up new world and opportunities. It enables a reader to add new knowledge, enjoy literature, and do daily routines that are part and parcel of modern life, such as, reading the newspapers, job listings, instruction manuals, maps and so on (Milan, 1996).

Everyone needs to develop endless interest to reading. In Chinese culture, there is saying: “If you fail to read for two days, your speech becomes senseless!” This clearly marks how reading influences our daily matters and interaction. Besides, a person who reads much convinces when
he speaks, wins when he argues, agitates people for his motive, etc. Moreover reading has additional purpose. For instance, if a person wants to become a novelist, a poet, a politician and the like, s/he should have a big appetite for reading. Otherwise, s/he is just like a person in a battle-field who lacks bullet to fire on his enemy. All points raised above are to show that reading is significant in all walks of life. Moreover, a reader needs to develop purpose for his reading because it is purpose that guides him what he does how he does and the like.

It is believed that readers become advantageous if they read for all purposes. A reading activity takes place when a reader has an interest or purpose over what the reading material contains. For instance, a student may read his/her module in order to prepare for an examination. Their reading comprehension may not be improved only by classroom reading exercises. But by having clear purpose, learners should read different texts in different places and improve their reading performances. Learners, therefore, should be encouraged to know the purpose of their reading activity. And their reading strategies should also vary according to the purpose (Nuttall, 1996).

Grellet (1981, as cited in Sisay, 2009) states that the purpose of reading has direct relation with the strategy employed. He said that understanding a written text means extracting the required information from it as efficiently as possible. For example, one apply different reading strategies when looking at a notice board to see if there is an advertisement for a particular matter and when carefully reading an article of special interest in a scientific journal(Sisay,2009).

When we come to the reading classroom, it is vital and wise to embrace the purpose of reading comprehension. In schools reading has academic purpose that is to help students learning by reading further texts, and to broaden their knowledge in their subject areas. Therefore, in teaching/learning of reading, both parties are advantageous when they clearly know their purpose of reading comprehension.

2.4. Theory of Reading

Every field of studies is founded on theories. Language teaching in general teaching reading in particular built on different theories. The theory that highly influencing the teaching and learning of reading is schema theory; it will be discussed briefly as follows:
2.4.1. Schema Theory

The study of second language has shown a rapid change due to fast growth of scientific research and investigation. In the field, countless studies have been carried out at different time by different researchers. Among the research findings which contribute much to the development of teaching reading is the theory of schema. This theory has brought significant change in the teaching learning process of reading.

To begin with, the term schema (plural schemata) is taken from Greek which means abstract mind structure. It is abstract because it does not relate to any particular experience; however, it is derived from all particulars that all we have had (McDonough and Shaw, 1993). Hedge (2000) defines it as a mental representation of a typical situation used to process a discourse and to predict the content of particular text. Furthermore, Reuthel and Cooter (1999) also define schema as a kind of file cabinet of information containing related concepts, events, and emotion. Different interrelated schema form an individual’s vast interconnected network of knowledge and experiences and come together to form concept. The size and content of each schema is influenced by past opportunities to learn (McDonough and Shaw1993; Nuttall, 1996; Reuthel and Cooter, 1999).

Schema theory suggests that what we know about a topic or construct influences how much we can or will learn by reading a passage that addresses that topic (Anderson & Pearson, 1984). Thus, our knowledge and experiences related to key ideas in the text we read influence what we learn and remember about what we read; world knowledge and word meaning also influence our understanding. The more we read and learn about the topic, the easier the next passage on that topic will be for us to understand (Janette et al, 2007).

It is the theory of knowledge, and its representation in the mind. The representation facilitates the use of knowledge in various ways. According to the theory, all knowledge is packaged in to units called schemata, and embedded in to the units of knowledge, and utilized. The way texts get interpreted directly or indirectly depends on the schemata activated by the text. Weather we successfully interpret a text or not depend on the schemata activated by the text and the schemata we share with the writer. If we share similar schemata, our interpretation becomes effective; unless the reverse is true. This is because, reading makes use of schema at the same time modifies it. Thus,
schema is built up from experiences including those derived from reading. Hence, it keeps on growing and changing throughout our lives (McDonough and Shaw, 1993 Nuttall, 1996).

Every schema is a device for representing knowledge of concept; along with specifications for relating it to an appropriate network of connections that hold all components of particular concept. Individuals acquire schema through their experiences of the real world. When individuals become more and more experienced, they refine, reshape, correct, and restructure their schema (Nuttall, 1996). The instruction of reading comprehension has been profoundly influenced by schemata theory which explains how people store information in their minds and how they already know helps them to gain new knowledge etc. Scholars such as Reuthel and Cooter (1996) suggested that most students face reading comprehension problems due to four schema related difficulties. They are: learners lack the needed schema to comprehend specific topic; learners may have suitable schema for a topic but authors may fail to provide them enough schema; readers could select and use permanently one schema or interpretation while reading which couldn’t helps them to construct meaning out of the text they deal with.

After all, to construct meaning, readers need to have two kinds of knowledge. They are linguistic and schematic knowledge. Linguistic knowledge includes morphological and syntactic knowledge whereas schematic knowledge embraces general knowledge such as socio-cultural knowledge; topic knowledge, and genre knowledge (Hedge, 2000). It is useful to reflect different process in reading but what the reader bears in his mind is that the two processes are in constant interplay where a reader makes shift of focus between them. This also ascertains that reading is an interactional process wherein language knowledge and schematic knowledge are in constant interaction. One can make an effective and efficient reading if and only if he uses an interactive approach. In general, EFL and ESL classrooms currently practice the teaching of reading with the assumption that readers need help on both linguistic and schematic knowledge to practice interactive reading. So, teaching methodology of reading should pay attention to both aspects (Hedge, 2000; Nuttall, 1996; Reuthel and Cooter, 1996)
2.4.1.1. Teaching Implication of Schema Theory

Schema theory has given scholars a power to give explanations about how readers comprehend a text. The discovery contributes much to students if a teacher clearly understands the instructional implication that comes out of schema theory. There are three schema related issues that need focus in teaching reading. They are: accretion, tuning, and restructuring (Reuther and Cooter, 1996)

Accretion refers to the learning of new information and adding it to the existing schema. For instance, students learn contributing factors of global warming such as emission of carbon to the atmosphere. This information then added to the global warming. Tuning, on the other hand, involves in modification of an existing schema to fit new information. So, the schema may be tuned to the point that students can begin to understand a large class of concepts or events. For example, how global warming affect sea animals. Finally, restructuring relates to the idea that creating new schema from old. For instance, global warming schema may be used to create a schema of desertification.

In conclusion, these three schemas related issue suggest several implications for teaching: First, teachers should make assessment of students’ background, to provide them meaningful learning. Second, a teacher should help students in choosing and use appropriate schema as they read the text at hand. Third, if a teacher finds some students lack necessary schema, he should build the necessary schema or background before he asks students to read. Finally, if the teacher discovers that students have fairly complete understanding of concept, then reading may be assigned with relatively brief background of the text and/or by building some discussions and so forth.

2.5. Approaches to Reading

In the world of teaching reading, there are three approaches - top-down, bottom-up and interactive. The two early models- bottom-up and top-down- emerged from the reading researches of English as a first language and introduced in ESL classes. These two models highly influenced the conceptualization of English as a second and foreign language and dominate the teaching process of reading until 1970 (Razi, 2004). It is in the year between 1970 and 1980 an interactive approach has been introduced in ESL and EFL classroom. It is an intermediary view which brings good insights from the early two models of reading (Cohen and Macaro, 2007; Nuttall, 1996).
2.5.1. Bottom-up Approach

This reading model underlines that reading is the process whereby the reader relies on the visual information. By which the reader gather information and construct some meaning out of it. Hence, readers utilize analytical strategies in meaning processing. It is, sometime, called traditional model of reading. In which, comprehension begins with the massage received from the text. The traditional, bottom-up, reading approach was highly influenced by behaviorist theory of learning of the 1950s, which claimed that learning was based upon habit formation through repeated exposure and association of a stimulus with a response. It means that readers only obtain information from the stimulus but not add their own. This model emphasizes on unidirectional processing of information that adheres to form part to whole processing of meaning. The model undermines contribution of the reader who has enough world knowledge, contextual information, and higher order of information processing strategies and the like. This model of reading signifies that reading is driven by the process that results in meaning. It means, in other words, reading is driven by text which proceeds from part to whole (Cohen and Macaro, 2007; Razi, 2004; Richards and Rogers, 2001).

According to this approach a reader is expected to extract meaning out from what is printed on the pages through recognition of letters and words, working out sentence structure. It is consciously utilized when an initial reading leaves reader in confusion; when the reader schematic knowledge is inadequate; and when a writer point of view is different from the point view of the reader (McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

Harmer (2001) and Nuttall (1996) give vivid explanation to this approach metaphorically. They said that reader who uses bottom up approach is just like a scientist who has magnifying glass to examine/see something slowly and carefully. It is contrary to eagle observation wherein the coverage is limited to specific place. In which, high emphasis is given to a written text; the identification of letters, words, sentences, and paragraph is followed; and information processing is taken place at text-level. Hence, it advocates reading as it is driven by the process that results in meaning; as it proceeds from part to whole.
2.5.2. Top-down Approach

Top-down process involves making of meaning by further doing on the text. The approach is holistic in nature. In such reading process, to make meaning, a reader relies on non-visual information such as his world experience, background knowledge, and schema. This model is highly influenced by cognitive theory of learning because it views reading as an active mental process where the reader is consciously involved in making meaning using different strategies like prediction, taking large chunks of text at a time and matching it with his background knowledge etc. It is extremely driven by goals and expectation of reader. So, we can call this reading process as an active because reader actively involves in meaning processing. This approach emphasizes on the input reader brings to a text from their experience and background knowledge, and interprets it based on prior knowledge they have (McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

In the same way, Harmer (2001) and Nuttall (1996) describe this approach metaphorically by saying that the reader who uses this approach takes a look at the text with an eagle’s eyes view. As the eagle views things from great height and differentiate them; it is capable of seeing a wide area spread out below; and it understands the nature of the whole land better than the observer on the ground; reader who uses this approach understands a text on hand better by looking roughly at textual and none textual information than looking at every word and sentence. Thus, we can say that a reader who uses top-down approach concedes a text as a whole and relates it to his own background knowledge and experiences.

2.5.3. Interactive Approach

This approach is designed to fill the gap between the two models of reading. It avoids criticism against each model since it takes the valid insights from both views. It brings together the most strong sides from the two models and makes one unified approach. With regard to this, Anderson (1999 cited in Razi, 2004, P.3) stated that criticism against bottom-up and top-down models led the scholars to develop a new approach i.e. the interactive approach. This model combines important elements of bottom-up and top-down models. In which a reader needs to be fast in order to recognize the letters and skim a text for the main idea (Razi, 2004).
In stated approach a reader is required to make use of both reading strategies concurrently to come across full meaning. The approach encourages the reader to construct meaning from his own reading by selective use of information from all sources such as graphic, phonemic, morphemic, syntactic, semantics, Bottom up. And he can make use of all level of meaning processing techniques such as prediction, inference, association with personal experience, top-down, to achieve the overall meaning (Hedge, 2000; McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

In the interactive model of reading, reader uses print as input and meaning as an output. At the same time they provide input to the text. This kind of reading is viewed as a perceptual process wherein reading is taken as dialogue between a text and reader that relies on schema. This approach is called interactive because in which both reader and writer interact actively. What is more, in this reading, a skilled reader uses all levels of processing such as syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and schematic information to accomplish tasks (Hedge, 2000; McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996;).

Some teachers often favor one approach over the other despite the criticism each approach faces. A lot of research findings show that both approaches have their own place in the process of effective reading. Indeed, the two preceding approaches tend to be compensatory. It means that if a learner is weaker in one, say in a top-down processing, he can compensate it using a bottom-up processing, and vice versa; hence, the two approaches influence one another. This gives a birth for interactive approach which creates level ground for both approaches to interact for better meaning processing. Because if bottom-up skills are ignored, there is the risk of misunderstanding the basic meaning from which top-down skills are built on. Conversely, if top-down skills are ignored, learners become passive readers, and do not develop the analytical skills which are important to effective reading. Thus, learner better uses the interactive approach which incorporates strategies from both models (Harmer, 2001; Hedge, 2000; McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996;).

To conclude, we have seen that bottom-up processing is a low level processing wherein focus is given to identifying words, phrases, and built up sentence structure to construct meaning. Unlike to this, top-down processing is a high level of processing that involves discerning meaning at the textual level using schemata and background knowledge to support comprehension. What is more, interactive processing of reading compromises the two models and creates level ground for both models and to ensure full comprehension. In which nothing will be missed because
whenever the reader lacks background knowledge to involve in the text, the model allows him to use words and sentence level processing to construct meaning. And again when he finds part of the text that can be understood if he links it to his personal experience, he can immediately shift his processing to the whole text level by involving his linguistic knowledge, world experience and common sense. Thus, this approach should be enhanced by teachers to be used by students in their reading practices whenever and wherever.

2.6. Techniques of Teaching and Learning Reading

Like any other instructional activities, the teaching of reading should chiefly base itself on a set of goals describing what the learning and instructional program is going to achieve. Traditionally, as it is mentioned in chapter one, the purpose of teaching reading in a language classroom has been aimed at helping students access to the literature written in the target language. This approach assumed that students learn to read a language by studying its vocabulary, grammar and sentence structure, and the like. At present time, however, the purpose of teaching reading goes beyond studying the structural organization of a text and its literal meaning comprehension. Rather, it focuses on comprehending implied meaning, interpreting, and evaluating the text etc. according to (Hedge, 2000; Macdonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

Now the focus is on how to make learners efficient reader. It is to mean that how to equip them with basic reading kits that could help them to obtain the information they need and to become competent in reading in its all aspect. For instance, Nuttall (1996, P. 31) said, “The main goal of teaching reading in EFL classroom is to enable students read without help unfamiliar authentic texts, at appropriate speed, silently and with adequate understanding.”

First, let us focus on in the following question before looking at experts’ suggestion on techniques of teaching and learning reading:

“Should learners read newspaper and text book uniformly? Why?”

Obviously, the answer is no. Because, in the process of teaching and learning reading, there is always one activity that comes before; it is setting purpose. Whenever a person has a plan to read any discourse s/he first set purposes in her/his mind, i.e. to get specific information, general idea or detail description of the text etc. In a classroom situation if the students unable to set purpose
for their reading, it is the responsibility of a teacher to set purpose for the reading lesson Nuttall (1996), unless all his effort becomes valueless because the reader who has no purpose for his reading is like a man who does not know his destination. So, readers need to know, it is purpose that guides them when and how to use the resource in their hand such as time and energy.

Depending on the depth and breadth of information needed by students, a teacher teaches them different techniques. Then students know, first, which technique is appropriate for particular information and then they adjust themselves for information they want to process. In terms of time and speed discharged, and the amount of information needed, reading can be divided as slow and quick reading. Slow reading, it means that when readers relatively spent slower speed and read the passage carefully and attentively to get detail information. This kind of reading sometimes called study reading or intensive reading. When readers are interested to know about the gist of the text, and when they seek to know specific information about something such as name of a place or a person; they should use quick reading. The two techniques of quick reading are known as skimming and scanning respectively. If students are able to use these techniques effectively, they save their time, energy and achieve their objectives (Inmon and Lenier, 1992; Nuttall, 1996).

The first requirement for effective reading is to know what a reader wants to obtain out of his/her reading. If the reader set purpose for his/her reading that he/she can judge his/her success or failure in accordance with how well and how fast he/she has made reading. In addition, the reader specifies what he/she wants to get out or his reading in advance that he/she can make his/her job easier (Nuttall, 1996). So, the primary activity of a reader is just to decide what he/she wants to obtain out of his/her reading.

Therefore, purpose is the most important driving force which moves reader forward to choose suitable way of reading. One can make use of different reading strategies and techniques to read a particular text; say for instance, a magazine. Depending on the purpose a reader has in his/her mind, he/she may read it differently, i.e. he/she may read the given journal to evaluate or judge its particular massage; to obtain specific information, to obtain main idea, to obtain detail information, to enjoy etc. As he/she reads, he/she adjusts his/her speed based on the purpose set in advance (Hedge, 2000; Inmon and Lenier, 1992; Nuttall, 1996).
2.6.1. Scanning

It can be defined as quick reading to find specific information from a text. For instance, a reader may wish to find particular data from a chapter of geography book (the length of Blue Nile) or where it is found but not interested to any other information. In such occasion he utilizes scanning. Another example of scanning is looking up the meaning of a new word in a dictionary (Hedge, 2000). When a person interest falls to find specific information, he uses scan-reading. Stapes that are commonly followed in scan reading include: first, keeping in mind its purpose, next, not to try to read word by word; and to work on the text as systematically as possible. One more example for such reading is reading a news paper article in which we rush quickly so as to obtain particular information. Thus, to make effective scanning learners first know how it can be done and then made it practical (Hedge, 2000; Macdonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

2.6.1.2. Skimming

Skimming can be defined as the act of quick reading to get the main idea of a text or to get an overall impression of the passage. In this reading activity what a reader usually does is reading quickly and selectively to come across to the intended meaning. When a reader wants to make skim-reading, he usually reads the title, sub-title, the first paragraph, the last paragraph and the first one or two sentences of each paragraph of the passage at hand. While doing this, a reader usually marks relevant idea by skipping over items that are not his/her interest etc. A good example for this reading is reading a news paper article to get the general picture of the editorial (Hedge, 2000). Such reading helps the reader to answer questions like: What is the text all about? What is the purpose of the author? For whom the writer addresses the article? Etc. So, learners need to know all these techniques of skimming to come up with meaningful skim reading (Harmer, 2001; Hedge, 2000; Macdonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

2.6.3. Intensive reading

Intensive reading is named differently by different scholars such as study reading, in depth reading, and reading between lines. Generally, this reading is viewed as reading for more careful treatment of a topic; i.e., reading for detailed information by which we make use of inference, drawing conclusion, and making judgments and so forth. The purpose of such reading is to
extract meaning by making a close look at on the text. Consequently, by which we make reading carefully and slowly to achieve the detail information of the text. This reading, in reading classroom, is typically concerned with texts not more than 500 words in length or not more than one page. The objective is to achieve full understanding of the logical argument, the rhetorical arrangement or pattern of the text, of its symbolic, emotional and social overtones; of the attitudes and purposes of the author, and the like. It is this text mostly used in language classroom to teach students different reading skills and strategies (Reuthel and Cooter, 1999).

There are important steps to be followed when we make intensive reading. These include: to read the text relatively with slower speed and higher attention, to read and interpret events, to read and understand cause and effect relationship to arrive at conclusion; to take out fuller meaning and ask oneself what the passage implies beyond what is simply said; examining the writer purpose, idea, attitudes by identifying the tone, mood, and intent of expression and so forth (Nuttall, 1996).

When it is seen in comparison to other techniques of reading, intensive reading is really meaningful, purposeful, and active. This reading strictly requires things like: analyzing coherence (the logical development of the text), reading to find whether a particular statement is true or false by getting evidence from a passage, reading for inference to make conclusions and judgments, working out the meaning of unfamiliar words from context and so on. What is more, in this reading if the idea is not clear, readers go forth and back to get detail information and understand the meaning (MacDounaph and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996). Furthermore, Nuttall puts what intensive reading involves in the following way:

i. **Literal comprehension**
   It refers to the ability to comprehend what is written in black and white and explicitly stated in the reading process

ii. **Interpretive comprehension**
   This level of reading requires higher thinking skill. It is meant that it requires a reader to enter deep in to the text beyond what is seen on the surface. This is achieved after the reader digests the content of the text. It is done by means of association of real life experience with things in print or with the imagination of the writer. Readers should
accept one fact; it is not always true what is experienced can help them in text interpretation because there are texts that deviate from normal circumstances and challenge their imagination; for example, scientific excerpt (Nuttall, 1996).

iii. Critical reading

By literal comprehension is meant that when the readers pay attention to surface information. Unlike to this, critical reading is a kind of reading activity whereby readers are expected to read the text and find out meaning by moving beyond its literal sense. What is more, critical reading is a kind of reading which involves attentive reading to obtain both explicit and implicit meaning of a text. This reading requires both literal comprehension as well as inference skills. The literal comprehension refers understanding of the surface meaning; whereas, inference refers to understanding of the implied meaning of the text (Nuttall, 1996; Inmon and Lenier, 1992). To make it visible, let us take a look at extract taken from Inmon & Lenier (1992):

...words can have interesting origin. Salt which is always been the most widely used seasoning in the world, was so important in Roman times that it was given monthly wages to the soldiers. It was called “salt money” or in Latin salarium. This is the reason that we use salary to mean money (Inmon and Lenier, 1992, P. 182).

The above excerpt can take reader centuries back to learn the value of salt during Roman time. It requires him to compare and contrast the current value of salt with Roman time through inference. This level of reading requires a reader to employ higher thinking skill. It is meant that it requires a reader to enter deep in to the text beyond what is seen on the surface. For instance, went back centuries and could see how Roman Solider used today’s salt to fulfill their basic need like food, cloth, shelter and so forth. This is achieved after the reader digests the content of the text and done it by means of association of real life experience with information in print or with the imagination of the writer. Furthermore, this reading process involves various interdependent acts of reading such as identifying, interpreting, evaluating views expressed by a writer etc.
iv. Evaluation

Among qualities of effective reader, evaluating what is read is a single factor. When a reader gets matured, he/she does not take for grant all what is read; rather he/she critically sees and identifies, first, facts from opinion and then passes his/her own decision. This activity makes a reader critical and saves him from hasty judgment. In fact, among reading activities, evaluation is the most challenging task because it requires: good linguistic knowledge, schematic knowledge, world experience including culture and social circumstances. So, every reader needs to develop this skill unless he faces problems because for him what is put in black and white is good source of information which might misleads him (Inmon and Lenier, 1992; Nuttall, 1996)

2.7. Extensive Reading

Scholars have never reached at consensus on the definition of extensive reading. Some define extensive reading from strategy point of view. As it is a reading process that takes place when a reader reads longer texts using skimming and scanning during class time. Others define it by taking in to account the quantity of materials covered; for instance, fifty books per year. The rest also define it from time point of view how much time is spent as a person reads. Furthermore, Purpose has also been used to define extensive reading i.e. it is a reading for pleasure (Hedge, 2000).

Despite controversy, extensive reading is viewed as a kind of reading that involves the reading of longer texts, chiefly for pleasure or entertainment and for general meaning. That can be done frequently either in the classroom or outside the classroom. It is an approach to the second language teaching and learning in which learners exposed to great deal of reading of different reading materials written in the target language, which intern improves their overall performances of reading and their linguistics competence as well (Nuttall, 1996; Hedge, 2000).

2.7.1. Characteristics of Extensive Reading

Extensive reading has many features as mentioned before such as to read texts as much as possible in and outside of the classroom, wide range of texts are presented to give a lot of option for a reader and to maintain his/her interest; encourage students in different ways for different
purposes; students can also choose what interest them to read and stop their reading whenever they get bored of. The purpose of such reading can be for pleasure, information, and general understanding; in such reading there is no follow up exercise. In which the teacher serves as a role model and share his/her reading experience the books and articles he/she likes etc (Nuttall, 1996; Hedge, 2000).

Generally, secondary and tertiary level students need to read too much because the best way to learn foreign language is to read extensively. So, they should first be equipped with efficient reading skills that can help them to meet their objectives and then begin this reading program at list for some minutes on daily bases and see the change. Teacher, in their part, should help inexpert readers to engage in this reading activity.

2.8. Knowledge of Vocabulary in Reading

It is possible to describe metaphorically the relationship of words and reading text. If a reading text is the heart, definitely, words are its blood line because words are the building blocks of a text; hence they are inseparable. In order to read and comprehend a passage, it is pertinent to have good word knowledge; unless it is too difficult to meet the goal of reading. Many studies have shown that good readers have good word power. In order to understand a text, readers need to know the meanings of words that make them understand a text by assembling and making sense of the words in context as it is held in the extract (Hiebert and Kamil, 2005).

Word knowledge has strong link with reading performance. For one thing, students who have less word power lack good speed. For the other, they lack good comprehension skill. To make learner effective in reading, it is the responsibility of a teacher to equip students with effective word attack skills because students meaning processing skills mostly rely on their word power. If not, all efforts made by both parties become meaningless because comprehension is directly affected by poor word knowledge (McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996; Harmer, 2000).

To equip learners with lifelong reading skills, vocabulary should be taught directly and indirectly. Direct instruction includes giving word definitions and pre-teaching of some technical words before reading takes place. With regard to this, Nuttall (1996) said that teacher needs to
teach some key words before they take their students in the actual reading. Indirect methods refer to incidental vocabulary learning, e.g. mentioning, extensive reading and exposure to language-rich contexts etc. (Harmer, 2000). So, students should be supported by these methods.

Moreover, what we commonly know about teaching vocabulary is teaching words in isolation which does not as such help comprehension because the possible meaning of a word is found in context rather than in isolation. With regard to this Ur (1996, as cited in McDonough and Shaw 1993) advocates that words have to be taught through collocation, guessing from context etc. Students should also learn the connotation and denotation meaning of words; unless, they may face confusion when they read. McDonough and Shaw (1993) further explain that the word ‘dog’ can be given divergent meaning; some may give the meaning of domestic carnivore animal; others take it as loyal animal; the rest may associate it with meaning like dirty and inferior etc. Furthermore, areas to be seen in vocabulary teaching include: synonyms-words which have the same meaning. Antonyms-words which have opposite meaning; super ordinates-words used to express general concept to cover specific items. Therefore, teachers need to teach all the above aspects of word attack skills including component parts of words-prefixes, suffixes etc. (Inmon and Lenier, 1992; McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

2.9. The Three Phases of Reading

As it has been stated, traditionally, the teaching of reading has often involved little more than assigning comprehension questions to the students and requiring them to answer those questions. This shows that a reader uses the comprehension questions not to enhance their interaction with the text but to limit their scope to the questions offered. In a classroom situation, for example, many readers start with question and use its wording to search for answer from a text. The task is not reading but answering the questions. In such reading, success is defined by getting how many answers to the questions given but not how deep a reader understand the text he/she reads (Geoffrey et al, 1978; Alyousef, 2006).

Citing McDonough (1995) Sisay (2009) states that reading comprehension is very broad and complex process wherein students passes through different stages-pre-, while-, and post-reading stages to achieve meaning processing. Through each stage readers perform different activities
that ensure their understanding. Likewise, teacher performs various activities as he takes students through the phases (Sisay, 2009). Many research findings, how good readers understand and learn from a text suggest that they use a set of highly complex and well-developed skills and Strategies before, during, and after reading that assist them to understand and remember what they read (McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

2.9.1. Pre-reading Phase
Consistent with the nature of the reading skills and the possible procedures suggested before, the pre-reading phase might be devoted to a number of things aimed at introducing the reading text and developing a framework for reading. It also intends to build and activate students’ prior knowledge (schematic knowledge) about the topics, concepts, issues, and vocabulary contained in the text to be read (Hedge, 2000). According to Nuttall (1996) before students begin to read a text, a teacher do many activities to make their task more explicit and their way of tackling it more effective. Hence, reading tasks and reading instruction are quite sensitive to the types of prior knowledge that the reader brings in his reading to comprehend a text. Therefore, teacher needs to plan and work properly in the following areas to make sure students better reading comprehension.

2.9.1.1 Activating and Increasing Students Prior Knowledge
Prior knowledge of the text to be read facilitates comprehension. As foresaid, there are some aspects of prior knowledge that include: knowledge of the world, cultural knowledge, subject-matter knowledge, and linguistic knowledge. Besides this, a reader’s interest in a subject matter will also influence the level of prior knowledge. All of these factors are important to different degrees, depending on a reading text as well as a task given. To this end, a teacher should do activities like pre-discussion of the topic, questioning, using visual aids, telling them issues related to the topic to activate readers’ prior knowledge (Macdonough and Show, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

In the classroom situation, a teacher can focus on words and concepts that may be unfamiliar to the students. Discussing the new words and concepts that exist in the text to be read with the students before putting them in the actual reading helps to activate their prior knowledge. Furthermore, asking students to tell everything they know about a topic is a useful way of
beginning to get them with activated prior knowledge. Hence, they should, then, begin to think what they don’t know about the topic (Razi, 2004).

2.9.1.2. Pre-teaching some key words

One of the duties of a teacher during pre-reading stage is helping to develop linguistic knowledge of the students. Whenever teachers find the presence of technical terms in the passage, they should first teach those unfamiliar words unless comprehension is affected. Nuttall (1996) said that learners are well aware of the potential problems in reading is lack of enough vocabulary so that they welcome as they thought. Therefore, teacher should pre-teach some key words to enhance students’ comprehension ability. Besides, teachers should encourage them to use contextual guessing as they read to come across the meaning of some unfamiliar words.

2.9.2. While-reading Phase

Nuttall (1996) stated that the principal goal of while reading phase is practicing skills and strategies such as skimming, scanning, guessing meaning from context. In addition, in this stage searching answers for the questions set before the actual reading, linking background knowledge with information on the text, guessing the meaning of unfamiliar words and the like. At the same time, a teacher involves in helping students to understand the author’s purpose, the content and structure of the text etc. Besides, Hedge (2000) goes on suggesting that this phase keeps learners to be active, flexible and reflective readers. Furthermore, he added that students read following the order of ideas in the text they react to opinions expressed in the text, understand information, ask them and predict the next part of the text etc.

As this reading stage falls next to pre-reading and after students have done none-text related activity, activity done based on schema, they engage in the actual practice of reading through which they read to meet their purpose and to grasp the needed information. In the process, they should monitor their understanding by doing activities like: making notes about the concepts, answering questions that they formulate during pre-reading time; changing strategies; for instance, scanning and/ or skimming, re-reading where the concept is vague or complex; Guessing unfamiliar words in context and examine their appropriateness etc (Nuttall, 1996; Hedge, 2000).
2.9.3. Post-reading Phase

In this phase students are required to comprehend the overall passage they read. This reading phase aimed at involving students in evaluation of their understanding through reviewing or summarizing the text, oral discussion, and the like. In the stage, students working on bottom-up concerns such as grammar, vocabulary and discourse features and relate what they have read with their own knowledge, experience and opinions, top-down. They further integrate what they have read or know with real world in order to extend their thinking ability. Moreover, talking, debating/role playing and writing in response to reading, students become more engaged in reading and develop a deeper understanding and appreciation (Hedge, 2000; Nuttall, 1996).

Furthermore, in this stage, students are encouraged to reflect up on what they have read and what they have taken out from the text they read. This can be achieved mostly in group discussion. At the same time, they are encouraged to go beyond what is put in black and white so as to construct meaning and associate with real life situation. Certainly, they involve in the activity of answering questions, summarizing the whole text in one’s own words, possibly drawing conclusion and/or applying information to a new situation (Geoffrey et al, 1978; Klinger et al, 2007).

2.10. Teachers Roles Vs Learners Roles in the Reading Classroom

As mentioned before, a reading session is divided in phases- pre-, while- and post-reading phases. In these three stages, both students and teachers play their own role. In each phase, for instance, during pre-reading phase, teacher asks student to come together and discuss the pre-reading activity so that students discuss; then in while reading stage teacher encourage students to skim and scan the passage etc. Similarly, students perform different activities which are expected of them to perform such as setting purpose, pre-reading discussion and the like. In the succeeding sub-topics we will see briefly what is expected from both.

2.10.1 The Role of Teachers

In the academic reading session, the role of teachers is to take students through the process of learning in the three phases of reading. In fact, it is immensely complex. For one thing, reading is much of learnable than teachable. For the other, it concerns almost all academic and social aspects of the environment. More specifically, in reading classroom, teachers’ have great
responsibilities to guide students towards effective reading practices to help them acquire the needed information and the reading skills as well. Hence, it is teachers themselves who must provide a model how a good reader behaves; what strategies he/she uses for different texts; and for different information. With respect to teaching reading in EFL classroom, Nuttall (1996) said that teachers play the role of facilitator, supporter, and organizer. Furthermore, Harmer (2001) point out:

In order to get students read enthusiastically in class, we need to work to create interest in the topic and task. However, there are further roles we need to adapt when asking students to read intensively. They are organizer, observer, feedback organizer and promoter (Harmer 2001, P.213).

Teaching reading comprehension passes through a three-step procedure: mentioning, practicing, and assessing thereby a teacher would mention the skills that he/she wanted students to use, then gives them opportunities to practice the skills through workbooks /modules or activity sheets. And finally assess whether or not they have successfully used the skills. With regard to this, Klinger et al (2007) indicate:

...students with learning difficulty can improve their reading comprehension if a teacher teaches them strategies that have been recognized as effective in promoting reading comprehension; or design instruction that incorporates effective principles of direct instruction and strategy instruction which provides guidance, feedback, and opportunities to practice across text types; monitor students’ progress and make adjustments accordingly (Klinger et al, 2007, P.117).

Therefore, as mentioned above, teachers should discharge the responsibility they shoulder in helping their students to meet their goals of learning reading in the class.

2.10.2 The Role of Students

In silent reading readers are expected to carry out different activity that is given from a teacher without expecting much support from him. Whenever they read, students should think their purpose; question the text which they are going to read, search answer for questions they set
during pre-reading phase; recall important events in the text so as to write the summary of the passage; prepare themselves for post reading discussion.

When reading is thought the main thing students need to know is how to question a text while they read. They should ask question like ‘what does the writer mean by this?’ I don’t comprehend the meaning of this word: what it matter?’ and thinking a loud about these and other questions (Nuttall, 1996). Many students have had no experience of reading as active process. So, it is relevant for teachers to show students how to question a text. More specifically, students should be supported how to carry out detective work. Hence, they always ask different questions; questions like: what to read? Why to read? How read? And so on. In addition, to sort out facts from opinions, they keep on asking specific questions using words like: what, where, when, who, how and way. Asking such questions help readers to discriminate facts from opinion at the same time help them to answer questions that they already posed during pre-reading stage.

After all, good readers always begin their reading by setting clear purpose and setting clear questions which help them to work carefully. Then, they go through the text to answer questions like: what does this piece of writing tells me? What happens? To whom it is written for? Why it happens and the like. These questions help them to comprehend the overall impression, to understand what the writer wants to convey; to associate what they obtain from the reading with their personal experience, to tackle any question which is raised from any direction etc (Klinger et al, 2007). Therefore, readers should practice these techniques throughout their reading.

2.11. Reading Speed and Flexibility

Reading comprehension and speed are two inseparable entities. Though which one of the two entities developed first is controversial, all scholars agreed that both are interdependent and indispensible. It means that students who read with faster speed comprehend what they read better than from students who read with slower speed. Reading involves the use of eyes and brain together. It is sometimes called psycholinguistic process. In order to read fast, you need to use more of your brain. Reading fast with comprehension means efficient reading. To achieve this, you need to read purposefully and interactively (Nuttall, 1996).
Students are not always expected to read every text with the same speed rather they need to read differently depending on the purpose they have in their mind and the time in their hand. So, they should develop flexible reading strategy which is governed by their reading purposes. Flexible reading is indispensable for all reading practices and doing it saves readers time, energy, and make them efficient readers as well. Good readers always make preliminary survey of what they are going to read, this will lead them to develop a series of questions about the subject they are going to study, they will then read, perhaps, partly scanning, partly skimming, and partly reading intensively to find the answers for the all questions set (Geoffrey et al, 1978).

In addition, scholars like Inmon and Lenier (1992) pointed out that there is scientifically accepted speed level which students need to develop and teacher can reinforce. They said that in order to use appropriate speed, the purpose that held in the mind of a readers determine a lot. For example, if a reader is looking for specific information, he/she has to apply scan-reading; by which he is expected to pick up from 250-800 words per minute. He can also apply skim-reading to grasp the main idea of the text. In this case s/he is expected to read the same (250-800 words) per minute; however, if he is studying for exam or other purpose, he uses study-reading; in this reading technique he can read a maximum of 250 words per minute. From this, one can learn that readers read a text flexibly on the basis of the purpose they have and the information they need to process (Inmon and Lenier, 1992; Nuttall, 1996).

Concerning this, Geoffrey and et al (1978) noted that efficient reading involves speed, flexibility and comprehension. Adding on this, Pugh (1978, as cited in Macdonough and Show, 1993) underlines that efficient readers should interact with various types of texts; choose appropriate reading strategies depending on the particular text at hand and information needed. They also added that those readers switch their styles of reading according to the type of text they read and the purpose they have. Therefore, it is much concern of a teacher to foster these skills among pupils. Fluent reading or efficient reading requires readers to use their eyes and mind together. So, readers also develop these reading strategies because it is pertinent for them to pursue their higher education where they are expected to read much (Geoffrey et al, 1978; MacDonough and Show, 1993).
2.12. Reading and Motivation

The benefit of motivation can be described better metaphorically in this way: to start on a car engine to go wherever we like, first, we make sure that the presence of enough fuel in the oil tank; otherwise, the engine never responds. Likewise, to find students engage in reading activities, we have to be certain of their motivational level; unless, all our effort becomes meaningless because students never respond in the teaching learning process like the car. Thus, it is wise to think of motivation more than one times before launching the daily lesson.

Many scholars ascertain that motivation is one of the key factors in all teaching learning process. It is also pertinent to the teaching of reading because reading is much depends on the learners’ interest. Therefore, to help learners engage in reading activity and achieve what the skill expects from them, they must be motivated. Expecting active involvement, good performance, and result without motivation is illusion. Research outputs also demonstrates that highly motivated students have conceptual orientation, involve their real-world experience, make meaningful choice, prefer interesting and thoughtful texts, need appropriate rewards, want evaluation in line with instructional processes, etc. In contrast, less motivated students found everything tiresome and boring (Harmer, 2001; Hedge, 2000; Inmon and Lanier, 1992; Nuttall, 1996).

Generally, to motivate students in reading classroom, what teachers need to do is: to orient students properly, to help them have better experience of the world, to guide them make meaningful choices; to assess their need and background knowledge and offer them suitable text; to direct them choose interesting texts, to offer them appropriate rewards, and evaluate them at the right time. Beside this, before a lesson of reading starts the teacher should tell them the objectives of the lesson, give them pre-reading tasks and/or oral questions, and tell them something about the author of the text to arise their interest etc. All these action in one way or another contribute to learner motivation (Hedge, 2000; McCarthy and Siccone, 2001; Nuttall, 1996)

2.13. Types of Reading Texts and Activities

Due to continuous and immense research findings in the world of teaching language in general and the teaching of reading in particular, there have been changes and improvements. Teaching
reading is undergoes in this change because what was accepted and proved yesterday as appropriate is now ignored and disproved. This event continues till the end of the world.

In the past, it was believed that there is no substitute to use contrived material to teach reading skills, particularly, in second and foreign language classes due to ease to use by both teachers and learners. Those materials are structure oriented and their purpose is just to teach structure in the name of teaching reading. These days, such outlook has no vacuum and it is highly challenged by scholars because the aim of teaching reading bases itself in preparing students for real language use and this can be achieved if and only if the students are exposed to real language use so that they should be exposed authentic materials (Harmer, 2001). In the following discussion we try to see briefly each.

2.13.1. Authentic Material

Harmer (1991) defines authentic materials as materials that are originally produced for native speakers and which are real and not developed for classroom purpose. Authentic materials are useful because they contain cultural aspects and show the students the real sample of language as used by native speakers. If our goal of teaching reading is to prepare learners for independent language use, then surely we are obliged at some stage to present them with realistic models of discourse; it is authentic text.

Many research findings depicts that authentic materials have a motivating effect. They are also viewed as materials that can bridge the gap between the classroom and the real world language use. In addition to their motivating value, authentic materials give learners a sense of achievement and encouragement. They inspire learners for further reading. When learners get out of the classroom situation, they confront with the real world and need to use the language that is what the community uses. So, a teacher has to prepare learners for the actual use of the language which can be accomplished by using authentic materials (MacDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996; Harmer, 2001; Hedge, 2000).

These days it is highly recommended to use authentic materials in the reading classroom. It is due to the philosophy of teaching reading for different level students underline that students should be familiar with actual use of language. Hence, one of the objectives of teaching reading of students is just to help them access to information written in the target language. Texts are
written for different purposes and students should read and understand them. For instance, an article on global warming is presented on some journal which is written in the natural language that native speaker uses. So, such text has to be read and its information must be shared. This can be possible if the second language learners are capable of reading and understanding what is written for native speakers of the language if not meaningless. The aim of reading session is to equip learner with this ability. So, teacher should support their students and lift them up to this level (Harmer, 2001; Langan, 2002; MacDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

It is said that authentic materials are quite helpful for teaching language so a teacher needs to know the Criteria used to choose authentic materials. Different scholars suggest their own views for choosing authentic materials. For instance, Nuttall (1996, P.170) suggests criteria such as suitability, exploitability, and readability must be taken in to consideration to adapt authentic material in reading classroom. Harmer (2001) in his part suggested three things to be considered to adapt authentic materials such as linguistic background, conceptual background and cultural background. Moreover, characteristics such as quality, appropriateness, and naturalness of the language must be considered.

Even if authentic materials are very useful the attention they get in ESL reading classroom is quite insufficient. Supporting this MacDonough and Show (1993) said that in EFL classes those materials are very little or none. Instead they contain many examples of texts which they called them traditional type of texts such as narrative and descriptive which do not go with students need. Furthermore, they added that EFL learners read a text: to obtain information for some purpose such as to obtain instruction on how to perform some task; to keep in touch with friends; to know when and where some thing is taken place; to know what is happening or has happened; for enjoyment etc. so the texts that should be brought to language classroom must be from these areas in order to meet students’ need. In contrast texts that are used in reading classroom are not these types (MacDonough and Show, 1993, P. 91).

2.13.2. Contrived Materials

Contrived materials are materials sometimes called artificial materials because they are developed only for teaching learning process. These days these materials are taken as less useful because they do not represent what is truly used in the real world. But still they are used to teach reading for
lower level students. However, Harmer (2001) argued that simplified texts are useful as compared to authentic texts because, he said, they are easy to use with second language students because their language ability is limited at a specific level. He further argued that simplified texts can reinforce vocabulary and grammar and prepare learners for reading authentic texts so that they should be equally used. Such constructed materials are advantageous because they use more familiar structures and words. These are more appropriate when a new grammatical structure is introduced or reinforced (Harmer, 2001).

2.14. Assessment and Feedback in Reading Classroom

As Nuttall (1996) said, reading is essentially taken as a private activity. However, it remains the fact that, it is thought in the classroom with much support of a teacher. If it is teachable, in turn, the act of teaching requires a teacher to conduct some kind of assessment to see the changes come through his effort and pass his/her own decision on students’ overall achievement. It includes their success or failure. So, it is quite significant to assess learners’ performance and give them appropriate feedback (McDonough and Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

There are two forms of reading assessment. The first is to find out how well students are reading in order to help them improve their practice; it is diagnosis type of text. This assessment is about giving feedback and assistance to learners reading performance. The second assessment is to measure how much progress has been made, it is assessment of decision. Both forms of assessment are needed for effective reading instruction. In the first reading, assessment is normally done by listening to students reading aloud, in this way, a teacher may assess readers’ word recognition and fluency. But beyond this stage, assessment should focus primarily on text comprehension and meaning construction (Heaton, 1988; McDonough and Shaw, 1993).

Indeed, text comprehension is usually assessed through questions. Usually, assessment questions should focus on main ideas and viewpoints, not minor details. These are called higher order questions. Methods of assessment vary with the types of responses students make to the questions. The students’ responses can be spoken or written. Written responses can be in the form of a multiple choice, short answers or extended pieces of writing and the like. Materials used for assessing reading should preferably be authentic. They should reflect the type of reading that
normally encountered in daily life (Klinger et al. 2007). Thus, teachers need to employ assessment and offer feedback to the students during reading instruction. Concerning this, Williams (2000, as cited in Klinger et al., 2007) point out:

Reading comprehension measures should help teachers monitor the comprehension of their students over time and provide information that is useful in designing reading comprehension intervention programs. Teachers can ask themselves (Klinger et al. 2007, P.33).
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The main objective of this study is to examine first year college students’ reading practices. To conduct this study, descriptive survey method with both qualitative and quantitative design was found appropriate. Tayie, (2005, P.50) states, “A descriptive survey attempts to picture or document current conditions or attitudes, that is, what exists at the time.” The researcher conducted this study so as to describe the existing phenomena, i.e. learning behavior (learning of reading) of the students. So, descriptive survey was found relevant. For one thing, it is an appropriate research method to address the researcher objectives. It is also the easiest method to reach a large number of populations. This, in turn, makes the generalisability of the study plausible. Citing Brown (2001) McKay states, “language surveys are any study that gathers data on the characteristics and views of respondents on the nature of language or language learning through oral interviews or written questionnaire.” (McKay, 2006, P.35).

3.2. Sampling

The researcher used two sampling techniques namely random probability sampling and a non-probability sampling called purposive sampling. Simple random sampling technique was used to select the needed sample size of student participant. The logic behind using this technique for selection was to give equal chance for the whole population to be selected with no bias. Hence, it helped to make generalization of the results obtained to the whole population.

Unlike to this, the researcher used a purposive sampling to select teacher population. The reason to use the given sampling technique for teacher respondents was; for one thing, the researcher wants the views of those teachers in order to answer his research question; for the other, the researcher wanted the responses of the teachers to triangulate the response obtained from students.

3.2.1. Setting

The study was carried out at Bonga College of Teachers Education which is located in Kaffa Zone Bonga town. Bonga is the Zonal city of Kaffa and located 110 km away from Jimma City to the
South direction. In the collage, there are two streams: Natural Sciences and Social Science streams. The study was carried out on Natural Science Stream which consists of six departments such as Biology, Chemistry, Math, Math and Natural Science Cluster, Physics, and Health and Physical Education departments.

3.2.2. Subjects of the study

The primary subject of this study was first year Natural Science Students of BCTE. In addition, to get more insight on the issue and to make the study more complete, the researcher included the views of teachers who have offered the course, Communicative English Skills-I. The participants, particularly, the students were selected on the basis of random probability sampling technique; whereas, all the teachers who offered the course were taken. First, the researcher met the department head and asked him about students who have taken the course in the semester. After obtaining information from him, he went to registrar to take students list and confirmed the total number of students who have taken the course. They are totally 208 (100%) out of which 104 (50 %) samples were taken. To take the needed sample size, he casted lots to decide either even or odd number would be taken. Finally, odd numbers were taken for the study. In addition, available sampling technique was used for teachers; as a result, four (4) instructors who have offered the stated course for the given stream students were taken.

3.1. Bio-data of the Participant Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Experience of Teaching</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.A/B.Ed</td>
<td>M.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Instruments

In this study, two instruments of data collection were used. They were questionnaires and classroom observation. The procedures followed in each instrument will be explained as follows.
3.3.1. Questionnaires

The main data gathering instrument used for this study was student’s and teacher’s questionnaire. Students’ questionnaire was mainly aimed at gathering information about students learning behavior i.e. how they practice reading in the classroom and how they were supported by their teacher in the session.

For student respondents, close-ended items were presented. It is because it does not consume much of their time as it is easily answered. So, students can fill all the items without getting bored of and the researcher can get reliable data. At the same time, such items are suitable for analysis as the subjects provide specific response to the question asked.

In comparison to interview and observation, questionnaire is mostly preferred by respondents for it maintains anonymity. As Seliger and Shohamy (1989) state, respondents usually don’t mind the process of filling in questionnaire and the survey method; as it gives them anonymity and complete freedom. The researcher was fully convinced by this justification and used this tool to collect data from teachers too. This is done to reduce anxiety of subject teachers who are his former colleagues and for fear that they may misinform him feeling that the investigation will uncover their individual practices. In addition, the researcher preferred to use open-ended questions to the teacher respondents since such items are very useful as they give full freedom to the participants to express whatever they feel with no limitation and even it may cause the respondent to offer an answer that may not be expected by the researcher but still important Mackay (2006). The total numbers of the items are 12 (see Appendix C)

As mentioned before, the researcher used close-ended items for student respondents. It was initially prepared in English; then it was translated into Amharic for they can better understand the main concept of the items in Amharic than in English. So, students couldn’t misinform the researcher because of language barrier. The total number of items in the students’ questionnaire ware 16 out of which 15 of them were close-ended and the remaining one (1) was open-ended question (see Appendix A). The close-ended items are preferred in order to reduce students’ confusion while filling out the questionnaire. Before distributing the questionnaire, the sample students were advised to carefully read the questions first and ask for further explanation on points they might not be clear
with. Consequently, some students asked for clarification on certain items as they filled out the questionnaire.

3.3.2. Observation
An observation checklist was designed on the basis of literature review and used during observation time. In the checklist activities that have to be performed in the three phases of reading: pre-reading, while-reading, and post-reading phases were included (Appendix D). When a classroom teaching learning process was in progress the researcher observed and checked performances against the prepared checklist to see how the learning reading process takes place. The data obtained through this instrument was used to crosscheck the information obtained from questionnaire.

3.4. Data Gathering Procedures
For this study, the following procedures were implemented. First, the instruments were piloted before they were made ready for actual use. The reason for piloting instruments was to check the content validity and clarity of items. That is why Mackay (2006, P.41) said, “The value of a survey is increased by piloting the instrument.” Second, classroom observations were conducted for two consecutive reading periods in each selected classroom for two weeks time using observation checklist. During the time, the actual classroom activities of students and teachers were recorded on the checklist. Third, with the help of teachers who have offered the course, questionnaire was administered for students. Finally, the researcher offered questionnaire for teachers themselves to fill it out.

3.5. Data Organization and Discussion
Date obtained from students’ questionnaire were tallied, tabulated and analyzed quantitatively through description and by applying simple statistical method, percentages. Whereas, information gathered from teachers through open-ended questionnaire was analyzed qualitatively and discussed through description. This data was used to crosscheck response provided by students in their actual practices. Furthermore, information obtained from classroom observation was analyzed qualitatively to triangulate data obtained from both teachers and students participants. Finally, data gained from all instruments were thematically organized, discussed and interpreted.
UNIT FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULT

4.1. Introduction

In this section the data derived from questionnaires and observation will be presented. Issues presented in the instruments were almost similar. It was done for triangulation purpose. The chapter also analyzes, interprets and discusses the data obtained through the aforementioned instruments using descriptive statistics wherein quantitative data is presented using simple statistical method namely percentage and qualitative data is thematically discussed respectively. The discussion will also elaborate the major findings of the study and draw conclusion out of it.

Table 4.1. Students’ response concerning Approaches to reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>scale</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I read a passage I follow the steps of identification of letters, words, and sentences to make meaning.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.1 above, one can easily see that the majority of the respondents, 61.53% of them replied that they strongly agree with the statement and hence they often follow the steps of identification of letters, words and sentences to construct meaning out of their reading. Likewise, 17.3% of the population replied that they agree to the statement and hence they practice the stated steps to comprehend what they read. It is only the minority, 11.53% replied that they strongly disagree with the statement. The remaining, 9.6% of the respondents replied that they disagree with the statement. Therefore, from information presented in Table 4.2 the researcher learnt that most students depend on bottom-up processing as they practice reading to construct meaning.
With regard to this, response given by teachers to the question asked which reading approach their students prefer to use, the following result is obtained. Teacher “A” said, “As I observed them, most students usually read word by word. So, I can say that they use bottom-up approach.” Likewise, teacher “B” replied, “students reading speed is very slow. They usually focus on word meaning instead of focusing the overall idea of the passage they read. Hence, they use bottom-up processing” Teacher “C”, on his part, stated that he is not quite sure about the approach his students use but he said, “Their reading process is slow and their compression is not satisfactory.” The other teacher, teacher “D” replied that most of his students do not involve actively in pre-reading discussion which require their former reading experience and background knowledge; so their reading process is bottom-up. In addition, during classroom observation time students were observed as they were straggling to construct meaning at word and sentence levels. Thus, the data derived from all instruments revealed that most students use bottom-up approach.

**Table 4.2. Prediction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>scale</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before I start reading, I like to discuss the content of the passage</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by focusing on topics and sub-topics of the passage.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.2 one can see that 33.65 % of the respondents replied that they strongly disagree with the statement; hence, they couldn't exercise prediction of what the passage all about by focusing on the topics and sub-topics in their discussion. Significant number of respondents, 30.8%, also replied that they disagree with the premise; so they couldn’t predict the content of the text by looking at the title and other relevant clues of the text. In reaction to the question, 15.3 % of the respondents answered that they strongly agree with the statement which implies they predict the text. Likewise 20.2% of respondents replied that they agree with assertion. From the total population, 63.45% of them offered answer that shows they can’t predict what the text all about prior to their reading.
Therefore, from the data obtained, it is possible to deduce that most students do not practice top-down processing when they read a passage.

To cross check students' replay, teachers were asked a question; which says what reading approach students' use as they read a passage. As a result, the following responses are obtained. Teacher “A’s” reply showed that they don't use top-down approach since they read word by word. Similarly, teacher “B’s” reply showed that they do not use top-down processing because they unable to employ reading strategies, for instance, inference. Teacher “C’s” reply indicated that they use slow and word by word reading; hence, it is bottom up processing. Teacher “D’s” reply is almost similar to the former respondents. His reply marked that students do not use the stated processing as it requires their schematic knowledge. However, he doesn’t favor it to be used by the students because they are expected to read much so as to cope with academic challenges. As an alternative, for the given level students, teacher “B” and “D” suggested that it is better for students to employ their experience and background knowledge as they read a passage.

Furthermore, the data obtained from classroom observation revealed that they can't utilize top-down processing in their reading process. During the time, teacher “B” asked students a question on the reading topic hopping that to tell him what they expect to learn from the reading passage “population”. For which few students reacted but they were off the point. With regard to this, Sissy citing Wallace stated that L₂ readers have attended more to bottom-up processing than L₁ readers since their restricted linguistic ability will make it more difficult for them to construct meanings out of top-down processing (Sissy, 2009). From the information obtained, the researcher understood that most students do not use top-down processing in their reading.

### Table 4.3. Use of prior knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to construct meaning from a reading passage, I depend on not only information given in the text but also in my background knowledge and personal experience</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 4.3 above, 37.5% of the respondents replied that they strongly agree with the statement. It indicates that they do not only rely on the information in the passage but also rely on their background knowledge and personal experiences. Similarly, significant proportion of the respondents, 30.3% of them stated that they agree with the statement which shows that they depend on their background knowledge while they attempt to construct meaning. Tiny proportion of the respondents, 15.4% of them replied that they strongly disagree with the statement which marks they do not rely on their schematic knowledge. Likewise, almost equal proportion of respondents, 16.34%, answered that they disagree with the statement. The last two segments of the population which form significant proportion, about 1/3 of the total population confirmed that they do not use the given processing model as they read the passage.

From the data obtained, one can deduce that most students employ interactive processing model as they carry out their reading. However, information obtained from teachers showed that they do not utilize this processing strategy. To know what reading approach students use in their reading practices, teachers were asked a question which says what approach do students use as they read and they replied as it is stated under Table 4.3. Teacher “A” replied that they have used bottom-up approach since they read word by word. Teacher “B” replied the same; as they have used bottom-up approach which he dislikes it because it is not productive and time consuming. Teacher “C” and teacher “D” shared responses given by teacher “A” and teacher “B”. They replied that students usually use bottom-up processing. Particularly, teacher “D” stated that they have used to practice the model since their early schooling. In addition, responses given for question number one and two stands against this response; because students’ once replied that they usually make use of bottom-up processing and they don’t use top-down processing. Perhaps, interactive approach puts in to practice the combination bottom-up and top-down models.

Interactive approach in reading is an approach which utilizes a mixture of the two models mentioned above, bottom-up and top-down (see literature review). This means depending on the nature of a text, readers shift from one processing to the other until they are able to make intended meaning. For instance, if readers find part of a text which is new and unfamiliar to them, they utilize bottom-up processing to construct meaning. Unlikely, if they find part of a text which they are
familiar, they utilize their schematic knowledge (top-down processing). So, there is a switch of strategies from one to the other (Harmer, 2000; McDonough & Shaw, 1993; Nuttall, 1996).

Table 4.4. Response on how often students involve in pre-reading activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We actively involved in pre-reading activities before we start reading</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 4.4, 59.6% of the respondents replied that they strongly agree with the statement. It implies, they are involved actively in pre-reading time. Similarly, 20.2% of the population responded that they agree with the statement. This demonstrates that they involve in pre-reading activity. From the entire respondents, 11.5% of them replied that they strongly disagree with the statement which implies they are not actively involved in the process. The remaining 8.6% of the respondents stated that they disagree with the premise which marks they don’t involve actively in pre-reading activities.

With regard to this teacher “A” said that they couldn’t involve actively in pre-reading stage because items included in the module are beyond their capacity. Teacher “B” replied that as they can’t discuss and he reasoned out that the pre-reading activities are not appealing and they are not designed in a way that to be tackled using one’s prior knowledge. Teacher “C” on his part said, “The pre-reading questions included in the module are difficult. I wonder if students understand the essence of some pre-reading questions because knowing exactly what the question means is half of getting the answer.” From this, one can infer that students’ do not involve actively during the stage.

Furthermore, information gathered during observation time proved that they don’t involve actively during pre-reading phase. When the researcher observed teacher “A’s” class, he recognized that students are gathered around table and murmur but when the teacher attempts to
elicit response from them after their discussion, majority of them were passive. After long attempt, some volunteer students raised their hands up to react for the question but their reaction is not to the point and the teacher has kept on encouraging them to react yet he couldn’t succeed much. Then, he ordered them to move in to the actual reading. Similarly, when the researcher made his observation in teacher “B” class he experienced similar situation. Teacher “B” first ordered students to form a group and then discuss the first five pre-reading questions. In his instruction, he stressed that he has expected every group members to react to those questions as he would ask them randomly. Then students began discussion; after awhile he tried to draw out responses from them yet he couldn’t obtain satisfactory response.

What was observed in teacher “C” and teacher “D” classes were not entirely different from what were observed in teacher “A” and teacher “B” classes. Teacher “C” opened the reading session in questioning. He asked the students to read the title of a passage (population) and to tell him their expectation of the passage. For this question, some students reacted properly but most students remain passive. Though teacher “D” preferred asking the pre-reading questions orally and wanted to take students through whole class discussion but he couldn’t find them tackling all the questions as he expected them.

Table 4.5. Purpose of reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you set purpose for your reading activity before you start reading?</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 4.5, respondents provided various answers to the question asked whether or not they set purpose to their reading. From the total respondents, 35.6% of them replied never; hence, they have never set purpose to their reading. Similarly, 25% of them also responded that they sometimes set purpose for their reading. Whereas, 22.11% of the population
answered that they always set purpose for their reading. The remaining 17.3% of them replied to the question that they usually set purpose for their reading. In contrast, evidence obtained from classroom observation and teacher respondents’ witnessed that they do not set purpose for their reading in advance. From data displayed in the table above, one can infer that most students do not set purpose for their reading.

In academic reading, setting purpose has many functions. It determines the overall readers’ activities during while reading stage. The speed they use; the area they focus on; the choices they make before they read a text are influenced by purpose. Indeed, to make choice is not a simple task; it requires readers to have purpose; say for instance, to obtain some knowledge or current information. First, they need to decide on their purpose of reading. Then, they need to make choice among alternatives to meet their purpose i.e. materials that could help them achieve their purpose. If their purpose is to obtain specific knowledge, they either read modules or books or encyclopedias. Whereas if their purpose if to relax, they read either novels or short stories or journals. In addition, purpose helps readers to choose useful and productive strategies for their reading process such as scanning or skimming or intensive reading. Thus, in the absence of purpose, readers do nothing because they don’t know what to do and how to do (see literature review).

Though having purpose in reading is valuable, the classroom situation witnessed that students have never set it before their reading. This could be due to lack of awareness on the importance of setting purpose and inadequate support from their teachers. It requires immediate attention if remarkable change is needed to come in the students reading performance. The initiative better be taken and put into practice by both teachers and students. As professional, teachers are responsible for bringing the intended change; whereas, students are part of the solution because they are responsible for their own learning. Therefore, teachers need to make sure that students set purpose before they are engaged in the actual reading. If not, teachers should provide them necessary help either to train them to set purpose and/or to give them purpose for their reading.
Table 4.6. Students’ response whether or not they were pre-thought new vocabularies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often does the teacher pre-teach you some selected new vocabularies from the passage? Outstrip, paternalistic, Abhorring</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 4.6, students offered different responses for the question asked if they are thought some unfamiliar words before they engage in the actual reading. For the given question 51.9% of the respondents replied sometimes which marks they were rarely thought. Likewise, significant proportion of the respondents, 22.1% answered never; hence, it signifies that they never learnt. In contrast, the minority which totally consists of 18.3% and 7.7% of the respondents replied that they are thought always and usually respectively.

From the given information, it is possible to understand that students do not learn some technical words during pre-reading time where the time is allocated to deal with this kind of activity and to elicit students’ background knowledge on the topic. This, of course, inhibits students overall reading performance. For instance, during observation time “Hypertension and population” respectively were the topic of reading lessons. In those two reading lessons, the researcher learnt that there were jargon words. For instance, in the text hyperbaton, there were technical terms like aneurysm, atherosclerosis, and stroke. Similarly, in the text population there are words like paternalistic, premarital chastity and subsistence. These technical terms were not thought by most teachers as they were made bold for students to find their meaning in context but it is entirely impossible to come across to the meanings of these words in this way.

Though there are some unfamiliar terms in the aforementioned passages, only teacher “B” is observed as he thought them. The rest teacher left them to be tackled by the students themselves using contextual clues were it is difficult to come across to the meaning of those words in the stated way.
Table 4.7. Students’ response to how often they make scan-reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you make scan-reading (quick and selective reading) to get specific information?</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is shown in Table 4.7 for question asked whether or not students make scan-reading to get specific information, the following responses are obtained. From the total respondents, 19.2% of them replied always which indicates they always cry out scanning. Similarly, 18.2% of them gave their response that they usually carry out scan-reading in their reading process. In contrast, 16.34% of them replied as they sometimes perform and the rest 46.15% of the respondents answered that they never practice scan-reading.

With regard to this, response obtained from the classroom teachers also indicates that they do not use such reading strategies. For instance, teacher “A” replied that students have utilized intensive reading in all their reading practices and they usually read a text uniformly with slow pace whatever information they need. So, whether they have required getting specific information or general idea or detail information to grasp, they employ the same reading strategy. Teacher “B” added that students know theoretically what scanning or skimming means but they don’t put them in to practice whenever necessary. Teacher “C” in his part said, “Students do not implement reading strategies because of knowledge gap how to employ the strategies.” This implies that they don’t know what procedures need to be employed whenever they want to make scanning or skimming so that they read a text for specific information and a general idea uniformly. In addition, the actual classroom observation also coincides with the teachers reply. In the observed reading sessions, there were activities which require students to make scanning and skimming to tackle. For instance, during second observation time, teacher “D” asked his students the question which says: “Who opposes Chinas one child policy?” the answer is specific and the name of the person. To react for this question, students took much time.
In academic reading, during the reading stage, students usually use strategies such as scanning and skimming to obtain some information. Likewise, in the stated stage, the main role of teachers is to facilitate students to make use of these strategies as effectively as possible to meet the desired goals. Besides, teachers are expected to monitor the overall reading performance of students in the stage; however, most of them haven’t carried out the aforementioned activities in the observed sessions. In those sessions, teachers left everything for students to do it themselves but students couldn’t perform that. Thus, teachers should strictly follow students whether or not they employ the strategies effectively, and provide them necessary support whenever they are in trouble. During observation session such kind of follow up and support were not observed from teachers to enhance the use of different strategies as well as students reading performance.

Table 4.8. Students’ response to how often do they make skim-reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you make skim-reading (quick &amp; selective reading from the beginning to the end) to get main idea.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is shown in Table 4.8, different responses are offered by the respondents to the question asked whether they carried out skim-reading while practicing reading. Among the respondents 14.42% of the total respondents replied always which shows that they frequently practice skimming. Similarly, 13.5% of them replied that they usually practice skim-reading. Contrary to this, 26.9% of them replied that they sometimes practice skimming. In the same way, the largest proportion, 45.5% of the respondents answered that they never practice it. In addition, findings from classroom observation also coincide with the students’ response which indicated that they do not practice skimming as they read a passage. For instance, during observation time, most students were found hardly to tackle questions asked on the main idea. For instance, teacher “B” asked them to tell him the central idea of the passage but most students remained passive and those of who provide their response were also off the point.
With regard to this, most teacher respondents stated that students have never made use of this strategy while they read. For instance, teacher “A” replied, “They always practice one reading strategy which is intensive reading.” The response given by teacher “D” is identical to teacher “A’s” replay. He said, “Most students do not use different strategies like scanning for specific information, skimming for main idea. The only strategy they accustomed to use is intensive reading.” In contrast to this, teacher “C” replied that students wait instruction from him to use different reading strategies. He said, “If they are asked to use skimming, they employ it.” However, the way teacher “C” stated is not the right way of employing skimming because the use of various reading strategies are determined by purpose of readers, the while reading activity or the purpose forwarded by a teacher himself (see literature review). Therefore, from all data obtained, the researcher learnt that most students do not practice skimming in their actual reading.

Generally, for the result obtained in the reading classroom, it is not only students should be blamed but also teachers should take some share (Teshome, 2010). During observation time, much effort was not made by most teachers as it was expected of them. In EFL classroom, some students need scaffolding to learn and to practice reading effectively (Nuttall, 1996). This is because most students do not receive adequate instruction in all language skills in general in reading skills in particular due to numerous factors where they were in lower grades. Among those hindering factors lack of text book, lack of awareness on new findings, resistance to change are cited as the major challenges observed in reading classroom (Mesfin, 2008; Sisay, 2009; Teshome, 2010). So, teachers of higher institutes should offer necessary support for students to fill the gap. For instance, they could show them stapes to be followed when students want to practice skimming and encourage them to practice the skills by focusing on titles, sub-titles, the first and last paragraphs of the passage they read. In the same way, they had better show them stapes to be followed in scanning and intensive reading (see literature review).
Table 4.9. Students’ response to how often they make slow and careful reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often make reading relatively with slow speed and careful attention to get detail information?</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is demonstrated in Table 4.9, most respondents, 52% of them replied always which signifies that they practice intensive reading frequently to obtain detail information. Significant proportion of respondents, 23% of them answered that they usually practice intensive reading. Opposing to this, the tiny minority, 9.6% of the respondents, replied that they sometimes practice intensive reading. The remaining, 14.4% of respondents answered that they never practice intensive reading. Hence, from the total population 75% replied that they have carried out intensive reading. From the given information, one can deduce that most students practice intensive reading. Likewise, responses obtained from teachers fully supported the reply given by the students.

Despite the fact that, the researcher has some reservation because he has experienced that students did not practice intensive reading in a way that reading researchers recommended. As Nuttall (1996) stated, for instance, intensive reading is not only meant reading a particular text with relatively slow pace and comprehend the literal meaning of the text, but it requires to decode the maximum information that is held in the text and try to comprehend what is not explicitly stated (see literature review). What the researcher has experienced is most students enjoy reading hardly.
Table 4.10. Students’ response to how often they guess meanings of unfamiliar words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you guess the meanings of unfamiliar words from immediate and wider context while you read?</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the question asked how often they guess the meaning of unfamiliar words, the following responses were given by student respondents. From the total respondents, 31.7% replied that they always practice guessing meaning from the context while reading. In the same way, 14.42% of the respondents answered that they usually practice guessing the meaning of new words when they encounter in their reading. Whereas, 23% of respondents answered that they sometimes guess. From the entire respondents, 30.8% of them replied that they never practice guessing.

With regard to this, responses obtained from teacher respondents contradict with students reply. Accordingly, teacher “A” said, “Most students are poor in guessing meanings of unfamiliar words as they face in their reading. When they encounter such meanings they usually ask him for help.” Correspondingly, teacher “B” on his part responded, “I think it is unusual for them to practice guessing because they couldn’t practice it when they were in high school.” Adding on this, teacher “C” said, “Students do not practice guessing the meanings of unfamiliar words rather they strive for to know only their dictionary meaning.” Furthermore, teacher “D” stated a little bit in a different way, saying that, they are weak in guessing because they have felt that guessing does not take them to the right meaning of words.

After all, during classroom observation, the researcher observed that students who sat next to him ask each other the meaning of unfamiliar words that they encountered. Therefore, by crosschecking all the evidences presented above, the researcher recognized that students do not practice guessing the meanings of unfamiliar words when they encounter in their reading. This, undoubtedly, hinders students reading comprehension because texts are built from words. So, failing to know the
meanings of words that form part of a text means, by analogy, failing to construct meaning out of a text they read (see literature review).

Table 4.11. Students’ response if they like to show their understanding through discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to show my understanding of ideas/issues of the reading text through discussion.</td>
<td>To a Great Extent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To somewhat</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be depicted in Table 4.11 students replied for the question differently. The majority, 59.6% of the respondents replied very little. This implies, most students almost never demonstrated their comprehension through discussion. Significant number of the respondents 22.11% answered that to some extent for the same question. This also signifies some students rarely practice the stated task. In contrary to this, the tiny minority, 11.53% of the respondents answered that they like to demonstrate their understanding in the stated way to great extent. The remaining proportion, 6.7% of the respondents replied that they carry out discussion not at all. From the data presented above, one can infer that most students do not demonstrate their understanding through discussion.

In academic reading, one of the most important activities is discussion that is held after students finished their reading. This stage helps readers to retain the most important points of the reading in their mind (see literature review). In the given stage, readers are required to recall important points from the text they read such as events, facts, characters, and make discussion on them. Regarding this, citing (Williams, 1984) Mesfin stated that during post-reading phase students carry out group discussion which should be followed by whole class discussion that help both a teacher and students to check whether or not comprehension is taken place (Mesfin, 2008).

Obviously, as Teshome (2010) also stated teachers may face some challenges in implementing this task due to various factors, for instance, students’ poor educational background. For this, they should work their level best to improve the situation and capitalize some good practices.
This is done to discharge their professional responsibility. Finally, teachers should be wise enough in employing activities in the stage. Those activities should be motivating enough to enhance students’ comprehension skills.

Table 4.12. Students reply to how often they write the summary of a passage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you write the summary of the passage you read in your own words?</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the question asked whether students demonstrate their understanding of the reading passage through summary writing or not, the following responses are obtained. From the total respondents, 33.6 % of them replied that they sometimes write summary to show their understanding of the passage. Likewise, 26 % of the respondents replied that they never perform such activity after they have completed their reading. Opposing to this, 22.11 % of the respondents answered that they always practice the given task. The remaining 18.2 % of the respondents answered that they usually practice summary writing after finishing their reading.

With regard to this, teacher respondents stated that what is actually happening during post-reading stage in the following way. Teacher “A” said, “Students’ are poor in reading comprehension. Mostly, when they reach at the end of the text, they forget what they have read at the beginning. So, they don’t demonstrate their comprehension through summary writing.” Similarly, teacher “D” replied, “Students do not demonstrate their comprehension through summary writing or paraphrasing because they couldn’t practice it when they were in high school.” In addition, he said, the module does not incorporate such activity for post-reading stage.” Teacher “B”, on his part, said that only few students try to demonstrate their understanding through writing summary or paraphrasing. Though for the give question teacher “C” reacted differently. He said, “I strictly follow student’s module which doesn’t consist of this activity.”
In the same way, during classroom observation, the researcher observed that no students demonstrated his/her understanding in the stated way and no teacher was also observed as he has encouraged students to do the given activity. Therefore, from information depicted in table 4.12 the researcher understood that most students did not practice paraphrasing and summary writing to demonstrate their comprehension after they have completed their reading activities. Though doing the given activity is a key to comprehension and retention of what they read.

Although many reading researchers agreed, teaching reading can be effective and meaningful if the three stages of reading are effectively implemented, the classroom atmosphere had no good signs of implementation of those strategies. To implement the strategies in the phases of reading, teachers should play a leading role and students show their willingness to practice the strategies as they read. If one of the two unable to overcome their responsibility, the teaching learning process of the stated skill will persist as it has been. From actual observation, the researcher learnt that most classroom practices were contradictory with the procedures suggested by experts.

Table 4.13. Students if they are motivated enough to find answers for questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In reading class, I’ m motivated enough to find answers for questions from a passage by reading/rereading the text than expecting the teacher to tell me the answers.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen Table 4.13, students give different responses for the question asked if they are motivated enough to find answers for the questions given through reading rather than expecting their teacher to tell them. From total population, 22.11% of the respondents replied that they strongly agree with the statement which marks they are keen enough to search answers for the questions given by themselves. Likewise, 35.6% of them answered that they agree with the statement which implies they are motivated enough to carry out the activity. Opposing to this, 16.3
% of the respondents stated that they strongly disagree with the premise; hence, they never be motivated to carry out such activity. The remaining, 16.3% of the respondents replied that they disagree with the statements i.e. they are not entirely prompted to carry out the stated activity.

Concerning this, teachers replied in the following way. Teacher “A” said, “Most students are not capable enough to find answers for the questions because their comprehension skill is very poor. After their attempt, I always tell them answers.” Likewise, teacher “C” said, “They do not find answers for the questions because they have comprehension problem. Besides, most of the activities are beyond their capacity.” Furthermore, teacher “B” replied that students are not motivated enough because some reading texts are not appealing to them. Finally, Teacher “D” stated that they perform it sometime.

Similarly, information obtained during actual classroom match with teachers’ response. During the first observation, teacher “A” used whole class discussion to carry out the post reading activity. At the time, he encouraged students to react to the questions, he found most students answering the questions hardly. In the same way, teacher “C” carried out the whole class discussion for the given activities; what he experienced is not much different from teacher “A’’s” experience. In the given phase, teacher “B” and “D” preferred to use group discussion and asked students after some time. The responses they obtain from most students were not satisfactory. As a result teacher “B” ordered them to read the passage once again at home and attempt the entire questions, whereas, teacher “D” writes some answers of the questions on the board and ordered them to complete the rest activities. From teachers reply and what the researcher observed in the actual classroom, he learnt that most students were passive and only few students try to search answers by themselves and responded to the question asked.
Table 4.14. Students’ response whether or not they are given feedback on their reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher gives us general feedback on the overall performance of our reading at the end of every reading class.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the question asked whether or not students are given feedback at the end of every reading session, the following answers are obtained. From the total respondents, 43% of them replied that they disagree with the statement which implies they were not given feedback. Likewise, 23% of them answered that they strongly disagree with the statement. This shows that they were not provided feedback after they have finished reading activities. In contrast, some proportion of the respondents, 19.2% of them answered that they strongly agree with the statement which indicates they were given. In the same way, 14.4% of the population replied that they were agreed with the statement which marks they were provided. Thus, from data depicted in table 4.14, one can infer that most of the respondents are not provided enough feedback on their reading lessons.

Concerning this, the following responses are obtained from teachers. For instance, teacher “A” left this question unfilled. Teacher “B” replied, “I provide, by ordering them to share their ideas with their classmate.” Teacher “C” said, “I have given them feedback on their reading styles.” This is not clear to the researcher what kind of feedback it is. Teacher “D” also stated, “I ordered them to share their ideas in a group or pairs.”

Although the last three teachers replied as they have given feedback to their students, the way they employed it did not follow procedures of feedback provision (see literature review). There are two reasons for offering feedback in reading classroom. The first is to show readers how well they are reading and processing meaning. The second is to measure how much progress they have been made so far; hence, for both forms of feedback assessments are needed. To improve
students reading practices, teacher should carry out both forms of feedbacks. But during classroom observation, the researcher observed that no teacher carried out such kind feedback.

As most scholars agreed, teaching has three major pillars. They are planning, implementing and evaluating. In fact, all these three major parts have detail description and subdivisions. Here some focus is given to evaluation from which feedback is derived. In the teaching and learning process, what comes next to assessment is giving feedback, which is mostly neglected in many ESL reading classroom (Macdonough & Shaw, 1993). Feedback is not seen separately from teaching learning process because it is part of assessment which logically comes next to it.

In the process of teaching, one of the most important duties of a teacher is giving feedback. Thus, as mentioned before, they should offer feedback to their students because it is a means to correct or improve learners’ performance to strengthen their good practices. From which, students can learn more, perform better, and improve their overall reading performances. If readers exactly know what their strong and weak side, they can work more to keep their strong side and to avoid the weak one; unless they stay in their comfort zone.

Table 4.15. Students' response how often they are encouraged to read books and other reading materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often the teacher encourages you to read books and other reading materials which are written in English language outside the classroom?</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the question asked if teachers encourage students to read various reading texts written in the target language, the following responses are obtained. As can be shown in the table above, 35.5% of the population replied that they have never been encouraged to carry out such reading activity outside the classroom. Likewise, 29.8% of the respondents answered that they were sometimes encouraged to carry out such reading. Apart from this, 26% of the respondents
reacted that they are always encouraged to practice reading. The remaining, 8.6% of the respondents replied that they are usually encouraged to make extensive reading.

In relation to this, the following responses were obtained from classroom teachers. For instance, teacher “A” replied that he has encouraged them to make extensive reading through offering them reading assignments on different topics. Teacher “B” said, “I have encouraged them to read much different articles written in the target language, particularly journals and newspapers because it helps them to improve their language skills.” Teacher “C”, on his part, replied that he has encouraged them to do so because he believed that extensive reading is useful to improve their reading ability. But teacher “D” replied in a different way; he said that he does not encourage them to do so because such activity is not included in the module. Though most teachers replied as they have encouraged students to perform extensive reading, during classroom observation there was no sign of encouragement or motivation of students to carry out the activity whenever and wherever possible. From responses obtained, the researcher learnt that students were not motivated and encouraged to carry out extensive reading.

Table 4.16: Students responses which type of reading text they like to read most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Ranking made by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among the following topics which you prefer to read most? Write number 1 up to 7 in the box from most you like to least you like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals &amp; newspapers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love story</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The items presented in Table 4.16 include texts that have been used in the reading session by subjects of the study and texts that are assumed to be preferred by students that could possibly meet their need. The aims of presenting these items are to know whether or not texts that are used at
present moment in the reading classroom motivate students to read or not. As a result the following result is obtained:

As students are asked to rank in order the texts given (see appendix C) according to their preference to read i.e. from the most they like to the least they like, the following results are obtained:

From the total respondents, 43% of them made biology their first choice. The other, 12.5% of the total population made biography their number one choice. Likewise, 10.6% of them have chosen culture as their number one choice. In addition, Sport and social affairs were made first choice by equal proportion of respondents (9.6%) of the total population for each genre. The other, 8.6% of the population made Journals and news papers their first choice. From the response given, the researcher understood that variation of response is due to individual differences which should be acknowledged by teachers if not it is difficult to meet learning objectives.

The data indicates that different segments of the population has chosen different genre as their first choice. This implies the presence of diversified needs of students in the reading classroom. In order to meet their interest, it is useful to incorporate different genres of texts. Beside this, texts such as sport and love stories were made 2nd and 3rd choice respectively by large proportion of the population i.e. by 33% and 25% of respondents' respectively. Using these two genres as supplementary text has great importance since they are preferred by larger proportion of the respondents.

The researcher made a close look at in the students' module from which he recognized that texts which are included in the module are from biology and social affairs articles. From which two of the texts are biology extracts and the rest three are from social affairs. In contrast, the data obtained from students revealed that they have diversified need which the module has met hardly.

If one pays similar attention to the module, he/she can notice that the material lacks important elements such as variety and authenticity. This entirely affects students' interest and motivation; perhaps, this intern puts negative impact on students' performance because, as it is said, reading is more of an individual activity that is highly influenced by interest and motivation. Out of the five reading texts in the module, two texts are from biology; the rest three texts are from social affairs.
This indicates the module entirely lacks Varity. From this the researcher learnt that the module which has been used to offer the course does not meet the diverse need of students.

Therefore, as much as possible, it is wise to take in to account students’ interest which can make the teaching learning process smooth. From the information obtained in table 4.16 above, it is suggested that instead of using all lessons from two genres, it becomes interesting, and varied if it is taken one text from each genre. If this is done, it is possible to meet students need, to touch their interest and to give them opportunity to be introduced to different genres. In addition, texts which are included in the module are inauthentic. They are materials developed for teaching and learning process which do not receive much attention from scholars of reading (see literature review). Many research findings demonstrate that the importance of using authentic materials (McDonough & Shaw, 1993; Nattall, 1996; Hedge, 2000; Harmer, 2001). So, ignoring these scientifically acknowledged materials and unable to follow the procedures suggested by experts entirely affect the teaching learning process of the skill and the outcome which is expected out of it.
5.1. Summary

Though reading is one of the most important skills which determine the academic success or failure of students, the current practices of students’ is not satisfactory. Inability to perform effective reading is not only put a negative impact on students’ language skills but also it hurts their overall academic performance. In the 21st century where the technological advancement reaches its climax and where information is disseminated through various media, electronic and written media, there is no substitute for reading to access any information. So, effective reading ability is unquestionably very helpful. Particularly, students who have been trained as future teachers shoulder great responsibility to take out children of the community from the darkness of illiteracy by shining the light of education. This is realized, first and for most, today’s students could develop good reading skills and abilities that help them to gather necessary knowledge and skills in their stay at college and after college as a professional.

Despite the benefit of effective reading, efforts made by natural science stream students of the college understudy is inadequate. Since the researcher has worked in the college, he experienced that most students of the aforementioned field of study had poor reading skills which inspired him to conduct the study. Thus, the general objectives of the study was to assess students’ actual classroom reading practices in line with theoretical frame work of reading set by reading researchers. More specifically, the study attempts:

- to identify which reading approach /approaches is/are employed as students read a text
- to explore the strategies that are mostly used by students as they practice reading
- to identify whether or not texts and activities used at different level of reading-in pre, while and post reading stages interest the students
- to describe the overall reading practices of students

Accordingly, a descriptive survey method with both quantitative and qualitative design was made use of so as to answer the aforesaid objectives. Two data collection instruments, namely
classroom observation and questionnaire were designed and used. With regard to the subjects of the study, 104 natural science students and four (4) teachers who offered them the course Communicative English skills-I were involved. Then data from all sources and instruments were tallied, tabulated, analyzed and discussed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Finally, the researcher extracted the following main finding from the analysis and discussion made so far:

The majority of the students surveyed in this study were found as they use bottom-up approach in their reading. The students believed that reading was meant the process of identification of letters, words and sentences and construct meaning out it.

The findings showed that students’ do not involve actively during pre-reading time wherein they are expected to discuss with their sit mate on the topic of a passage using their background knowledge of the topic and to predict what it is all about. It was in this stage that the foundation of reading laid down such as by setting purpose, short listing some guiding questions which should get answers during while reading stage. Though the information obtained confirmed that students did not discuss and set purpose as they carried out their reading. It was happened that due to factors such as lack of effective pre-reading task, lack of adequate background knowledge and lack of proper guidance and support.

Information obtained from classroom observation and teacher’s questionnaire on while-reading phase indicated that students did not utilize reading strategies such as skimming, scanning and guessing meanings from context. Hence students were found as they read the whole text uniformly which clearly shows failure of students to utilize various techniques suggested by reading researchers. Moreover, there is no separate and clearly put while reading activity in the module which leads students to perform the stated techniques as they read a text.

Students’ motivation level to reading was very low. Teachers were found doing nothing to motivate them. The reading texts and activities are inauthentic which did not stimulate students to involve actively during different reading stages. Teachers were found unable to rewrite particularly reading activities and present for students in a sensible manner. The provision of feedback in all observed session was almost none. Furthermore, teacher did not encourage students to read extensive reading though it has magnificent role for EFL learners. After all,
there was a difference in the students’ actual classroom reading practice and what researchers of reading suggested to be practiced by learners.

5.2. Conclusions

From the above findings the following conclusions are made.

1. The majority of students in this study were found as they practiced reading using bottom-up approach.

2. Students did not involve actively during pre-reading time through active discussion, in setting purpose, listing down some signpost questions that guide them in which aspect of the passage they should focus on; predicting what the passage is all about by looking at the topic and sub-topics.

3. There was not clearly put while-reading activity. Students were observed as they fail to utilize reading strategies such as scanning, skimming, and intensive reading flexibly and interchangeably whenever they are necessary during while-reading stage. Rather they stick to slow reading with same pace from the start till the end which is entirely contradicted with the principles of effective reading suggested by scholars of the field.

4. Lack of effective post-reading activity that enhances discussion during stage, initiates students either to paraphrase or summarize what they read in their own words which in turn facilitates students retention skills, improve their recalling ability, facilitates their comprehension skills; even enhances their writing skills.

5. Teachers unable to maintain the active involvement of students throughout the three stages of reading. They couldn’t pre-teach some key words, during pre-reading time; they couldn’t encourage students to set purpose; they failed to motivate students to use various strategies; they couldn’t offer feedback at the end the session; they fail to redesign pre-reading activity which they considered it as ineffective for pre-reading phase. They couldn’t motivate students to read various texts outside the classroom even if one of the ways to improve EFL learners reading skills is to encourage them carry out massive reading outside the classroom etc.
6. The big challenge that influenced the reading practices of students was how to put in to practice their knowledge and skills. Students know what scanning or skimming means but they don’t know how to make use of them whenever necessary i.e. their practical aspect.

5.3. Recommendations

On the basis of the discussion made and the conclusion formulated, the succeeding recommendations have been forwarded.

1. Teachers should update themselves with research findings to learn the current convention of teaching language in general and teaching of reading in particular so as to help their students cope with academic challenges.

2. Educational training program ought to focus on approaches, theories, strategies, and techniques of teaching and learning if tangible change is needed to take place. The majority of students were found practicing bottom-up approach as they perform reading because they did not know or understand how to use other approaches and strategies as they practice reading.

3. The study indicates that inability of students to involve actively during pre-reading time. It is due to lack of effective pre-reading task, inauthentic text, adequate background knowledge. So, teacher should evaluate the activity and redesign it whenever necessary; try to upgrade reading texts to authentic level; they should know the level of their students’ background knowledge first and implement techniques such as accretion, tuning, and restructuring.

4. In the instructional module, activities are not designed and put according to pre-, while- and post-reading activities in all unities so that teachers who offer the course should present the reading activities according to the three phases of reading.

5. Teachers strictly follow students up whether or not they use reading strategies and provide them necessary help to employ it as effectively as possible. Most students only know the theories of those strategies but not know how they are practically implemented. So, before they order students to employ the strategies, teacher should show them how they apply the strategies i.e. serve as role model.
6. The college should look for ways to improve the reading texts and activities used in the module Communicative English skills-I.

7. Teacher should try to make texts in use authentic and re-write some activities that are not motivating and difficult for students to involve their background knowledge to deal with them. Possibly they can substitute them by authentic texts and activities which are interesting and motivating. Moreover, activity like discussion and/or paraphrasing and/or summary writing must be incorporated in post reading activities.

8. Teachers should work hard to take students through the three stages of reading as they involve actively. They should do what has to be done in each stage depending on the situation on hand such as pre-teaching some technical terms, set purpose for students reading, motivate them to use flexible reading, offer feedback at the right time etc. until students become capable of doing those activities by themselves and become fluent readers.

9. Teachers should work hard and enforce learners to use different reading strategies and techniques as they read. They should not directly order students to practice those reading strategies; instead they better give them some scaffolding. As it was seen in the classroom, most students did not know how to put in to practice scanning and skimming. So, they should better show them the practical staples followed when each strategy is employed.
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Dear student,

This study primarily aims at finding out the reading practices of first year students of Bonga College of Teacher Education. The study has no any relation to individual performance and I request you to feel free and answer all the questions frankly. Besides, you don’t need to write your name and other necessary information on the sheet for confidentiality purpose. Finally, the success of this study is directly lays on the care and genuineness with which you answer each item.

For your great cooperation Thank you in advance

Part I: Personal Information

Directions: Insert the relevant information both by putting tick mark (✓) and by filling the blank spaced.

Sex: Male □

Female □

Age: ________

Department ________

Section: ________
Part II:

**Directions:** Please, put a thick mark (v) in the box found in front of the response that most closely corresponds to your view.

1. When I read a passage I follow the steps of identification of letters, words, and sentences to make meaning.
   A. Always □ C. usually □  D. Sometimes □  D. Never □
2. Before I start reading, I usually predict the content of the passage by focusing on a title, picture, and some key words given in the text.
   A. Strongly Agree □ B. Agree □ C. strongly disagree □  D. disagree □
3. In order to construct meaning from a reading passage, I depend on not only information given in the text but also my background knowledge and personal experience.
   A. Strongly Agree □  B. Agree □  C. strongly disagree □  D. disagree □
4. How often do you set purpose for your reading activity before you start reading?
   A. Always □  B. usually □  C. sometimes □  D. never □
5. How often does the teacher pre-teach you some selected new vocabularies from the passage?
   A. Always □  C. usually □  D. sometimes □  D. Never □
6. How often do you make scan-reading (quick and selective reading) to get specific information?
   A. Always □  C. usually □  D. sometimes □  D. Never □
7. How often do you make skim-reading (quick & selective reading from the beginning to the end) to get main idea.
   A. Always □  C. usually □  D. Sometimes □  D. Never □
8. I often make reading relatively with slow speed and careful attention to get detail information?
   Strongly agree □  B. Agree □  C. strongly disagree □  D. Disagree □
9. How often do you guess the meanings of unfamiliar words from immediate and wider context while you read
   A. Always □  B. usually □  C. sometimes □  D. never □
10. I like to show my understanding of ideas/issues of the reading text through discussion.
    A. To a Great Extent □  B. to somewhat □  C. very Little □  D. not at All □
11. How often do you write the summary of the passage you read in your own words?
   Always ☐  B. usually ☐  C. sometimes ☐  D. never ☐

12. In reading class, I’m motivated enough to find the answers of questions from a passage by reading/rereading the text than expecting the teacher to tell me the answers.
   A. Strongly agree ☐  B. agree ☐  C. Strongly disagree ☐  D. disagree ☐

13. The teacher gives us feedback on the overall performance of our reading at the end of every reading class.
   A. Strongly agree ☐  B. agree ☐  C. Strongly disagree ☐  D. disagree ☐

14. How often the teacher encourages you to read different books, magazine and newspaper and other reading materials which are written in English language outside the classroom?
   A. Always ☐  B. usually ☐  C. sometimes ☐  D. never ☐

15. Among the following topics which do you like to read most? Write number 1 up to 7 in the box from most you like to least you like.
   A. sport articles ☐
   B. love stories ☐
   C. articles on biology ☐
   D. biography ☐
   E. journals & newspapers ☐
   F. cultural articles ☐
   G. articles on social affairs ☐

If any _______________________

16. What comment do you have on the teaching learning process of reading?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank You once again!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Nature of Reading</th>
<th>Main Idea</th>
<th>Intensive Reading</th>
<th>Scanning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>h postpone/scan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>main idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>intensive reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Millistest, mis kohustuslik on teaduslik, et seadust eest seotud vähemikud
parandaksid? Kui oli algulid, mida see teaduslik
parandamisel takistab?

15. Millistest teaduslikust hoolimatu osast hoiatab seaduseid
veebis? Millised teaduslikud eest kohustavad vaid
ajaloolise mõõdetut saada?

16. Millistest teaduslikust hoolimatu osast hoiatab seaduseid
veebis? Millised teaduslikud eest kohustavad vaid
ajaloolise mõõdetut saada?
17. Напиши слова и выражения, которые ты встретил во время чтения. Что в них тебе больше всего понравилось? Что из них ты бы хотел запомнить? Какие из них ты бы хотел использовать в своих рассказах?
Appendix C: Teachers’ Questionnaire

Jimma University
College of Social Science and Law
Department of English Language and Literature

Dear Teacher,

This study aims at assessing the reading practice of first year Natural Science students of Bonga College of Teacher Education who take the course Communicative English skills-I. Through which, I want to find out students actual reading practice in communicative English classes. For the success of the study, your genuine response plays magnificent role. So, I kindly request you to react to each question frankly.

Thank you in advance!

Part I: Personal Information

Directions: put a thick mark in the box and Insert the relevant information in each blank space.

Sex: Male ☐
Female ☐

Teaching experience: ________
Part II:

Directions: Please, put a thick mark in the box and/or express your opinion by writing on the space provided.

1. Do students involve actively in pre-reading discussion time?
   A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐
   If your answer to question number 1 is ‘No’ why? Please specify your reason

2. Are students capable enough to predict the content of the text which they read by focusing on the title, pictures or a set of key words given in the text?
   A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐
   If your answer to question number 2 is ‘No’, why? Please specify

3. What role do you play during pre-reading stage?

4. Do students set purpose for their reading?
   A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐
   If your answer is ‘No’ why? Please specify your reason

5. How do you describe students reading strategies? Do they use scanning, skimming, and intensive reading properly as they read?
6. How do you see students’ vocabulary knowledge? Do they practice guessing when they face unfamiliar words as they read a passage? Please specify

7. How do you describe students reading compression skills? Do they demonstrate their understanding of a text through summary writing or paraphrasing? Please, specify

8. Are students capable of finding answers from the passage for questions presented in different stages of reading?
   A. yes □ B. No □
   If your answer to question number 7 is ‘No’, why? Please specify

9. How do you give them feedback after their actual reading practice?

10. Do you encourage students to read different materials written in the target language outside the classroom? How?

Do you like the approach they use, why? Please, specify your reason

12. What comment do you have towards the reading texts and activities included in the module you are using?

I thank you!
Appendix D: Observation Checklist

Jimma University
College of Social Sciences and Law
Department of English Language and Literature

Topic of the lesson __________________ Class observed: year _______ department _______

Data _________ Time ___________

This observation checklist is designed to observe the actual classroom practices of teacher & students in reading classes during the three phase reading: Pre-while-and post-reading stages.

Pre-reading Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The classroom Teacher</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduces the actual reading lesson through short discussion to elicit the information students already have about the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivates students to predict the contents of the text by focusing on the titles, pictures given on the topic or a set of key words in the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gives purpose for reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Activate and use students back ground knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Asking students about their previous experience or knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Providing back ground information/telling their own experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Makes students discuss what they know about the topic in pairs/group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pre-teach some selected new vocabulary items from the passage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:___________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

xiv
### Pre-reading Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Make discussion when asked by the teacher and forward their points of discussion to the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Infer the content of the text Using titles, pictures related to the topic or a set of key words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have purpose in their reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>use their background knowledge to construct meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Share what their experiences and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Make discussion on the topic and write their point of discussion in pairs/group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

### While-reading Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The classroom Teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shows students how and when to use different reading strategies/procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gets students to read the text silently and quickly for gist (skimming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gets students to read the text silently and quickly for specific piece of information (scanning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Encourage students to read the text and answer while-reading activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encourages students to guess the meaning of unfamiliar word from context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provides students ample time for reading and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Encourages students to find answer rather than telling them what it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Go around the class and monitor on how students working tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Asks students to answer the questions orally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### While-reading phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>The students</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use different reading strategies/procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read the text silently and quickly for gist (skimming)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read the text silently and quickly for specific piece of information (scanning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Make an intensive reading and try to grasp detail information of the passage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Guess the meanings of unfamiliar words from context while reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Read the text given and answer the while-reading activity as they read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-reading Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>The classroom Teacher:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gets students to discuss &amp; answer comprehension questions in pairs/groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Makes students compare their answers in pairs/groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motivates students to read their answers to the questions for the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Encourages students to relate information in the text to their life experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Initiates students to explore the ideas/issues in the text through writing/speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Encourages students to extract the main ideas and issues in the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Summarizes the day’s reading lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Post-reading Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>The students</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discuss in pairs/ in groups and give answer to comprehension questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compare their answers with other pairs/groups and get feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Motivated enough to forward their answer to the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Show their understanding of the ideas/issues in the text through writing/speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Write the summary of a passage or paraphrase the passage in their own words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Relate what is obtained from the reading passage to personal experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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