

T.C.
UNIVERSITY OF GAZİANTEP
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE OPINIONS OF INSTRUCTORS
AND STUDENTS TOWARDS THE PROBLEMS
RELATED WITH THE READING CLASSES WITH A
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DÜZİÇİ ÇEAŞ ANATOLIAN
HIGH SCHOOL**

MASTER'S OF ART THESIS

EYYUP SERKAN ÖNCEL

GAZİANTEP
JUNE 2006

T.C.
GAZİANTEP ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI

**DÜZİÇİ ÇEAŞ ANADOLU LİSESİNE REFERANSLA
İNGİLİZCE OKUMA DERSLERİNDEKİ SORUNLARA
İLİŞKİN ÖĞRETMEN VE ÖĞRENCİ GÖRÜŞLERİNİN
İNCELENMESİ**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

EYYUP SERKAN ÖNCEL

GAZİANTEP
HAZİRAN 2006

T.C.
UNIVERSITY OF GAZİANTEP
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE OPINIONS OF INSTRUCTORS
AND STUDENTS TOWARDS THE PROBLEMS RELATED
WITH THE READING CLASSES WITH A SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO DÜZİÇİ ÇEAŞ ANATOLIAN HIGH
SCHOOL**

MASTER'S OF ART THESIS

EYYUP SERKAN ÖNCEL

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK

GAZİANTEP
JUNE 2006

T.C.
GAZİANTEP ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI

**DÜZİÇİ ÇEAŞ ANADOLU LİSESİNE REFERANSLA
İNGİLİZCE OKUMA DERSLERİNDEKİ SORUNLARA
İLİŞKİN ÖĞRETMEN VE ÖĞRENCİ GÖRÜŞLERİNİN
İNCELENMESİ**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

EYYUP SERKAN ÖNCEL

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK

GAZİANTEP
HAZİRAN 2006

T.C.
UNIVERSITY OF GAZİANTEP
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**An Analysis of the Opinions of Instructors and Students towards the Problems
Related with the Reading Classes with a Special Reference to Düziçi Çeaş
Anatolian High School**

Eyyup Serkan ÖNCEL

Date of Viva: 28.06.2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Osman ERKMEN
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master's of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Filiz Y. TILFARLIOĞLU
Head of Department

This is to certify that I (we) have read this thesis and that in my (our) opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master's of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK
Supervisor

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master's of Arts.

Examining Committee Members:

Signature

Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK

Assist. Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN (Chairman)

Dr. Güven MENGÜ

T.C.
GAZİANTEP ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI

**Düziçi Çeş Anadolu Lisesine Referansla İngilizce Okuma Derslerindeki
Sorunlara İlişkin Öğretmen ve Öğrenci Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi**

Eyyup Serkan ÖNCEL

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 28.06.2006

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü onayı

Prof. Dr. Osman ERKMEN
SBE Müdürü

Bu tezin Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak gerekli şartları sağladığını onaylarım.

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Filiz Y. TILFARLIOĞLU
Enstitü ABD Başkanı

Bu tez tarafımca (tarafımızca) okunmuş, kapsamı ve niteliği açısından bir Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK
Tez Danışmanı

Bu tez tarafımızca okunmuş, kapsam ve niteliği açısından bir Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Üyeleri:

İmzası

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN (Jüri Başkanı)

Dr. Güven MENGÜ

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK for her suggestions and guidance to this master thesis and I would also like to thank her for being my thesis supervisor with her unequalled guidance and patience.

I would like to add my special thanks to my wife Semiha ÖNCEL and my five-year-old son Yaşar ÖNCEL for their patience and understanding.

I would also like to thank to my mother Emel ÖNCEL and my father Yaşar ÖNCEL for encouraging me to finish this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank to the students and teachers in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School who provided me with necessary background information for my thesis.

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE OPINIONS OF INSTRUCTORS AND STUDENTS TOWARDS THE PROBLEMS RELATED WITH THE READING CLASSES WITH A SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DÜZİÇİ ÇEAŞ ANATOLIAN HIGH SCHOOL

ÖNCEL, Eyyup Serkan

M.A. Thesis, Department of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Assist.Prof.Dr. Elif Leyla TOPRAK

June 2006, 131pages

Students of Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School have some problems in reading classes. They claim that they are not successful in comprehending the text at the end of reading classes. The real reason of their failure is the necessary reading activities are not applied during reading classes. Students need to learn how to comprehend a text and need to be taught specific comprehension skills such as scanning, skimming, activating background knowledge or deducing the meaning from text. The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the problems faced by teachers and students related with reading classes in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. A questionnaire has been conducted as data collection instrument in this descriptive study. There were 48 Likert-type items in the questionnaire. Frequencies, means, standard deviations and percentages were calculated for each item of the questionnaire. The data were analysed by using chi-square test. The questionnaire was given to the students of first year classes and the second year classes and the English instructors at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. 160 students and 8 English instructors answered the questionnaire. There were 4 main hypotheses related with before-reading activities, during-reading activities, after-reading activities, and home-reading activities in this study. Moreover, there were 48 sub-hypotheses related with the reading activities which were done through before, during, after, and home reading stages. Only 7 hypotheses were rejected at the end of statistical analysis. This means that both the instructors and the students agree with each other concerning before reading activities, while reading activities, post-reading activities and home reading activities.

Key words: Reading Stages, Reading Activities, Reading Comprehension.

ÖZET

DÜZİÇİ ÇEAŞ ANADOLU LİSESİNE REFERANSLA İNGİLİZCE OKUMA DERSLERİNDEKİ SORUNLARA İLİŞKİN ÖĞRETMEN VE ÖĞRENCİ GÖRÜŞLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

ÖNCEL, Eyyup Serkan
Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi ABD
Tez Danışmanı: Yrd.Doç.Dr.Elif Leyla TOPRAK
Haziran 2006, 131 sayfa

Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anadolu Lisesi öğrencileri okuma derslerinde bazı zorluklarla karşılaşmaktadır. Okuma derslerinin sonunda parçayı kavramada başarılı olamadıklarını iddia etmektedirler. Başarısızlıklarının esas nedeni okuma derslerinde gerekli okuma aktivitelerinin yapılmamasıdır. Öğrenciler bir parçanın nasıl kavranacağını ve tarama, göz gezdirme, eski bilgiyi aktive etme, ya da anlamı parçadan çıkarma gibi özel kavrama becerilerini öğrenmelidirler. Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anadolu Lisesi'ndeki öğrencilerin İngilizce okuma derslerinde karşılaştıkları sorunları araştırmaktır. Betimsel araştırma niteliğindeki bu çalışmada veri toplama aracı olarak bir anket kullanılmıştır. Ankette 48 adet Likert-tipi soru vardır. Anketteki her soru için frekans, ortalama, standart sapma ve yüzdelik hesapları yapılmıştır. Anket verileri ki-kare (x^2) testi kullanılarak değerlendirilmiştir. Anket, Düziçi Anadolu Lisesi'ndeki 1. sınıf ve 2. sınıf öğrencilerine ve İngilizce öğretmenlerine uygulanmıştır. 160 öğrenci ve 8 İngilizce öğretmeni anket sorularını cevaplamıştır. Bu çalışmada, okuma öncesi aktiviteler, okuma esnasındaki aktiviteler, okuma sonrası aktiviteler ve evdeki okuma aktiviteleriyle ilgili 4 ana hipotez ve bu hipotezlerle bağlantılı 48 tane alt hipotez vardır. İstatistiksel işlemler sonunda hipotezlerin sadece 7 tanesi kabul edilmemiştir. Sonuçta, öğretmen ve öğrencilerin okuma öncesi, okuma esnası, okuma sonrası ve evdeki okuma aktivitelerindeki görüşlerinde hemfikir oldukları tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Okuma safhaları, okuma aktiviteleri, okuduğunu anlama.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No</u>
ABSTRACT	i
ÖZET	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. PRESENTATION	1
1.2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
1.3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
1.4. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	4
1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	4
1.6. HYPOTHESES	5
1.7. ASSUMPTIONS	8
1.8. LIMITATIONS	8
1.9. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	9
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
2.1. PRESENTATION	11
2.2. WHAT IS READING?	11
2.2.1. Types of Reading Skills	13
2.2.2. Scanning	13
2.2.3. Skimming	14
2.2.4. Reading Aloud	15
2.2.5. Intensive Reading	16
2.2.6. Extensive Reading	16
2.2.7. Narrow Reading	18
2.2.8. Critical Reading	19
2.2.9. Sustained Silent Reading (SSR)	21
2.3. SELECTION OF READING MATERIALS	21
2.3.1. Interest Factor in Selection of Reading Materials	22
2.3.2. Difficulty Level of Reading Materials	23
2.3.3. Authentic Texts	24
2.3.4. Simplified Texts	25
2.4. SCHEMATA AND COMPREHENSION	26
2.4.1. Culture and Reading	30
2.4.2. Bottom-up Processing, Top-down Processing, and the Interactive Model	32

	<u>Page No</u>
2.5. READING STRATEGIES.....	33
2.5.1. Pre-Warm-Up Strategies.....	34
2.5.2. Before Reading Strategies.....	34
2.5.3. During Reading Strategies.....	35
2.5.4. After Reading Strategies.....	35
2.5.5. Home Reading Strategies.....	37
2.6. RELATED STUDIES CARRIED OUT ABROAD.....	37
2.7. RELATED STUDIES CARRIED OUT IN TURKEY.....	38
3. METHODOLOGY.....	41
3.1. PRESENTATION.....	41
3.2. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	41
3.3. RESEARCH POPULATION AND SAMPLING.....	42
3.4. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES.....	42
3.5. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY.....	42
3.6. DATA ANALYSIS.....	43
4. DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	44
4.1. PRESENTATION.....	44
4.2. FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SUB-HYPOTHESES UNDER THE HEADING OF MAIN HYPOTHESIS 1.....	44
4.3. FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SUB-HYPOTHESES UNDER THE HEADING OF HYPOTHESIS 2.....	61
4.4. FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SUB-HYPOTHESES UNDER THE HEADING OF MAIN HYPOTHESES 3-4.....	85
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	92
5.1. PRESENTATION.....	92
5.2. SUMMARY.....	92
5.3. CONCLUSIONS.....	92
5.3.1. Conclusions of Seventeen Statements (Statements 1-17), Regarding the Opinions of Instructors and Students about the Problems Related with the Reading Classes Concerning Before Reading Activities in Reading Classes.....	93
5.3.2. Conclusion of Twenty-Four Statements (Statements 18-41), Regarding the Opinions of Instructors and Students about the Problems Related with the Reading Classes Concerning While-Reading Activities in Reading Classes.....	97
5.3.3. Conclusion of Seven Statements (Statements 42-48) Regarding the Opinions of Instructors and Students about the Problems Related with Reading Classes Concerning Post Reading Activities and Home Reading Activities in Reading Classes.....	102
5.4. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	104
5.4.1. Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypothesis “Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using Some Related Pictures.”.....	105
5.4.1.1. Illustration.....	105
5.4.1.2. Using visual aids.....	106

	<u>Page No</u>
5.4.2. Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypothesis “Before Reading Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Period in Which the Work was Written.”.....	106
5.4.2.1. Giving background knowledge	106
5.4.2.2. Margin “knowledge” question	106
5.4.2.3. Pre-reading plan (prep)	107
5.4.2.4. Biographical montage	107
5.4.2.5. Guessing at missing information.....	107
5.4.2.6. Previewing	107
5.4.3 Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypotheses (2.6) and (2.8)	108
5.4.3.1. Extracting and classifying vocabulary from the text.....	108
5.4.3.2. Dictionary exercise.....	108
5.4.3.3. Word prediction	108
5.4.3.4. Vocabulary map	109
5.4.3.5. Miming the meaning of unknown words	109
5.4.3.6. Word listing.....	109
5.4.4. Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypotheses (3.3),(3.5) and (3.7).....	109
5.4.4.1. Question and answer worksheets	110
5.4.4.2. Question worksheets leading to pair work in class	110
5.4.4.3. Do it yourself’ questions	110
5.4.4.4. Summaries with gaps	110
5.4.4.5. Summaries with incomplete sentences.....	111
5.4.4.6. Copy-delete strategy.....	111
5.4.4.7. Language worksheets	111
5.4.4.8. Creating a bibliography.....	111
5.4.4.9. Analyzing and revising	112
5.4.4.10. Soliloquy/thought tracking.....	112
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	113
REFERENCES	114
APPENDICES	125
VITAE(ÖZGEÇMİŞ)	130

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page No</u>
Table 4.1 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading Activity the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Subject of the Work.".....	44
Table 4.2 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading Activity the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work by Reading it Quickly.".....	45
Table 4.3 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using the Title of the Work.".....	46
Table 4.4 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using Some Related Pictures."	47
Table 4.5 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using the Students' Previous Knowledge about the Author/Poet."	48
Table 4.6 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Period in which the Work was Written.".....	49
Table 4.7 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Author/Poet of the Work.".....	50
Table 4.8 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Characters of the Work.".....	51
	<u>Page No</u>
Table 4.9 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to The Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives	

Background Knowledge about the Linguistic/Stylistic Features of The Work.”	52
Table 4.10 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Cultural Features of the Work.”	53
Table 4.11 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Wants His/Her Students to Make a Research on Cultural Background of the Work.”	54
Table 4.12 The Frequencies and the Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Creates a Situation for Classroom Discussion on the Title of the Work.”	55
Table 4.13 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Asks Questions Using the Question Words; How, Why, Where, Who, What, When.”	56
Table 4.14 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language by Making Research Before the Lesson.”	57
Table 4.15 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language Watching Some Video Cassettes.”	58
Table 4.16 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement “The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language Listening to Radio Programmes in English.”	59
Table 4.17 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement “The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language Reading English Magazines, Newspapers.”	60
Table 4.18 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement “The Instructor Gives the Vocabulary of the Work Using the opposites of the Unknown Words.”	61
	<u>Page No</u>
Table 4.19 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and the Instructors' responses to the Statement “The Instructor Gives the Synonyms of the Vocabulary.”	62

Table 4.20	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Wants His/Her Students Try to Grasp the Meaning of the Unknown Vocabulary from the Context."	63
Table 4.21	The Frequencies and Percentages of The Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Use English-English Dictionary to Learn the Unknown Vocabulary."	64
Table 4.22	The Frequencies and Percentages of The Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Use English-Turkish Dictionary to Learn the Unknown Vocabulary."	65
Table 4.23	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Do Not See the Unknown Words as 'Problem' While Reading. They Try to Understand the Main Idea."	66
Table 4.24	The Frequencies and Percentages of The Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives the Meaning of Unknown Words by Drawing Pictures on the Board."	62
Table 4.25	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives the Meaning of Unknown Words by Using Mimes."	68
Table 4.26	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to The Statement "The Instructor Gives the Meaning of Unknown Words by Using Them in The Sample Sentences."	69
Table 4.27	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading Structural Differences between the Students' Mother Tongue and Target Language Cause a Problem."	70
Table 4.28	The Frequencies and Percentages of The Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading Unknown Words are Problem on The Students' Understanding."	71
Table 4.29	The Frequencies and Percentages of The Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading Insufficient Cultural Background Knowledge Causes a Problem of Understanding."	72
	<u>Page No</u>	
Table 4.30	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Try to Understand the Whole Work."	73

Table 4.31	The Frequencies and Percentages of The Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “While Reading the Students Try To Understand Only a Part of the Work.”	74
Table 4.32	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “While Reading the Students Try to Have their Own Interpretations about the Whole Work.”	75
Table 4.33	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “The Students can Read Two Works (i.e. Two Stories which Have Similar Linguistic Features or Similar Subjects) by Comparing them with Each Other.”	76
Table 4.34	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “The Students Listen to the Work which is Examined in the Classroom on the Tape Recorder.”	77
Table 4.35	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “The Students Watch the Work they are Examining on Video.”	78
Table 4.36	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “After Reading Some Parts of the Work, the Students are Asked to Predict the Other Parts of The Works.”	79
Table 4.37	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “While Reading the Students Make their Interpretations In the Classroom Discussion.”	80
Table 4.38	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “While Reading the Students Play the Work in the Classroom.”	81
Table 4.39	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “While Reading the Students Create a Discussion about the Characters of the Work.”	82
Table 4.40	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “While Reading the Students Put themselves in the Shoes of the Characters and Write Diaries.”	83
Table 4.41	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “While Reading the Students Write Dialogues between Two Characters of the Work.”	84
	<u>Page No</u>	
Table 4.42	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students’ and Instructors’ Responses to the Statement “After Reading the Students Write a Summary about what they Have Understood from The Passage.”	85

Table 4.43	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "After Reading the Students are Given Only Passage Reading as Homework."	86
Table 4.44	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Given Worksheets about the Period in which the Work was Written as Homework."	87
Table 4.45	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Given Worksheets about the Characters of the Work."	88
Table 4.46	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' responses to the Statement "The Students are Given Worksheets about Authors/Poets of the Work."	89
Table 4.47	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Wanted to Study the Linguistic Features of the Work as Homework."	90
Table 4.48	The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The students are Given Worksheets as Homework with the Worksheets of the Vocabulary."	91

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1. PRESENTATION

In this study, the problems faced by teachers and students related with reading classes are going to be investigated at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School in terms of the components of reading activities such as before-reading activities (in other words; into activities, warm-up activities, pre-reading activities), while-reading activities (in other words; through reading activities, during reading activities), post-reading activities (in other words; beyond reading activities, follow-up activities, after reading activities), and home-reading activities (Henceforth, terms given in the first place will be referred to). This chapter consists of the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the hypotheses, the assumptions and the limitations, and the operational definitions.

1.2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Reading is described as both a process and a product. The main purpose of reading is to develop the necessary attitudes, abilities and skills in the reader which are needed for obtaining information, agreeing or reacting to ideas, and developing interests (Badrawi, 1992:16). Grabe and Stoller (2002:9 cited in Razi, 2005) define reading as the ability to extract meaning from the printed page and interpret this knowledge correctly. Another definition of reading is that it is the act of constructing meaning from text (Pressley, 1998 cited in New Mexico Reading Initiative, 2005). Reading is regarded as a continuously developing skill. It is not possible to learn all at once; it improves by making practise (<http://www.sarasota.k12.fl.us/sarasota>). Reading is an interactive process between a reader and a text. While trying to extract the meaning, there is an dynamic interaction between the reader and the text (Alyousef, 2005). The most important goal of language learning programmes is learning to read with understanding (Dlugosz, 2000:289). Learners should learn a

number of reading skills which will help them in comprehension. They should be taught how to read for the main idea, for details, for specific information, for the gist of the text. They should also read critically and use the dictionary (Badrawi, 1992:17). It is the EFL teachers' job to supplement effective reading activities to help learners become efficient readers (Rivas, 1999:12).

Reading has five phases. The first one is the pre-pre-reading phase (see section 2.4.1). In this stage, students make short exercises or discuss interesting messages. These activities also help learners do some review of materials previously taught (Reis, 1993). The second one is the before reading phase (see section 2.4.2) and its goal is to give or activate the background knowledge to the readers for comprehension of texts. The third one is the while-reading phase (see section 2.4.3). Strategy and skill practice, and linguistic development, as well as helping learners to understand the purpose of the writer, and the text structure and content are the main goals of this phase. The fourth one, the post-reading phase (see section 2.4.4) helps the readers to relate the text to their own life, knowledge, and opinions. The fifth one is the home-reading (see section 2.4.5), which helps the readers to get some background knowledge before reading and during reading (Rivas, 1999:16-18). In the Phil's EFL Support Site (2005), it is stated that pre-reading phase introduces and stimulates interest in the topic and motivates students by providing a reason for reading. It also provides language preparation for the text. While-Reading phase clarifies content and vocabulary of the text and helps students understand the writer's purpose. It helps students understand the structure of the text as well. In the post-reading phase, the aim is to consolidate and reflect upon what has been said and relate the text to the students' own knowledge. This phase provides a stimulus for other language activities. Lately, a fifth stage has been added which can be considered as pre-pre-reading stage. In this stage, students make short exercises or discuss interesting messages. These activities also help learners do some review of materials previously taught (Reis, 1993).

While reading, information is extracted according to the purpose of reading, interests, motivations, and so on. Our previous experience and knowledge of the world helps us to understand cohesion, coherence, concepts and points and view, and the conventions of the written language (Lopes, 1991:42). Relevant background experience reinforces understanding (Williams, 1983:11). Badrawi (1992:16)

mentioned that "If the reader's background, training, attitude, and so on, are similar to the writer's, he is likely to interpret the text with no conscious effort".

This study has been carried on at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School in the first year and the second year classes. Düziçi is a town of Osmaniye in Akdeniz Region. Düziçi is on the east of Çukurova and on the west sides of the Amanos Mountains. Düziçi is surrounded by Ceyhan River, Berke Dam and Aslantaş Dam on the north; by Amanos Mountains and Bahçe (a town of Osmaniye) on the east; by Kadirli (a town of Osmaniye) on the north-west; by Andırın (a town of Kahramanmaraş) on the north-east; by Osmaniye on the south and south-west. About forty thousand people live in Düziçi. Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School was thrown open in 1993. Up to now, 1243 students graduated from this school. It has only one preparatory class with 30 students. There are three first year classes with 90 students. There are four second year classes with 70 students. These second year classes are divided into four departments; Science, Turkish and Mathematics, Social Sciences, and the Foreign Language (English). There are four third year classes with 67 students. These classes are also divided into four departments; Science, Turkish and Mathematics, Social Sciences, and the Foreign Language (English). English is taught by seven teachers in this school. In the preparatory class, English is taught at an elementary level. Grammar is focused on and less time is spent for reading in this class. In the first year and the second year classes, especially in the foreign language (English) departments, four basic skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) are taught. In the third year classes, only grammar is reviewed and in the Foreign Language (English) department, tests are solved for the preparation of University Entrance Exams for English.

1.3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Students of Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School have some problems in reading classes. They claim that they are not successful in comprehending the text at the end of reading classes. The underlying reason of their failure is thought to be that the necessary reading activities are not applied during reading classes. Students need to learn how to comprehend a text and need to be taught specific reading skills such as scanning, skimming, activating background knowledge or deducing the meaning from the context.

The other weakness of the students of Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School is that they pay too much attention to details and as a result they often miss the main ideas. One of the basic skills of reading is the identifying of the main idea. (Mickulecky, 1984:263). If the reader does not have this ability, s/he will get lost in a mass of detail. Also, the students have small reading vocabulary and this blocks their comprehension. "Instead of allowing new word to frighten him, the reader should approach them positively and use specific techniques to deal with them" (Badrawi, 1992:17).

The next weakness of those students in reading classes is considered to be the limited background knowledge. "Comprehending a text is an interactive process between the reader's background knowledge and the text" (Carell and Eisterhold, 1983 cited in McKay, 1987:18). Sufficient background knowledge makes reading easier to understand.

1.4. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The students at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School get some difficulties with comprehending the reading texts because of the insufficient reading activities applied in reading classes. As it mentioned earlier in this study, the problems faced by the teachers and the students related with reading classes are going to be investigated in terms of the components of reading activities such as before-reading activities, while-reading activities, post reading activities, and home reading activities.

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the opinions of instructors and students towards the problems related with the reading classes at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In this study, it is hoped to come up with certain implications for the students, the teachers and the syllabus designers towards the betterment of reading classes. EFL teachers should help their students develop a positive attitude toward reading and encourage them to read more. In this study, it is aimed at suggesting some reading techniques and skills which will help the students and the teachers in reading classes.

It is also hoped that the instructors of Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School will make use of the results of this study by paying attention to the needs of their students while they suggest reading activities in a reading class.

1.6. HYPOTHESES

This study has four main hypotheses which have also their subsequent sub-hypotheses.

Main Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students towards the problems related with the 'before- reading activities' in reading classes.

This hypothesis has 17 sub-hypotheses related to the opinions of instructors and students according to the statements regarding the before-reading activities.

There is no significant difference in the responses of instructors and students concerning the statements:

1.1 Before reading, the instructor gives background knowledge about the subject of the work.

1.2 Before reading, the instructor gives information about the subject of the work by reading it quickly.

1.3 Before reading, the instructor gives information about the subject of the work using the title of the work.

1.4 Before reading, the instructor gives information about the subject of the work using some related pictures.

1.5 Before reading, the instructor gives information about the subject of the work using the students' previous knowledge about the author/poet.

1.6 Before reading, the instructor gives background knowledge about the period in which the work was written.

1.7 Before reading, the instructor gives background knowledge about the author/poet of the work.

1.8 Before reading, the instructor gives background knowledge about the characters of the work.

1.9 Before reading, the instructor gives background knowledge about the linguistic/stylistic features of the work.

1.10 Before reading, the instructor gives background knowledge about the cultural features of the work.

1.11 Before reading, the instructor wants his or her students to make a research on cultural background of the work.

1.12 Before reading the instructor creates a situation for classroom discussion on the title of the work.

1.13 Before reading, the instructor asks questions using the question words; how, why, where, who, what, when.

1.14 The students have the cultural background of the target language by making research before the lesson.

1.15 The students have the cultural background of the target language watching some video cassettes.

1.16 The students have the cultural background of the target language listening to radio programmes in English.

1.17 The students have the cultural background of the target language reading English magazines, newspapers.

Main Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students towards the problems related with the 'while-reading activities' in reading classes.

This hypothesis has 24 sub-hypotheses related to the opinions of instructors and students according to the statements concerning the while-reading activities.

There is no significant difference in the responses of instructors and students concerning the statements:

2.1 The instructor gives the vocabulary of the work using the opposites of the unknown work.

2.2 The instructor gives the synonyms of the vocabulary.

2.3 The instructor wants his/her students try to grasp the meaning of the unknown vocabulary from the context.

2.4 The students use English-English dictionary to learn the unknown vocabulary.

2.5 The students use English-Turkish dictionary to learn the unknown vocabulary.

2.6 The students do not see the unknown words as "problem" while reading. They try to understand the main idea.

2.7 The instructor gives the meaning of unknown words by drawing pictures on the board.

2.8 The instructor gives the meaning of unknown words by using mimes.

2.9 The instructor gives the meaning of unknown words by using them in the sample sentences.

2.10 While reading, structural differences between the students' mother tongue and target language cause a problem.

2.11 While reading, unknown words are problem on the students' understanding.

2.12 While reading, insufficient cultural background knowledge causes a problem of understanding.

2.13 While reading, the students try to understand the whole work.

2.14 While reading, the students try to understand only a part of the work.

2.15 While reading, the students try to have their own interpretations about the whole work.

2.16 The students can read two works (i.e. two stories which have similar linguistic features or similar subjects) by comparing them with each other.

2.17 The students listen to the work which is examined in the classroom on the tape recorder.

2.18 The students watch the work they are examining on video.

2.19 After reading some parts of the work, the students are asked to predict the other parts of the works.

2.20 While reading, the students make their interpretations in the classroom discussion.

2.21 While reading, the students play the work in the classroom.

2.22 While reading, the students create a discussion about the characters of the work.

2.23 While reading, the students put themselves in the shoes of the characters and write diaries.

2.24 While reading, the students write dialogues between two characters of the work.

Main Hypotheses 3 and 4: There is no significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students towards the problems related with the "post-reading activities" and "home-reading activities" in reading classes.

These hypotheses have 7 sub-hypotheses concerning the opinions of instructors and students according to the statements regarding the post-reading activities and home-reading activities.

There is no significant difference in the responses of the instructors and students concerning the statements:

3.1 After reading, the students write a summary about what they have understood from the passage.

3.2 After reading, the students are given only passage reading as homework.

3.3 The students are given worksheets about the period in which the work was written as homework.

3.4 The students are given worksheets about the characters of the work.

3.5 The students are given worksheets about authors/poets of the work.

3.6 The students are wanted to study the linguistic features of the work as homework.

3.7 The students are given worksheets as homework with the worksheets of the vocabulary.

1.7. ASSUMPTIONS

In this study, it was assumed that the teachers and the students in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School gave the true objective answers which indicate the general situation in their reading classes. It was also assumed that the questionnaire was accepted valid and reliable after conducting a pilot study in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

1.8. LIMITATIONS

1. This study has suggestions only for the teachers and students in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

2. The results can only be used in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

3. Suggestions were limited to the opinions of teachers and students who have answered the questionnaire distributed in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

4. The students' questionnaire was given to the first year classes and the second year classes.

1.9. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

EFL: EFL is an abbreviation for “English as a Foreign Language”. This means mainly to talk about students whose first language are not English and are learning English in their own country. For example, a Chinese person who is learning English in China (ESL Clubhouse, 2004).

ESL: ESL is an abbreviation for “English as a Second Language”. This term is often used to talk about foreign students who are learning English while they are living in an English speaking country. For example, a Chinese person who is learning English in Canada (ESL Clubhouse, 2004).

Comprehension: Comprehension is understanding or mentally grasping the meaning of something. It is an ability to understand the meaning or importance of something (Myers and Palmer, 2002).

Background Knowledge: The knowledge of the world that the reader or listener makes use of in interpreting a piece of spoken or written language (<http://ub.es/div5/departam/dll/resources/prov71.htm>)carrying).

Fluency: The use of the language freely to express our own ideas. To focus on meaning rather than form to communicate (<http://ub.es/div5/departam/dll/resources/prov71.htm>).

Target Language: The language which is being learned, whether it is the first language or a second (or third or fourth) language (<http://ub.es/div5/departam/dll/resources/prov71.htm>).

Task: The carrying out of an activity/series of activities to achieve a pre-established objective (<http://ub.es/div5/departam/dll/resources/prov71.htm>).

Reading Skills: Reading skills are specific abilities which help a reader to read the written form as meaningful language, read anything written with independence, comprehension, and fluency, and mentally interact with the message (SIL International, 1999).

Motivation: Motivation is defined as a desire to achieve a goal, combined with the energy to work towards that goal (Lintern, 2002).

Surface Meaning: Surface meaning means what the words on the page mean; sometimes that is all they do mean, but sometimes there are implicit meanings, too (http://www.longman.co.uk/tt_seceng/resources/glosauth.htm).

Reading Strategy: Reading strategies are specific actions readers take to make meaning from context (<http://l1t.msu.edu/vol6num3/brandl/default.html>).

Reading Technique: As learners become more confident in their reading, they can learn to apply a range of techniques in order to extract the information they need from texts

(http://www.dfes.gov.uk/curriculum_literacy/tree/reading/readingcomp/guidance/2/).

CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter includes the definitions of reading, reading styles (scanning, skimming, reading aloud, silent reading, intensive reading, extensive reading, narrow reading, critical reading), selection of reading materials (interest factor in selection of reading materials, difficulty level of reading materials), schemata and the comprehension of text (culture and reading), reading strategies (pre-warm-up strategies, before reading strategies, during reading strategies, after reading strategies, home reading strategies), related studies carried out abroad and in Turkey.

2.2. WHAT IS READING?

Reading is defined as constructing meaning from a text (New Mexico Reading Initiative, 2005). Grabe and Stoller (2002:273 cited in Razi, 2005) describe reading as the ability to construct meaning from the printed page and interpret this information correctly. Reading has been the skill most emphasized in traditional foreign language teaching, and even today is the mainstay of English as a foreign language instruction in many countries (Susser and Robb, 1989). Many attempts have been made to define reading. Reading is a psycholinguistic guessing game that involves an interaction between thought and language. Reading processes are cycles of sampling, predicting, testing, and confirming. Two types of information are important in reading. The first one is the visual information which we get from the printed page and the second one is the nonvisual information which includes our understanding of the relevant language, our familiarity of the subject matter, our general ability in reading, and our knowledge of the world (Mei-yun, 1989:13).

Moreover, Smith (1971:43) states that reading depends on the information getting through the eyes to the brain and the things the brain tells the eye is much more important than what the eye tells the brain. When reading, the information we

extract depends on the purpose of our reading, our interests, motivations and so on. We get information to make sense of what we read, using our world knowledge and our previous experience. By using our previous language, we can identify and understand cohesion, coherence, and conventions of written language (Lopes, 1991:42). According to Nazly Badrawi (1992:16) reading is both a process and a product. It does not mean just receiving meaning in a literal sense.

The main purpose for teaching reading is to develop in the reader the attitudes, abilities, and skills needed for obtaining information, fostering and reacting to ideals, developing interests and a deriving pleasure by reading through understanding. It should be viewed as an important goal to read with understanding (Dlugosz, 2000:285). Reading is a mental process. It is not just getting meaning from the printed page. Meaning lies in the mind of the person who wrote the words. The interpretation of the texts will be easy if the reader's background, training, attitude, and so on, are similar to the writer's (Badrawi, 1992:16). Martin (1991) states that the purpose of reading is to connect the ideas on the page to what you already know. If you do not know anything about a subject, then pouring words of text into your mind is like pouring water into your head. You do not retain much. For example, if you like sports, then it is easy for you to read the sports-page. You have a framework in your mind for reading, understanding, and storing information.

Good readers are active readers. From the outset they have clear goals in mind for their reading. They constantly evaluate whether the text, and their reading of it, is meeting their goals. Good readers typically look over the text before they read noting such things as the structure of the text and text sections that might be most relevant to their reading goals. As they read, good readers frequently make predictions about what is to come. They read selectively, continually making decisions about their reading; what to read quickly, what to read carefully, what not to read, what to re-read, and so on. Good readers construct, revise, and question the meanings they make as they read. They draw upon, compare, and integrate their prior knowledge with material in the text. They think about the authors of the text, their style, beliefs, intentions, and so on. They monitor their understanding of the text making adjustments in their reading as necessary. Good readers try to determine the meaning of unfamiliar words and concepts in the text and deal with inconsistencies or gaps as needed (Duke and Pearson, 1992).

The types of texts we generally come across are novels, short stories, tales, other literary texts and passages, essays, diaries, anecdotes, biographies, plays, poems, letter postcards, telegrams, notes, newspaper and magazine headlines and articles, letters to the editor, weather forecasts, radio and TV programmes, reviews, handbooks, text-books and guide books. The reason for reading is to get something from the writing: facts, ideas, enjoyment, even feelings. The aim is to get the message the writer has expressed. This is the authentic reason for reading. Students usually read to improve, practice, and consolidate specific linguistic items—vocabulary, structure, and so on. This is not the authentic use of a text. In the reading classes, teachers' concern should be to increase motivation by making foreign-language reading interesting. The stronger your interest, the greater your comprehension (Martin, 1991). So, authentic materials should be used in reading classes to reflect the authentic purposes for which people do in fact read. Therefore, the first requirement in a reading lesson is that the text should;

a) interest the students,

b) be at the right level of difficulty,

c) be authentic (Evangelidou, et al., 1990:31). It is stated that the major reasons for lack of reading comprehension are poor motivation and lack of experience. However, teachers can help students regain their motivation and improve their reading performance by connecting reading assignments to real-world reading experiences (Hollaway, 1999).

2.2.1. Types of Reading Skills

Although our reading purposes vary in our lives and some of the terms related with reading such as skimming or scanning are often used indiscriminately, therefore the main ways of reading and their definitions are given as follows:

1) Scanning; 2) Skimming; 3) Reading aloud; 4) Silent reading; 5) Intensive reading; 6) Extensive reading; 7) Narrow reading; 8) Critical reading.

2.2.2. Scanning

Scanning is described as a type of reading which involves finding a particular piece of information located in a material. In order to locate information quickly depends on the reader's knowledge about how a text is organized (Ghani, 1993:42-43). Howard (2005) describes scanning as surveying a text to find the part

that contains the information readers need. Scanning is reading rapidly through a text to find particular information (<http://esl.about.com/library/lessons/nbreadtypes.htm>, 2005). You read through a text looking for something specific (English Language Centre, 1998). Scanning is described as quickly going through a text to find a particular piece of information (Phil's EFL Support Site, 2005). Thuss (1999) points out that after having skimmed the text, the reader can study the text in more detail reading more slowly and carefully and looking for specific information that he is interested in. This is called scanning. Scanning is quickly going through a text to find a specific piece of information, for example: (a) Look at page X and find out when and where Michael Jackson was born; (b) How many times does the word "student" occur on this page? (Evangelidou, et.al, 1990:31).

2.2.3. Skimming

Skimming means to glance rapidly through a text to determine its general content or gist. It can be asked to students to locate facts to say briefly what a text is about (Evangelia et.al, 1990:31). Skimming is defined as reading rapidly for the main points of a reading material (<http://esl.about.com/library/lessons/nbreadtypes.htm>, 2005). Ghani (1993:42) defines skimming as reading rapidly through a text to get a general idea about the subject. You read a text very quickly to get the main ideas (English Language Centre, 1998). Skimming is described as quickly reading a text to get the gist of it (Phil's EFL Support Site, 2005). Hyland (1990:16) points out that skimming is a more text-oriented form of surveying and refers to the method of glancing through a text to extract the gist of main points. Students can learn something of the text topic by using the title and any subheadings; it should be known that the first and last paragraphs often include valuable background, summarizing, or concluding information. The students should be aware of the importance of topic sentences and where to find them. Thuss (1999) states that before starting to read a text in detail, the reader should take a moment to preview the text. Reading quickly without pausing to study the details is called skim reading or skimming. The reader should understand:

- a) for which audience the text was written (general public, professionals, laymen, etc.).
- b) What type of text it is (report, informal letter, article, advertisement, etc.).

- c) What the purpose of the author is (to describe, to inform, to explain, to instruct, to persuade).
- d) The general contents of the text.

2.2.4. Reading Aloud

Reading aloud is one of the most used techniques in reading classes (Nicholas, 1989:33). Reading aloud shows the relationship between the printed word and meaning (NW, 2005). Hubbard (1983, in Nicholas 1989:33) points out that reading aloud is a useful technique for testing pronunciation and general fluency. Dhaif (1990:458, in Amer 1997:43) states that reading aloud is especially important at the early stages of learning the language. Beginning readers aim to read word by word. By reading aloud, they read longer semantic units rather than focusing on graphic cues. At this point, reading aloud helps readers to achieve a higher level of comprehension by reading longer meaningful units of texts rather than focusing on individual units. Reading aloud to students can be a vehicle for providing information, explaining concepts. Through this activity, a teacher can build and clarify important background knowledge before introducing a new concept or unit of study, and at the same time more interest conducive to a higher level of learning (PSSA Classroom Connection, 2006).

There are some objections to reading aloud. Nuttall (1982:138) states that it is not easy for the teacher and the student to read aloud round the class. It is clear that listening to someone else read is not a very stimulating or challenging exercise. Besides this, it does not bear any value to listen to an inefficient or an inaccurate model in developing reading skills.

The language learner who is asked to read is usually embarrassed by his/her bad performance and this causes a demotivating effect on him/her. If s/he is a sensitive teenager, s/he will not participate in most reading activities (Nicholas, 1989:3).

The texts often used for reading aloud in reading classes are not suitable for this kind of exercise because they were not written for this purpose. The texts which are used for intensive reading or extensive reading should be read silently and cannot be fully appreciated when read aloud. The process of reading aloud obstructs comprehension because the reader focuses on producing the right pronunciation of the words rather than on their meaning (Nicholas, 1989:34).

2.2.5. Intensive Reading

Intensive reading means reading shorter texts to get detailed information with a specific emphasis on complete understanding (<http://esl.abot.com/library/>, 2005). LeLoup and Ponterio (2005) describe intensive reading as reading texts by closely focusing on meaning and structures to get all the details. The purpose of intensive reading for Grellet (1981, cited in Bruton, 2002) is to extract particular information. Nuttall (1982:23) points out that intensive reading involves approaching the text under the close guidance of the teacher or under the guidance of a task which forces the student to pay great attention to the text. Intensive reading is defined as reading shorter texts to extract accurate detailed information (Phil's EFL Support Site, 2005). In intensive reading, the purpose is to arrive at a profound and detailed understanding of the text. You read through a text very carefully, almost every word, because it is important to understand every word (English Language Centre, 1998). According to Alyousef (2005), the aim of the intensive reading is to read a text to get the meaning and to be acquainted with writing mechanisms. Shelton (2006) stresses that intensive reading refers to careful reading and possibly translation of shorter, more difficult foreign language texts with the ultimate goal of complete and detailed understanding. It is often the case that intensive reading is the only kind of reading that students do in the language classroom.

Sonka (1979:45) states that intensive reading refers to the kind of work done in the class requires optimal concentration and a careful approach to the reading material. Bamford and Day (1997) define intensive reading as the careful reading of shorter, more difficult foreign language texts with the goal of complete and detailed understanding. Intensive reading is also associated with the teaching of reading in terms of its component skills. Texts are studied intensively in order to introduce and practice reading skills such as distinguishing the main idea of a text from the detail, finding pronoun referents, or guessing the meaning of unknown words.

2.2.6 Extensive Reading

Appleton (2005) expresses that extensive reading is to read extended texts for pleasure willingly. LeLoup and Ponterio (2005) define extensive reading as reading longer texts without focusing on details or looking up all vocabulary. Another definition of extensive reading is reading longer texts for pleasure to get an overall understanding (<http://esl.about.com/library/lessons/nbreadtypes.htm>, 2005).

Robb and Susser (1989) point out that an extensive reading programme is the single most effective way of improving both vocabulary and reading skills in general. Extensive reading is defined as reading longer texts, usually for pleasure (Phil's EFL Support Site, 2005). Shelton (2005) defines extensive reading as reading large amounts to get a global understanding of what you are reading. Extensive reading is generally associated with reading large amounts with the aim of getting an overall understanding of the material. Readers are more concerned with the meaning of the text than the meaning of individual words or sentences (Bambard and Day, 1997). Hedge (2003 cited in Alyousef, 2005) expresses the view that extensive reading changes due to the students' motivation and school resources. A well-motivated and trained teacher's job is to choose suitable handouts or books for the students. The selected texts for extensive reading should be authentic, since extensive reading helps the readers develop their reading ability and language competence. You read through a text because you are interested in it. You read the entire text but you do not really need to understand every word (English Language Centre, 1998). Graney (2005) expresses the view that extensive reading focuses on reading a quantity of materials that are easy for students to read. Grundy (2004) points out that extensive reading plays an important role for students to read a wide variety of texts in the target language that encourage exposure to a wide range of text types. Extensive reading also plays a role in the development of general knowledge which is an important factor in comprehension. While choosing materials for extensive reading, it should be taken into consideration that there should be very little new vocabulary and grammar. Using extensive reading in a classroom atmosphere is not an easy thing to do. It takes much time to make a suitable curriculum, since everyone is not reading the same thing at the same time. Choosing the appropriate reading materials is the most difficult job (Blogger, 2005).

The reading materials which are selected for extensive reading programs should address students' needs, tasks and interests in order to energize and motivate them to read the books. In Yemen, this was achieved through the use of familiar material and popular titles reflecting the local culture (e.g. Aladdin and His Lamp) (Bell, 1998).

Much classroom reading work has traditionally focused on studying of shorter texts for presenting lexical and grammatical points or for providing students

with limited practise in various reading skills and strategies. However, a large number of students in the EFL/ESL world require reading for academic purposes and therefore need training in study skills and strategies for reading longer texts and books. So, extensive reading helps readers build confidence with extended texts (Bell, 1998).

2.2.7. Narrow Reading

Narrow reading is defined as confining reading to a single topic or works by a single author. The advantages of narrow reading are listed in the following:

1. Students who read either a single topic or author comprehend the texts easier after the first few pages.
2. Readers become familiar with the repeated vocabulary of a particular topic or the particular style of the writer.
3. The repeated schemata (i.e. culture-specific knowledge) increases comprehension (Norris, 1999).

According to Frenrickson (2001), the theory is that by reading within the same topic, you can more easily understand the main ideas and the vocabulary used to describe them. Instead of struggling with totally new material, you will see many words and ideas repeated –a big help in understanding and remembering them. He states that the newspaper is the perfect place to find material for narrow reading. First, new stories often continue for many days. Each day you read, the story becomes more familiar and easier to understand. Secondly, newspapers tend to focus on certain types of topics such as politics, crime, the environment and the activities of famous and powerful people. By focusing one topic at a time, you can quickly build up the language and the knowledge necessary to read stories within this topic. Krashen (2004) points out that as they read narrowly, narrow readers gain more contextual knowledge. When they read more in one area, they will learn more in that particular area.

Some students' apparent reading problems may be problems of insufficient background knowledge. Where this is taught to be topic related, it has been suggested that 'narrow reading' within the students' area of knowledge or interest may improve the situation. Similarly, where schema deficiencies are culture-specific, it could be useful to provide local texts or texts which are developed from the reader's own experiences (Stott, 2001).

2.2.8. Critical Reading

Critical reading is described as the reader's applying of certain processes, models, questions, and theories that result in enhanced clarity and comprehension (The Writing Centre, 2005). Robertson (2005) expresses the view that to keep your purpose in mind while reading is the first step in critical reading. It would be better to take a few moments to think about your expectations from the text. Collins (1993) defines critical reading as to make judgements about how a text is argued. Knott's definition (2005) of critical reading is the ability of making judgements about how a text is argued. According to Wheeler (2003), critical reading is actually thinking about a subject, moving beyond what the original essay concluded to the point of how the author reached that conclusion and the degree to which that conclusion is accurate. The key is that you should not read looking only or primarily for information. You should read looking for ways of thinking about the subject matter. For active, critical reading to occur, students must be encouraged to question, to make predictions, and to organize ideas which support value judgements. Critical reading helps the reader to engage in the process of reading actively and constructively. In critical reading, it is reader's job to negotiate continually what s/he knows with what s/he is trying to make sense of (Plotnick, 2005). Both the role of background knowledge and the student's ability to draw upon it are essential to critical reading. To become critical readers, the important thing is that students should learn to value their own thinking, compare their thinking and their interpretations with others, and revise or reject parts of that process when it is appropriate (Wesley, 2001).

Hardcastle (1995) presents five critical reading strategies in the following:

1. **Previewing:** Learning about a text before really reading it. Previewing helps readers to get a sense of what the text is about and how it is organized before reading it closely. The easiest way for previewing is to learn from the head notes or other introductory material and to skim to get an overview of the content and organization.

2. **Contextualizing:** Placing a text in its historical, biographical, and cultural contexts. When you read a text, you read it through the lens of your own experience. What you have come to know and value from living in a particular time and place shapes your understanding of the words on the page. But the texts you read were all

written in the past, sometimes in a radically different time and place. To read critically, you need to contextualize, to recognize the differences between your contemporary values and attitudes and those represented in the text (Lye, 1996).

3. Outlining and summarizing: Identifying the main ideas and restating them in your own words.

4. Comparing and contrasting related readings: Exploring likeness and differences between texts to understand them better.

Kurland (2000) points out that critical readers recognize not only what a text says, but also how that portrays the subject matter. They recognize the various ways in which each and every text is the unique creation of a unique author. A non-critical reader might read a history book to learn the facts of the situation or to discover an accepted interpretation of those events. A critical reader might read the same work to appreciate how a particular perspective on the events and a particular selection of facts can lead to particular understanding (Peirce, 1998).

Kiper (2002) states that certain goals should be accomplished for critical reading. These are listed below:

- to recognize an author's purpose
- to understand tone and persuasive elements.
- to recognize bias
- to be open to re-evaluation of current personal beliefs and values.
- to know your own strengths and weaknesses for reading strategies. These may include previewing or looking at the whole article.
- to summarize the main points.

Some of the properties of critical readers are listed in the following:

1- Critical readers spontaneously generate questions before, during, and after reading. Questions generated by critical readers include: Who makes decisions and who is left out? Who benefits and who suffers? Why is a given practice fair or unfair? What are its origins? What alternatives can we imagine? What is required to create a change? (Norton and Scantlebury, 1995).

2- Critical readers use questions to focus their attention on important components of the text. They understand that they can pose questions critically.

3- Critical readers understand that many of the questions are not answered explicitly in the text, but left to the reader's interpretation (University Studies Curriculum Design, 2006).

2.2.9. Sustained Silent Reading (SSR)

Sustained Silent Reading is a period of uninterrupted silent reading (Ladbrook, 2002). Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) can serve many purposes:

1. SSR offers student an opportunity to read material of their own choice.
2. SSR can build students' confidence in their abilities to work through reading trouble spots.
3. Many studies of whole-class groups and of select groups of unmotivated readers show that SSR can result in students wanting to read more.
4. SSR can be one more element in a reading program aimed at demonstrating the joy that reading can bring and develop lifelong readers and learners (Hopkins, 2002).

Grabe (1991:380, cited in Appleton, 2005) stated that silent reading helps the reader build their vocabulary and structural awareness, develop automaticity, increase background knowledge, develop comprehension skills and improve motivation and confidence. Shelton (2006) expresses the view that students can gain confidence in silent reading, since they can verbalize sounds that they previously could not and this results in wider reading by some of the weaker readers in the class. Hopkins (2003) points out that in SSR students have the chance to read material of their own choice. While reading trouble spots, SSR helps to build students' confidence and this increases their motivation. What the teacher does during and after the reading time is crucial. Teachers have the opportunity to demonstrate their interest and enjoyment of reading by providing a role model of silent reading. In order for SSR to be a success, the teacher has to read and modelling does not finish at the end of the silent reading period. Teachers should comment upon and talk about books they read. As a result, students in class will become eager to do the same (Chow and Chou, 2000). Campagna (2005) suggests that the single principle SSR based on is reading is a skill and the more you use it, the better you get at it.

2.3. SELECTION OF READING MATERIALS

The selection of appropriate reading passages is one of the more complex tasks facing the English as a foreign language reading teacher. It is an important decision because it is the content of the materials that determines the amount of vocabulary, language structures and concepts which form a reading program (Cartwright and Cartwright, 1985). It's teacher's duty to motivate reading by selecting the appropriate reading materials, especially for the beginners (Alyousef, 2005). Bean (2002, cited in Hagelstein, 2004) points out that students should be encouraged for self-selection of reading materials in order to read for enjoyment. Callan (2005) states that texts that reflect a reader's vocabulary and comprehension level closely help the readers develop their reading comprehension and vocabulary growth. The teachers should know their students well to choose reading materials appropriately. Studies show that via the careful selection of texts and setting of tasks, effective reading can be encouraged (Phil's EFL Support Site, 2005). It is necessary to use additional readings as supplements regardless of the textbook used in an EFL reading program. The selection of an appropriate reading passage is critical because the focus of the EFL reading class should be on some aspect of reading. If the passage chosen for a reading class is inappropriate, it will affect the success for that particular lesson negatively. However, properly selected materials will free the teacher to work more efficiently to reach the aim of the course and also to show concern for individual reading problems (Day, 1994:20).

2.3.1. Interest Factor in Selection of Reading Materials

Teachers make on decisions about reading materials each day and these decision are made according to some factors such as length of book, type of words included interest factor for the student (Spadorcia, 2004). The most important factor in selecting a reading text is interest. When looking for texts for their students, teachers are often keen to find something interesting (Lewis and Hill, 1985:107). Banville (2005) expresses the view that some students do not have sufficient interest in some subjects that enable them to understand the new content so, the topics should be more relevant and more interesting for the students. Capturing students' interest is the key element in reading. If the teachers choose interesting reading materials for the students, they will read them willingly (Stanley, 2005). Worth (1996, cited in McKenzie, 2002) stresses that interest is the key element for learning to occur.

Interest helps the reader to move to a deeper level of understanding. Interest is important because of its relation to motivation. When the topic of a reading text is not interesting for students, their motivation to read is substantially lessened (Day, 1994:21). Rivers (1981:52) states that development of fluent reading will only be possible if the subject matter interests the readers.

Teachers should try to find reading texts that have a reasonable amount of new information which will interest their students. Too much new information in a story makes it difficult to read regardless of the interest level. A passage that contains relatively little new information can be boring (Day, 1994:20). Phinney (2005) points out that it would be better for students to choose their own reading materials if possible. Knutson (1998) states that in reading classes, teachers should make an analysis about students' interests and provide them with choices of authentic texts. It should be known that reading is more interesting and text information is understood and recalled better when reading is purpose driven.

2.3.2. Difficulty Level of Reading Materials

Materials should be selected by taking into consideration the level of difficulty. The most frequent judgements of teachers about the difficulty of reading materials are complexity of plot, organisation, abstractness of the language, familiarity of vocabulary, and clarity of syntax. Desirable reading materials always draw upon students' backgrounds (NCTE, 2006). Whether the selected reading text is appropriate to the proficiency level of the students or not is an important factor. If a text meets two criteria, then it is appropriate. First, it must be at an appropriate level of complexity. Second, the text should be interesting for the reader (Mackay et.al, 1979:51).

A text should be at the right level of difficulty for the students. The question is to assess the right level of difficulty and determine the number of unknown items which can be included in a reading passage. Too many unfamiliar words in a passage can decrease comprehension (Krashen, 1982:48).

Nuttall (1982:54) points out that inclusion of new words depend on the reader's purpose. If the aim is to get the gist of the text (skimming), a student can skip unfamiliar words. But for intensive reading, which requires a slow and careful reading, a lot of words may be included. Furthermore, Nuttall claims that the texts

with a high proportion of new lexical items will defeat the aims of the reading programme.

Obviously, vocabulary is not the only criterion in selecting materials. However, if the aim is to read a great deal both in and outside the class, the reading material selected for the students should not be too complicated linguistically. A text which is structurally difficult for students will only distract the students and force them to look up many words per page in order to understand the content of the story. Obviously, this will not be an enjoyable activity. As it is known that the primary concern of reading classes is motivation and this motivation should not be killed by providing the students with materials consisting of hundreds of unfamiliar words which certainly kill the pleasure of reading (Gephard, 1987:52).

2.3.3. Authentic Texts

The purpose of an authentic text is to communicate meaning. In other words, an authentic text is one which is written for native speakers of that language to form an authentic communication (Shelton, 2006). Martinez (2002) defines authentic materials as materials that have been produced to fulfil some social purpose in the language community. Kılıçkaya (2004) states that authentic material is significant because it increases students' motivation for learning and makes the learner be exposed to the real language. Daskalos and Ling (2005) point out that authentic texts deal with contents and meaning rather than linguistic forms or other structures. Authentic materials help students deduct cultural messages and prepare them pleasure reading. Howard (2005) states that teachers need to develop appropriate activities that emphasize understanding and give meaningful messages deal with realistic tasks and consist of various learning strategies.

Jordan (1997:105) lists the advantages of using authentic materials in the classroom as in the following:

- 1- Students are exposed to real discourse, as in videos of interviews with famous people.
- 2- They can produce a sense of achievement, e.g., a brochure on England given to students to plan a 4-day visit.
- 3- The same piece of material can be used under different circumstances if the task is different.

4- Books, articles, newspapers, and so on contain a wide variety of text types, language styles not easily found in conventional teaching materials.

5- They can encourage reading for pleasure because they are likely to contain topics of interest to learners.

Richard (2001:253) gives the disadvantages of using authentic texts as listed in the following:

1- They may be too culturally biased, so this will make it difficult to understand outside the language community.

2- The vocabulary might not be relevant to the student's immediate needs.

3- Too many students are mixed, so lower levels have a hard time decoding the texts.

4- Special preparation is necessary which can be time consuming.

5- The material can become outdated easily, e.g. news.

Case (2006) stresses that classroom time can be most usefully spent by the teaching of reading strategies rather than focusing on language to tackle authentic texts. Robert (1997) points out that foreign language teachers are continually searching for better ways of accessing authentic materials and providing experiences that will improve their students' knowledge and skills in these target areas. As the internet transforms communication around the world, it is natural that it should play major role in the foreign language classroom. There are a number of internet applications that can be used to enrich the foreign language classroom such as electronic mail, electronic lists, electronic journals, world wide web, streaming audio and video, search engines, file transfer, chat, audio and video communication (Guariento and Morley, 2001). Dumitrescu (2000:20) points out that authentic texts appear to supply the essential input needed to increase learner awareness of language usage in written and spoken mediums and decrease reliance on pedagogic language rules.

2.3.4. Simplified Texts

Simplified texts are those that are created or adapted to be more accessible to the reader (Heather, 1993). Nation and Deweerdt (2001:55 cited in Davidson, 2001) state that readers take place an essential part of a language learning program and learners of all proficiency levels should have the chance of doing incidental language learning through learning. Unfortunately, unsimplified texts do not give

this opportunity at beginning and intermediate levels since they contain a great deal of unknown words. Daskalos and Ling (2005) express the view that reading texts can be simplified in order to readers' needs and ease comprehension. In other words, simplification of texts used in the classroom is deliberately made by the teacher so that students can understand what they read without too much worrying about unknown words and complex grammar rules.

A good simplified text:

1- is controlled so that there are not many unknown words. The new words are usually explained in the text or used repeatedly.

2- has selected structures. The structures are similar to the ones in the course-book.

3- has a good plot or subject which will motivate the learner to keep reading (Claridge, 2005).

Swaffar (1985, cited in Claridge, 2005) states that simplified texts aim to teach language rather than to communicate. Linng (2005) points out that there should be a balance in the simplified texts; not too simple and not too difficult. If low English proficiency students read simplified texts all the time, their English proficiency will not increase.

2.4. SCHEMATA AND COMPREHENSION

Schema is defined as general knowledge that "represents what is believed to be generally true of a class of things, events, or situations" (Anderson, 1977(b):2 cited in Toprak, 2004:2). According to Razi (2005), schema is defined as background knowledge that helps the reader to make predictions for better comprehension and interactions. Foos (1992:420 cited in Toprak, 2004:3) describes schemata as "the information which is selected from experience, abstracted, interpreted and often integrated with other information that has been presented or with information that is already known". Rubba (2005) points out that topic-centred assemblies of knowledge which exist in a person's stable knowledge base are called schemas. A person's world knowledge is stored in schemas. Readers use their prior knowledge and world experience when they try to comprehend a text. They relate the new information in the text to their schemata. The richer the schema is for a given topic the better a reader will understand the topic. If new textual information does not fit into a

reader's schemata, the reader misunderstands the new material or ignores the new material (Morris, 1997).

Alvarez and Risko (1989) point out that readers rely on their prior knowledge and world experience when trying to comprehend a text. It is this organized knowledge that is accessed during reading that is referred to as schema. Readers make use of their schema when they can relate what they always know about a topic to the facts and ideas appearing in a text.

Chandler (1995) states that schemata are stored in long-term memory and are employed when we interpret our experiences. Many psychological experiments have shown the importance of our expectations in making sense of new experiences. Schemata embody such expectations. In interpreting situations we observe or read about, schemata provide general outlines of phenomena usually associated with similar situations: typical acts, preconditions, roles, motives, and results. According to the schema theory, interpreting events involves mapping the available information on to an appropriate schema which is already stored in memory (this applies whether the situation involves buying something in a shop, reading a story, watching TV, or whatever). We derive these schemata from our past experience.

Schemata theories deal with the reading process where readers combine their background knowledge with the text they read (Razi, 2005). Schiffrin (1994:103 cited in Johnson and Johnson, 1999:283) describes schema theory as "a view of the means by which ... presuppositions are externally constructed and impose external constraints on the ways in which we understand messages." Stott (2001) points out that schema theory is based on the belief that every act of comprehension involves one's knowledge of the world as well. Thus, readers develop a coherent interpretation of the text through the interactive process of combining textual information with the information a reader brings to a text. Some students' apparent reading problems may be problems of insufficient background knowledge. Where this is thought to be topic related, it has been suggested that "narrow reading" knowledge or interest may improve the situation. Similarly, where schema deficiencies are culture-specific, it could be useful to provide local texts or texts which are developed from the readers' own experiences. There are numerous ways in which relevant schemata may be constructed including lectures, visual aids, demonstrations, real life experiences, discussion, role-play, text previewing,

introduction and discussion of key vocabulary, and key-word association activities. Examples of such contextualisation include, showing pictures of a city before asking the students to read a text about that city, or playing a video clip from a film adaptation of the novel the class is about to study. Rumelhart and Ortony (1997: 101-111 cited in Toprak, 2004:3) list the characteristics of schemata in the following:

1. Schemata have variables.
2. Schemata can embed, one within another.
3. Schemata represent knowledge at all levels of abstraction.
4. Schemata represent knowledge rather than definitions.

Schemata theory attempts to address specifically how we actively make meaning of information. A schema is a hypothetical mental structure for representing generic concepts stored in memory. It's a sort of framework, plan, or script.

Knowledge is classified as general (generic) or specific (episodic). (Schank and Abelson, 1997:37 cited in Toprak, 2004:6). General knowledge helps us to understand and interpret another person's action and specific knowledge is used to interpret and participate in events people have been through many times. Schrank and Abelson (1997) rank episodic (specific) knowledge into subgroups, general and specific knowledge and they proposed a script theory that is based on that specific knowledge. In addition Toprak (2004:6) points out that "Their definition of specific knowledge involves direct individual involvement; should individuals encounter events that they had experienced previously, they interpret those events with minimum time and effort. Their background knowledge obtained through personal experiences leads them to an interpretation of the event with the least processing cost." Script theory (Schrank and Abelson, 1997) provides a valuable source for the analysis of event sequences. Schrank and Abelson's script relates to the example of restaurant setting. Everybody knows a script of the events that happen in a restaurant. Therefore, when a restaurant scene takes place in a text, the reader's restaurant script will be activated in their comprehension process naturally. Restaurant scripts of course change from one culture to another culture in details; the important thing is that learners of a second language should be equipped with appropriate schemata in order to comprehend properly a script-based theory, therefore, helpful for students in solving problems in the comprehension of narrative texts (Johnson and Johnson, 1999). Widyamers (1999) stresses that all human beings possess categorical rules or

scripts that they use to interpret the world. New information is processed according to how it fits into these rules, called schema. These schemata can be used not only to interpret but also to predict situation occurring in our environment. Information that does not fit into these schemata may not be comprehended correctly. This is the reason why readers have a difficult time comprehending a text on a subject they are not familiar with even if the person comprehends the meaning of the individual words in the passage. If the waiter in a restaurant, for example, asked you if you would prefer to sing, you may have a difficult time interpreting what he was asking and why, since singing is not something that patrons in a restaurant normally do. However, if you had been to the restaurant in the past and knew that it was frequented by opera students who liked to entertain the crowds you would have incorporated that information into your schema and not be confused when the waiter asked if you would prefer to sing.

Reading is not the passive assimilation of textual information. Comprehension requires the reader to go beyond the information given. Reading texts require the reader's active interpretation. We must draw not only on our knowledge of language but on our knowledge of the world. According to schema theory, readers comprehend a text when they are able to apply a schema that gives it coherence. Schemata allow us to make inferences about what we read. We fill in gaps in a schema which are not specified in the text. Comprehension can be regarded as selecting schemata and confirming that they are appropriate for the text being read, or constructing a new schema which works. A reader who can not find a schema which seems to fit finds the text incomprehensible. In the realm of the schema theory, what is recalled is not the actual words used in a passage but a reconstruction based on what the reader understood. As time passes, we are increasingly less likely to be able to distinguish between details in the text and those which we read into by applying schemata (Chandler, 1995).

Researchers have identified several types of schemata. Content schema refers to background knowledge about the cultural orientation or content of a passage. For example, it might be known that Mark Twain wrote stories about life on the Mississippi River during the nineteenth century. This kind of content schema helps the reader to understand and recall more than do readers less familiar with text content (Singhal, 1998). Formal schemata define reader expectations about how

pieces of textual information will relate to each other and in what order details will appear. For example, in a detective story, a reader could expect the following chain of events: A crime occurs, possible suspects are identified, evidence is uncovered, and the perpetrator is apprehended (Reutrel and Cooler, 1996:201-203).

2.4.1. Culture and reading

Culture is defined as all the accepted and patterned ways of behaviour of a given people. It is that facet of human life learned by people as a result of belonging to some particular group. It is that part of learned behaviour shared with others (Thanasoulas, 2001). Chastain (1988) and Brown (2000, cited in Razi, 2005) define culture as “a way of life that characterises a group of people in a given period of time according to their ideas, customs, skills, arts, and tools.” Rauf (1988) points out that in reading a foreign language text, we extract three levels of meaning: lexical meaning, structural or grammatical meaning, and sociocultural meaning. For lexical or grammatical meanings students may turn to a dictionary or a grammar textbook. It is sociocultural meaning that is the most difficult for a second language learner to penetrate, for it involves the values, beliefs, and attitudes of the speech community. Johnson (2005) states that reading is not simply a decoding operation. It is not enough for the students to get the surface meaning of the text. Reading is an interaction between writer and reader which cannot be had without an insight into the culture of target language. The success of a second language program, therefore, depends on reducing the culture bondage of a student and motivating him to understand the culture of the target language. Stott (2001) indicates that schema theory describes the process by which readers combine their own background knowledge with the information in a text to comprehend that text. All readers carry different schemata and these are also often culture-specific. This is an important concept in EFL teaching, and pre-reading tasks are often designed to build or activate the learner’s schemata.

Each language imposes its user on a language and culture specific narrative schema. EFL students use their culture specific narrative superstructure in their narrative schemata of that particular foreign language. These culture specific narrative schemata enable them to interpret narratives in the foreign language when it resembles the narrative schemata of that particular foreign language (Toprak, 2004:25). Carrell (1988:245) mentions that one of the most obvious reasons why a

particular content schema may fail to exist for a reader is that the schema is culturally specific and is not part of a particular reader's cultural background. He lists numerous ways in which relevant schemata may be constructed including lectures, visual aids, demonstrations, real life experiences, discussion, role-play, text previewing, introduction and discussion of key vocabulary, and key-word/key-concept association activities. Examples of such contextualisation include for example, showing pictures of a city before asking the students to read a text about that city, or playing a video clip from a film adaptation of the novel the class is about to study (Matikainen and Duffy, 2000).

Singhal (1998) states that since many language teachers are not exposed directly to the foreign culture, they should make up for this lack by disciplined reading. They should read critically the works on culture, analysing the differences of interpretation and possible biases. They should supplement this with the study of literature, because it contains culture. Culture insights can also be had from the various media such as newspaper, magazine, radio and television.

Thanasoulas (2001) forms the following goals for the teaching of culture;

1- To help students to develop an understanding of the fact that all people exhibit culturally-conditioned behaviours.

2- To help students to develop an understanding that social variables such as age, sex, social class, and place of residence influence the ways in which people speak and behave.

3- To help students to become more aware of conventional behaviour in common situations in the target language.

4- To help students to increase their awareness of the cultural connotations of words and phrases in the target language.

5- To stimulate students' intellectual curiosity about the target culture, and to encourage empathy towards its people.

Spott (2001) points out that the strong bond between culture and language must be maintained for the student to have complete understanding of the meaning of language. Differences in values and attitudes are one of the main sources of problems in foreign language learning. According to Watt (2004), culture specific values can be significant factor in comprehension if the values expressed by the text differ from the values held by the reader. In this situation, the teacher should facilitate reading by

providing specific background experience. Cullen and Sato (2000) point out that every culture specific interference problem dealt with in the classroom presents an opportunity to build new culture specific schemata that will be available to the EFL student outside the classroom.

The strong bond between culture and language must be maintained for the student to have a complete understanding of the meaning of language. Differences in values and attitudes are one of the main sources of problems in foreign language learning (Plastina, 2000). Culture-specific values can be a significant factor in comprehension if the values expressed by the text differ from the values held by the reader. At this point, the appropriate schemata cannot be activated during reading process and this will block the reading comprehension (Rauf, 1998:44-45). To solve this problem, teachers can provide background information about the content of the reading material. Successful comprehension depends on the background information provided by the teacher. As a result, students can be given opportunities to gain new knowledge and can be also encouraged to recall the already existing knowledge in their memory (Carrol, 1982:232-233).

2.4.2. Bottom-up Processing, Top-down Processing, and the Interactive Model

The interactive model emphasizes that the reader is an active participant who can contribute to the construction of meaning (Lessard, 1997). When reading, students interpret the text in light of their previous knowledge and simultaneously modify their original schema as new information is learned. From this perspective, there are two simultaneous and complementary ways of processing a text: top-down and bottom-up. (Chia, 2001). Toprak (2004:3) points out that “there are two ways to activate the available schemata. When a dominating schema is activated by it is subschemata, this is the process called bottom-up. Conversely when a dominating schema activates its subschemata, the process of this activation is called top-down”. In top-down processing, readers use their prior knowledge to make predictions about a text. In bottom-up processing, readers rely on their knowledge of language to recognize linguistic elements (letters, words, and sentence structure) for the construction of meaning. It is logical to suppose that readers must understand the individual parts of the text before they can grasp the overall meaning, but in practice, effective readers continually adopt a top-down approach to predict the probable theme and then move to the bottom-up approach to check their assumption by

reading details. This implies that in teaching reading, teachers should instruct students to start their reading by using a top-down approach and later switch between the two approaches, as each kind of interpretation supports the other (Reutzel, 1985:194-198). In bottom-up processing, the old models of reading are reflected as a simple process of decoding words into thoughts. According to this process, first, words must be recognized and after they have been decoded the thoughts must be remembered. This process works from the parts to the whole, building up gradually in a process of growth. Top-down processing states that the reading begins with expectations and ideas about a text, based on its title, format and style, before readers begin to look for words which will accept or refuse these expectations. This process begins with a picture of the whole and deals with the parts in term of this (Phil's EFL Support Site, 2005). Carrell and Eisterhold (1983:557 cited in Alyousef, 2005) mentions that if the information is novel or does not fit their ongoing hypotheses about the content or structure of the text, readers will be sensitive to this information and top-down processing is useful for readers to resolve ambiguities or to select between alternative possible interpretations of the incoming information. Daskalos and Ling (2005) state that the bottom-up model is decoding of the language that is used in the text. In other words, the reader continuously tries to translate different words or sometimes identifies different sounds that he or she combines into words and than sentences. In the top-down model, the reader makes his or her own conclusions about what is said in the text by using his or her experiences and background knowledge. Howard (2005) expresses the view that the reader's construction of a text is from the smallest units (letters to words to phrases to sentences, and so on) in the bottom-up approach. Eventually, the process of constructing the reading text from those units gets automatic. In the top-down process, readers fit the text into the knowledge, expectations, assumptions and questions that they already have and then re-examine by focusing on the unexpected information. Moreover, most readers apply an interactive process by using bottom-up or top-down processes alternately or simultaneously during reading.

2.5. READING STRATEGIES

Reading strategies indicate how readers perform a task, how they make sense of what they read, and what they do when they do not understand. Such strategies are used by the reader to enhance reading comprehension and overcome

comprehension failure. Reading strategies help the readers to be more skilful and strategic readers (King, 2006). Stott (2001) points out that how you prepare yourself before you read influences how much you will understand and retain. Brandl (2002) points out that reading strategies are specific actions that readers take to make meaning from text. These strategies help students increase their reading and learning process. One of the most important goals in English Language teaching is to improve students' independent text interaction strategies (Shih, 1992:289).

These strategies are described in the following:

2.5.1. Pre-Warm-Up Strategies

The main goal of this stage is to arouse the interest of the students for the text or for some grammar rules to be studied. This strategy also enables the readers to do some review of previously taught reading materials. The materials to be used in this stage can be riddles, sayings, quotations and pictures left on the board. The class hour will be more funny and interesting for the students and this will motivate their comprehension. The creativity of the teacher completely affects the activities (Reis, 1993).

2.5.2. Before Reading Strategies

The synonyms of before reading strategies are pre-reading activities, warm-up activities, and into activities. The pre-reading stage helps the readers activate their relevant schema and it also motivates the students before reading a text (Alyousef, 2005). Banville (2005) states that pre-reading activities encourage the students learn vocabulary, lexical patterns and grammar. Before reading activities motivate the students in reading and help them to use their prior knowledge or experience to understand the text that they read (Lilleberg, 2005). Buehl (2003) points out that pre-reading is a preparation stage for the students to activate their background knowledge about the topic of that particular text. Pre-reading activities expand students background knowledge about a topic, because before reading a text some readers may not have sufficient background knowledge or may not be familiar with that topic. Before reading activities introduce students to a particular text, elicit or provide appropriate background knowledge, and activate necessary schemata (Alderson, 2000:47). It will be helpful to get students prepared to receive the new reading material and to get into the subject before introducing the new material. If the

students get prepared before the introduction of new material, their interest and motivation to learn can increase and this will create a positive and receptive atmosphere (Corrigan and Davies, 2005). Morris (1997) points out that before reading strategies have been developed to help students relate new information appearing in written discourse to their existing knowledge. Pre-reading strategy also helps students activate their prior knowledge and make predictions about what they will read (Coira, 2001). Rivas (1999:16) states that schema activation is needed before reading. If the students lack the appropriate schemata, they should be given them. Before reading activities seek students' involvement, interest and motivation, as well as providing language preparation. Basically, before reading strategies are a means of incorporating the learners' knowledge of the world, linguistic knowledge, ideas and opinions, before checking them against the text. At the same time, they generate vocabulary related to the text topic that aids vocabulary development. Stott (2001) mentions that pre-reading activities must accomplish both goals: building new background knowledge as well as activating existing background knowledge. Particularly useful and popular here are 'questioning' and 'brainstorming' where learners generate information on the topic based on their own experience and knowledge.

Before reading a selection, students preview the text. Readers think about the title of the text. They make predictions and generate questions. They set expectations about what information can be given in the text. They skim for text structure (headings, bold print, italicized words, illustrations and other visual presentations) which may give clue about the text. Readers think about the author's purpose for writing the text. They set their own purpose for reading. They try to activate their relevant background knowledge to understand the text (Brandl, 2002). Cartwright and Cartwright (1985) point out that pre-reading activities preview new vocabulary and pronunciation and set goals for reading. They summarize main points.

2.5.3. During Reading Strategies

The synonyms of during reading activities are while reading activities, in activities and through reading activities. Through reading activities help the students comprehend and explore the terms, concepts, and issues raised in the discussion of the new reading material (Corrigan and Davies, 2005). By means of during reading

activities, students improve in decoding the words, giving the correct meaning of those words, and thinking about the content of the text (Lilleberg, 2005). Buehl (2003) states that during-reading activities help students to visualize, to make inferences, and to monitor their comprehension. Howard (2005) states that by means of through reading activities, students may expand and change existing schemata and form new schemata. In while reading activities, students can check their understanding as they read (NCLRC, 2004). During reading activities help students develop reading strategies, improve their control of the second language, and decode problematic text passages. Helping students to employ strategies while reading can be difficult because individual students control and need different strategies. Nevertheless, the teacher can pinpoint valuable strategies, explain which strategies individuals most need to practise, and offer concrete exercises in the form of guided reading activity sheets (Richard and Lockhart, 1994:55-60). Such practice exercises might include guessing word meanings by using context clues, word formation clues, or cognate practice; considering syntax and sentence structure by noting the grammatical functions of unknown words, analysing reference words, and predicting text content, reading for specific pieces of information and learning to use the dictionary effectively (Dwyer, 1983:56).

2.5.4. After Reading Strategies

The synonyms of after reading activities are follow-up activities, post-reading activities, and beyond reading activities. After reading activities deepen understanding and help students summarize and synthesize what they read. They help students to integrate their new learning with the previous information and to apply the new information to their real life (Buehl, 2003). Rivas (1999:16) points out that after reading strategies help learners to consolidate what they have read and to relate the text to the learners' experience, knowledge and opinions. Beyond reading activities expand and deepen your students learning experience and lead to new insights and learning opportunities (Corrigan and Davies, 2005). Chastain (1988 cited in Razi, 2005) states that when the focus is on the structural or lexical parts of the text, post-reading activities help students to clarify unclear meaning. According to Brandl (2002), after reading strategies help students read between and beyond the lines. Stott (2001) states that it is now time to make use of what you have read to generate a summary, paraphrase or semantic map in preparation of a more extended

writing assessment. Shih (1992:290) points out that after reading exercises first check students' comprehension and then lead students to a deeper analysis of the text. After students read the text, they can make use of different kinds of strategies to organize important information such as note-taking and summarizing. Writing summaries help students state the main idea statement and key supporting points of a text. Note-taking can be defined as a good way to show relationships between ideas.

2.5.5. Home Reading Strategies

The strategies which are described above are all applied in the classroom context. In these activities, there is always teacher-student communication. In addition to this, it will be helpful for students to make some review of their learning at home. It is not possible to teach all the things in the class, so it is a useful way to use home-reading activities with extra materials to reach a successful teaching-learning process (Kayışoğlu-Korkmaz, 2000:85). Rivas states that home reading strategies enable the reader to get some background knowledge before reading and during reading (1996: 16-18).

2.6. RELATED STUDIES CARRIED OUT ABROAD

In "Reading Comprehension Strategies of Gifted Anglo and Hispanic Bilingual Female High School Students Enrolled in An Advanced Placement Spanish Literature Class", Matias (2005) investigated factors that influence the reading comprehension strategies which are used by four gifted, bilingual, females enrolled in an AP Spanish Literature class. Findings showed that the students understood and identified reading strategies including self-monitoring, looking for main ideas and themes, utilizing and making connections to prior knowledge, using the context to determine the meaning of unknown words; skipping parts or words; re-reading, questioning, thinking and explaining, and reading critically. This study provides teachers with information regarding the use of effective reading comprehension strategies in a foreign language classroom.

In "Second Language Reading: The Interrelationships among Text Adjuncts, Students' Proficiency Levels and Reading Strategies," Park (2005) states that readers use their background knowledge to interpret texts. This background knowledge is termed as schemata. There are some pre-reading text adjuncts such as pictures, definition lists, or text structure information related with the texts to help

students understand the reading passage. The primary goal of this study was to investigate the effects of different text adjunct types on L2 reading comprehension. Results of the study showed that the high-proficiency ESL students benefited most from the expanded framework text adjunct when they read in an L2. Results also showed that the low-proficiency ESL students benefited from both the expanded framework text adjunct and the vocabulary text adjunct.

In “Second Language Learners Use of English during Guided Reading Lessons”, Borka (2005) examined and described the conversational patterns of teachers and English language learners that occurred during 35 guided reading lessons. The findings suggest that increasing the speech opportunities of English language learners is partially dependent on teachers’ awareness of and ability to establish effective instructional and conversational behaviours within the sociocultural environments of their classrooms.

In “Teacher-directed Instruction plus Classwide Peer Tutoring and the Reading Growth of First-Grade Students”, Baker (2005) examined the effects of two types of reading instruction upon the reading growth of first grade students. The reading growth of 15 students who engaged in teacher-directed reading instruction plus a supplemental peer tutoring program to enhance reading skills was compared to 14 students engaged in only teacher-directed reading instruction. The students in the peer tutoring group worked together in pairs using the First-Grade Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) program as a supplement to the existing Open Court Reading curriculum. Reading growth was assessed across 8 weeks on five separate occasions using the Phonemic Segmentation Fluency measure of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). Hierarchical linear modelling indicated no significant differences between students receiving a teacher-instructed reading program and those in a teacher-instructed plus PALS program.

In “Narratology and Language Teaching”, Toprak (2004:1-9) deals with the problems of Turkish students faced with English Literature in the comprehension stage. She concluded that Turkish students at English Literature courses were captured in the decoding process and were not able to construct the meaning. The students also had problems with schema distortions and this affected the cognitive processes negatively and finally misunderstanding occurred.

2.7. RELATED STUDIES CARRIED OUT IN TURKEY

Kutlar (2001:I-II) mentions in “An Analysis of the opinions of Instructors and Students Towards the Problems with the Main Idea Construction in Freshman Classes” that freshman students of engineering faculty at Gaziantep University sometimes fail to comprehend the text while they are reading expository texts. The reason for this is these students are unable to construct the main idea of a passage. The aim of this study is to investigate the problems that freshman students at the Foreign Languages Department may face with while constructing the main idea of expository texts. She found that freshman students are generally given the chance of discussing what the passage is about by paying attention to the title or subtitle of the text and majority of the teachers and students agree that a picture related with the passage to find the main idea is never or rarely used in freshman classes before reading. She also found that the students are given little chance to make a list that consists each paragraph’s main idea of a passage in English classes and the students never or rarely state the main idea by summarizing the passage following the reading.

Kayısoğlu-Korkmaz (2000:II-III) aimed in “An Analysis of the Opinions of Instructors and Students Towards the Problems Related with Reading Activities in Reading Classes” to suggest a solution to reading comprehension problems that the high school students have in their reading classes. She carried out her study at Özel Çağ Lisesi in Tarsus. She found out that the students in this school are taught through some effective teaching techniques. They are supported by the activities that present cultural background knowledge about the given work, but they are insufficient in some situations.

Kurtul-Oğuz (1999:I) aimed in “The Role and Importance of Culture and L1 reading Skills in Foreign Language Literacy” to find out whether L1 reading skills affect L2 reading skills. The study was carried out at Çimentaş High School in İzmir. She found out that the reading skills of L1 affects L2 learning and the students transfer the old reading skills instead of learning the new skills. Someone who could not transfer would not be successful and L2 language teachers should know both L1 and L2 grammar and culture.

In the study “An Evaluation of the Efficiency of Pre-Reading Tasks and Schema Activation Activities in Teaching Reading” prepared by Demiriz (1998:III),

the efficiency of the pre-reading tasks and schema activation activities in teaching reading are evaluated. The aim of the study is to determine that pre-reading and schema activation activities encourage EFL learners' reading comprehension. A brief review of the major approaches about reading instruction in language teaching are presented in the study and the evaluation of the pre-reading tasks and schema activation activities by paying particular attention to the data elicited by means of research conducted with the first-year students of Başkent University are introduced in the thesis.

Çağlayan (1997:III) in "Effects of Different Pre-Reading Activities on the Comprehension of Different Text Types by Turkish EFL Learners" aims to examine the effects of different pre-reading activities, namely pictorial context and prequestioning on the comprehension of different types of academic reading texts, namely concrete texts and abstract texts by Turkish EFL learners. It was found that the effect of pre-reading activities may be related to the text types. Therefore, prequestioning slightly affected the comprehension of the abstract text while pictorial context slightly improved the comprehension of the concrete text.

Sivrikaya (1996:IV) in "An Experimental Study on the Significance of Students' Interests in Reading Comprehension Through Authentic Texts" focuses on the significance of the students' interests in foreign language reading comprehension through the use of authentic texts. The study was conducted on Turkish students of EFL at Anadolu University, English Language Teachers Training Department of Education Faculty. It was concluded that students' interest is an important factor in foreign language reading.

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY

3.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter consists of the research design, the research population and sampling, the data collection tools and techniques, reliability and validity of this study, and data collection analysis.

3.2. RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study is to analyse the opinions of instructors and students towards the problems related with the reading classes with a special reference to Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. In this study, the collection and analysis of quantitative data is used. The information that is expressed numerically is defined as quantitative data. It must be reduced in a meaningful way to describe the data. This can be done in two ways. You can use a graph or reduce the data to a numeral form. At this time, the information about the data is available from the descriptive information (Trochim, 1999 cited in Kutlar, 2001:55). In a descriptive method, the aim is to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately. It involves collecting data to test the validity of the hypotheses concerning the current status of the subjects of the study (Ekmekçi, 1991:43).

In order to observe if there are statistically significant differences between the variables or not, chi-square value was used. Before the construction of the questionnaire used in this study, the hypotheses were formulated. The questionnaire was distributed to the students of first year classes, second year classes and the English instructors at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. There are four main hypotheses (see chapter 1). By means of these hypotheses, students' and teachers' opinions were evaluated.

3.3. RESEARCH POPULATION AND SAMPLING

This study has been carried out during the 2005-2006 education year at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. 90 students of first year classes, 70 students of second year classes and 8 English instructors answered the questionnaire.

There is only one preparatory class with 30 students at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. There are three first year classes with 90 students. There are four second year classes with 70 students. These second year classes are divided into four departments; Science, Turkish and Mathematics, Social Sciences, and the Foreign Language (English). There are four third year classes with 67 students. These classes are also divided into four departments; Science, Turkish and Mathematics, Social Sciences, and the Foreign Language (English). English is taught by eight instructors in this school. In the preparatory class, English is taught at an elementary level. Grammar is focused and less time is spent for reading in this class. In the first year and the second year classes, especially in the Foreign Language (English) department, four basic skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) are taught. In the third year classes, only grammar is reviewed and in the Foreign Language (English) department, much time is spent to solve tests for the preparation of University Entrance Exams for English.

3.4. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

For our study, the results have been obtained by means of a questionnaire. There were 48 questions which search for the problems related with reading activities applied in reading classes. The questionnaire was designed for both the students and the English instructors at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

The questionnaire was developed by using different kinds of sources in this study. Pre-reading activities will be examined through the questions 1-17. During reading activities will be examined through the questions 18-41. The questions 42-48 were asked in the questionnaire to get answers about follow-up activities and home-reading activities (see section 1.5).

3.5. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

A questionnaire was used as a data collection tool to find out the opinions of teachers and students. After having constructed the questionnaire a pilot study was carried out. The pilot study was carried out with 50 students of first year and second

year classes who were selected randomly. 8 English instructors also answered the questionnaire. The calculations of the results showed that the questionnaire was valid and reliable, so no change was done.

There were 48 Likert-Type items in the questionnaire. Answer slots were composed of three options: never, sometimes, and always. Frequencies, means, standard deviations and percentages were calculated for the items in the questionnaire.

The results were obtained by using SPSS 9.01 version. The reliability value was found to be 0.7355 which indicated that the questionnaire was reliable.

3.6. DATA ANALYSIS

The questionnaires were given to 160 students of first year classes and second year classes at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. They were given 45 minutes (one period of lesson) to answer the questionnaire. The questionnaire was also given 8 English instructors at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. 10 students gave insufficient answers to the questionnaires so they were rejected.

The data were obtained by using SPSS 9.01 version program after the questionnaire was conducted. The scores were obtained by using the chi-square value for the probability level of $p=0.5$. From this score, it is understood that we are willing to accept a less restrictive 95% probability of non-chance results. All the results of the hypotheses were interpreted using the value of chi-square given in the standard x^2 table. To accept the hypothesis, the calculated x^2 was supposed to be found as below the chi-square value accepted in the standard table (x^2 calculated $<$ x^2 table).

CHAPTER FOUR DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. PRESENTATION

The analysis of the hypotheses and the research questions which were discussed in chapter one were mentioned in this part. The frequencies and percentages of the responses to each questionnaire item were computed and presented in tables. The tables were described individually. The results of analysis present information about the opinions of instructors and students towards the problems related with the reading classes at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

4.2. FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SUB-HYPOTHESES UNDER THE HEADING OF MAIN HYPOTHESIS 1.

Table 4.1 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to The Statement "Before Reading Activity the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Subject of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	15	10,0	1	12,5	16	10,2
Sometimes	88	58,7	5	62,5	93	58,8
Always	47	31,3	2	25,0	49	31,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df= 2 p=0.05 x^2 calculated= 2,319 x^2 table= 5,991

The result mentioned in table 4.1 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of x^2 calculated= 2,319 was found lower than the value of x^2 table= 5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is not rejected by chi square test. 62.5% of the instructors and 58,7% of the students point out that before reading activity, sometimes, background knowledge about the subject of the work is given. Moreover, 25 % of the instructors and 31,3 % of the students give the answer as " always".

Table 4.2. The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading Activity the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work by Reading it Quickly."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	29	19,3	3	37,5	32	20,2
Sometimes	93	62,0	4	50,0	97	61,4
Always	28	18,7	1	12,5	29	18,4
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df= 2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated= 1,390

x^2 table= 5,991

After the application of x^2 test, no statistically significant difference has been observed. Table 4.2 shows that the value of x^2 calculated= 1,390 is lower than the value of x^2 table= 5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Both instructors (50%) and students (62%) agree that the activity of giving information about the subject of the work before reading activity is sometimes done.

Table 4.3 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using the Title of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	20	13,3	0	0	20	12,6
Sometimes	73	48,7	5	62,5	78	49,4
Always	57	38,0	3	37,5	60	38,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df= 2

p= 0.05

χ^2 calculated=2,924

χ^2 table=5,991

The observation of table 4.3 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of χ^2 calculated=2,924 is lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 62,5% of instructors and 48,7% of students state the answer as "sometimes". Moreover, 37,5% of instructors and 38% of students state the answer as "always". The result shows that giving information about the subject of the work using the title of the work is a common activity in reading classes.

Table 4.4 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using Some Related Pictures."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	42	28,0	1	12,5	43	27,2
Sometimes	84	56,0	5	62,5	89	56,3
Always	24	16,0	2	25,0	25	16,5
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=8,445

x^2 table=5,991

As can be seen in table 4.4 there is statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. x^2 calculated=8,445 was found higher than x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. As the result indicates, the students' opinions and the instructors' opinions differ from each other. 62,5% of the instructors point out that they sometimes give information about the subject of the work using some related pictures before reading. On the contrary, 28% of the students state that they never use this activity.

Table 4.5 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using the Students' Previous Knowledge about the Author/Poet."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	100	66,7	3	37,5	103	65,2
Sometimes	46	30,7	3	37,5	49	31,0
Always	4	2,7	2	25,0	6	3,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=4,352

x^2 table=5,991

Table 4.5 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructor and students. The value of x^2 calculated=4,352 was found lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 66, 7% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors mention that the technique of giving information about the subject of the work using the students' previous knowledge about the author/poet has never been applied in reading classes. However, 30,7% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors state that this kind of activity is sometimes used.

Table 4.6 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Period in which the Work was Written."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	77	61,3	3	37,5	80	50,6
Sometimes	58	38,7	4	50,0	62	39,2
Always	15	10,0	1	12,5	16	10,2
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df= 2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=6,340

x^2 table= 5,991

Analysis of table 4.6 shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors since the value of x^2 calculated=6,340 is higher than the x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. This means that the instructors and the students did not agree with each other. 61,3% of the students state that they never do this activity. On the other hand, 50% of the instructors claim that they sometimes give background knowledge about the period in which the work was written before reading.

Table 4.7 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Author/Poet of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	81	54,0	3	37,5	84	53,2
Sometimes	61	40,7	5	62,5	66	41,8
Always	8	5,3	0	0	8	5,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

 x^2 calculated= 0,176 x^2 table=5,991

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=0,176 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 54% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 40,7% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". No instructor gives the answer as "always". This result indicates that the students are not given the opportunity of getting background knowledge about the author/poet of the work before reading.

Table 4.8 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Characters of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	81	54,0	4	50,0	85	53,8
Sometimes	61	40,7	1	12,5	62	39,2
Always	8	5,3	3	37,5	11	7,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=3,900

χ^2 table=5,991

As can be seen above both instructors and students agree on the idea that there is no statistically significant difference between two groups. The value of χ^2 calculated=3,900 is lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 54,0% of the students and 50,0% of the instructors point out that this activity is never applied in reading classes. 40,7% of the students and 12,5 of the instructors say that they sometimes do this activity.

Table 4.9 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Linguistic/Stylistic Features of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	42	28,0	3	37,5	45	28,9
Sometimes	91	60,7	4	50,0	95	60,1
Always	17	11,3	1	12,5	18	11,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

 $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=1,473$ $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

As can be observed in table 4.9 that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 60,7% of the students and 50% of the teachers state that they sometimes use this activity. The activity of giving background knowledge about the linguistic/stylistic features of the work before reading is sometimes used.

Table 4.10 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Cultural Features of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	55	36,7	3	37,5	58	36,7
Sometimes	80	53,3	4	50,0	84	53,2
Always	15	10,0	1	12,5	16	10,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 x^2 calculated=0,819 x^2 table=5,991

As can be seen in table 4.10 that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students because the value of x^2 calculated=0,819 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 53,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors mention that they sometimes use this activity. 36,7% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors give the answer as "never".

Table 4.1.11 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Wants His/Her Students to Make a Research on Cultural Background of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	73	48,7	4	50,0	77	48,7
Sometimes	69	46,0	3	37,5	72	45,6
Always	8	5,3	1	12,5	9	5,7
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=4,619

x^2 table=5,991

Table 4.11 reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of x^2 calculated=4,619 was found lower than x^2 table=5,991. Thus this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Taking the opinions of instructors (50%) and students (48,7%) into consideration the result can be interpreted as this technique is never used in reading classes.

Table 4.12 The Frequencies and the Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Creates a Situation for Classroom Discussion on the Title of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	68	45,3	2	25,0	70	44,3
Sometimes	67	44,7	2	25,0	69	43,7
Always	15	10,0	4	50,0	19	12,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 x^2 calculated=3,023 x^2 table=5,991

The obtained value of x^2 calculated=3,023 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 45,3% of the students and 25% of the instructors state that this activity is never done in reading classes. Moreover, 44,7% of the students and 25% of the instructors point out that the activity of creating a situation for classroom discussion on the title of the work before reading is sometimes done in reading classes.

Table 4.13 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "Before Reading the Instructor Asks Questions Using the Question Words; How, Why, Where, Who, What, When."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	29	19,3	1	12,5	30	19,0
Sometimes	75	50,0	1	12,5	76	48,1
Always	46	30,7	6	75,0	52	32,9
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=5,531

χ^2 table=5,991

As can be seen in table 4.13 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of χ^2 calculated=5,531 is lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 50% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors mention that they sometimes do this activity. 30,7% of the students and 75% of the instructors point out that this activity is always done in reading classes. The results show that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes.

Table 4.14 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language by Making Research Before the Lesson."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	83	55,3	1	12,5	84	53,1
Sometimes	56	37,3	6	75,0	62	39,3
Always	11	7,3	1	12,5	12	7,6
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 x^2 calculated=3,298 x^2 table=5,991

The analysis of table 4.14 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=3,298 was found lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 55,3% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors say that this activity has never been used in reading classes. 37,3% of the students and 75% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". As clearly illustrated in the table, this activity is never done in reading classes.

Table 4.15 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language Watching Some Video Cassettes."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	89	59,3	4	50,0	93	58,9
Sometimes	54	36,0	4	50,0	58	36,7
Always	7	4,7	0	0	7	4,4
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=5,826

χ^2 table=5,991

The result demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of χ^2 calculated=5,826 is lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the students (59,3%) and 50% of the instructors state that this activity is never done in reading classes. Moreover, 36% of the students and 50% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". The table shows that this activity is never done in reading classes.

Table 4.16 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language Listening to Radio Programmes in English."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	108	72,0	5	62,5	113	71,5
Sometimes	34	27,7	3	37,5	37	23,4
Always	8	5,3	0	0	8	5,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

 x^2 calculated=1,196 x^2 table=5,991

The result demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of x^2 calculated=1,196 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the students (72%) and the instructors point out that they never do this activity. The table indicates that this activity is never done reading classes.

Table 4.17 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Have the Cultural Background of the Target Language Reading English Magazines, Newspapers."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	94	62,7	4	50,0	98	62,0
Sometimes	45	30,0	4	50,0	49	31,0
Always	11	7,3	0	0	11	7,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

$x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,307$

$x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

As can be seen in table 4.17 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,307$ is lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 62,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors state that this kind of activity is never done in reading classes. 30% of the students and 50% of the instructors point out that they sometimes do this activity. As can be seen from the table, the activity of having the cultural background of the target language reading English magazines, newspapers is never done in reading classes.

4.2 FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SUB-HYPOTHESES UNDER THE HEADING OF HYPOTHESIS 2.

Table 4.18 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives the Vocabulary of the Work Using the Opposites of the Unknown Words."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	30	20,0	0	0	30	19,0
Sometimes	80	53,3	7	87,5	87	55,0
Always	40	26,7	1	12,5	41	26,0
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,279$ $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

The result in table 4.18 was found as $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,279$ and $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. As a result there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the instructors (87,5%) and 53,3% of the students state that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes. Moreover, 26,7% of the students and 12,5 of the instructors give the answer as "always".

Table 4.19 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and the Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives the Synonyms of the Vocabulary."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	16	10,7	0	0	16	10,1
Sometimes	83	55,3	5	62,5	88	55,7
Always	51	34,0	3	37,5	54	34,2
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=1,238

x^2 table=5,991

The table indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of x^2 calculated=1,238 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 55,3% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors point out that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes. 34% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors say that they always do this activity. The results of the statistics show that this activity is sometimes done reading classes.

Table 4.20 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Wants His/Her Students Try to Grasp the Meaning of the Unknown Vocabulary from the Context."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	9	6,0	0	0	9	5,7
Sometimes	96	64,0	6	75,0	102	64,5
Always	45	30,0	2	25,0	47	29,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

$\chi^2_{\text{calculated}}=1,118$

$\chi^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

The results gathered in table 4.20 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of $\chi^2_{\text{calculated}}=1,118$ was found lower than the value of $\chi^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the students (64%) and the instructors 75% say that this kind of activity is sometimes done in reading classes. The table shows that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes.

Table 4.21 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Use English-English Dictionary to Learn the Unknown Vocabulary."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	24	16,0	3	37,5	27	17,0
Sometimes	97	64,7	4	50,0	101	63,9
Always	29	19,3	1	12,5	30	19,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=2,272

x^2 table=5,991

The observation of table 4.21 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of students and instructors as the value of x^2 calculated=2,272 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 64,7% of the students say that they sometimes use English-English dictionary to learn the unknown vocabulary. 50% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". Moreover, 19,35% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors mention that English-English dictionary is always used.

Table 4.22 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Use English-Turkish Dictionary to Learn the Unknown Vocabulary."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	13	8,7	1	12,5	14	8,8
Sometimes	74	49,3	4	50,0	78	49,4
Always	63	42,0	3	37,5	66	41,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 x^2 calculated=0,935 x^2 table=5,991

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=0,935 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 49,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors state that English-Turkish dictionary is sometimes used to learn the unknown vocabulary. 42% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors give the answer as "always".

Table 4.23 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students do not See the Unknown Words as 'Problem' While Reading. They Try to Understand the Main Idea."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	33	22,0	3	37,5	36	8,8
Sometimes	79	52,7	3	37,5	82	49,4
Always	38	25,3	2	25,0	40	41,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=7,455

x^2 table=5,991

There is statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=7,455 is higher than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. As a result, the opinions of the instructors and the students about this statement differ from each other. Although 52,7% of the students state that they sometimes see the unknown words as problem while reading, 37,5% of the instructors point out that students never see them as problems at this stage. Moreover, 37,5% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes".

Table 4.24 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives the Meaning of Unknown Words by Drawing Pictures on the Board."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	84	56,0	1	12,5	85	8,8
Sometimes	48	32,0	6	75,0	54	49,4
Always	18	12,0	1	12,5	19	41,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=0,970

x^2 table=5,991

The obtained value of x^2 calculated=0,970 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 32% of the students and most of the instructors(75%) state that this technique is sometimes used in reading classes. 12% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors give the answer as "always." As it can be seen in the table, the statistics shows that the instructor sometimes gives the meaning of unknown words by drawing pictures on the board.

Table 4.25 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives the Meaning of Unknown Words by Using Mimes."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	44	29,3	0	0	44	27,8
Sometimes	83	55,3	7	87,5	90	56,9
Always	23	15,3	1	12,5	24	15,3
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=5,998

χ^2 table=5,991

There is statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of χ^2 calculated=5,998 is higher than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. This means that, the opinions of the students and the instructors differ from each other. 55,3% of the students point out that the instructor sometimes gives the meaning of unknown words by using mimes. Most of the instructors (87,5%) give the answer as "sometimes". Moreover, 15,3% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors state that this technique is always used in reading classes. 29,3% of the students give the answer as "never". However, there are no instructors who answer as "never".

Table 4.26 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Instructor Gives the Meaning of Unknown Words by Using Them in the Sample Sentences."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	12	8,0	0	0	12	7,6
Sometimes	82	54,7	5	62,5	87	55,1
Always	56	37,3	3	37,5	59	37,3
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p= 0.05

χ^2 calculated=0,245

χ^2 table=5,991

The result in table 4.26 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of χ^2 calculated=0,245 is lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 54,7% of the students and most of the instructors (62,5%) give the answer as "sometimes". 37,3% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors say that this technique is always used in reading classes. The statistics in table 4.2.9 clearly shows that the instructor sometimes gives the meaning of unknown words by using them in the sample sentences.

Table 4.27 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading Structural Differences between the Students' Mother Tongue and Target Language Cause a Problem."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	45	30,0	1	12,5	46	29,1
Sometimes	79	52,7	4	50,0	83	52,5
Always	26	17,3	3	37,5	29	18,4
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=3,224

x^2 table=5,991

As can be observed in table 4.27 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=3,224 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. The table shows that while reading structural differences between the students' mother tongue and target language sometimes cause a problem. 52,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes".

Table 4.28 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading Unknown Words are Problem on the Students' Understanding."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	12	8,0	0	0	12	7,6
Sometimes	80	53,3	4	50,0	84	53,2
Always	58	38,7	4	50,0	62	39,2
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=2,211

χ^2 table=5,991

As can be observed in table 4.28 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of χ^2 calculated=2,211 was found lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 80 of 150 students give the answer as "sometimes". 58 of 150 students state the answer as "always". 4 of 8 instructors state that while reading unknown words are sometimes problem on the students' understanding. Moreover, 4 of 8 instructors give the answer as "always". The statistics shows that while reading unknown words are sometimes problem on the students' understanding in reading classes.

Table 4.29 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading Insufficient Cultural Background Knowledge Causes a Problem of Understanding."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	46	30,7	0	0	46	29,1
Sometimes	76	50,7	5	62,5	81	51,3
Always	28	18,7	3	37,5	31	19,6
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=1,396

x^2 table=5,991

The analysis of the table 4.29 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=1,396 was found lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the instructors (62,5%) and 50,7% of the students point out that while reading insufficient cultural background knowledge sometimes causes a problem of understanding. 46 of 150 students state the answer as "never". However, no instructors give the answer as "never".

Table 4.30 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Try to Understand the Whole Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	19	12,7	1	12,5	20	12,7
Sometimes	62	41,7	2	25,0	64	40,5
Always	69	46,0	5	62,5	74	46,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

$x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,562$

$x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

The results in table 4.30 show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,562$ was found lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 46% of the students and most of the instructors (62,5%) of the instructors give the answer as "always". 41,7% of the students and 25% give the answer as "sometimes". The statistics in table 4.2.13 shows that the students always try to understand the whole work while reading.

Table 4.31 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Try to Understand Only a Part of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	54	36,0	5	62,5	59	37,4
Sometimes	65	43,3	1	12,5	66	41,8
Always	31	20,7	2	25,0	33	20,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=2,881

x^2 table=5,991

As can be seen in table 4.31 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=2,881 is lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 65 of 150 students state that they sometimes try to understand only a part of the work while reading. 1 of 8 instructors gives the answer as "sometimes". 54 of 150 students and 5 of 8 instructors state the answer as "never".

Table 4.32 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Try to Have Their Own Interpretations about the Whole Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	28	18,7	2	25,0	30	19,0
Sometimes	88	58,7	4	50,0	92	58,2
Always	34	22,7	2	25,0	36	22,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 x^2 calculated=0,663 x^2 table=5,991

The analysis of table 4.32 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of x^2 calculated=0,663 was found lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 58,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". Moreover, 22,7% of the 25% of the instructors state the answer as "always". As the statistics in table 4.2.15 shows, the students sometimes try to have their own interpretations about the whole work while reading.

Table 4.33 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students can Read Two Works (i.e. Two Stories which Have Similar Linguistic Features or Similar Subjects) by Comparing them with Each Other."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	56	37,3	4	50,0	60	38,0
Sometimes	68	45,3	1	12,5	69	43,7
Always	26	17,3	3	37,5	29	18,3
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

 $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=2,113$ $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=2,113$ was found lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 45,3% of the students say that they can sometimes read two works by comparing them with each other. 12,5% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". 37,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors state the answer as "never".

Table 4.34 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Listen to the Work which is Examined in the Classroom on the Tape Recorder."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	57	38,0	2	25,0	59	37,3
Sometimes	60	40,0	1	12,5	61	38,6
Always	33	22,0	5	62,5	38	24,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

 $\chi^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,994$ $\chi^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

The statistics in table 4.34 indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students because the value of $\chi^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,994$ was found lower than the value of $\chi^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 40% of the students state that they sometimes listen to the work which is examined in the classroom on the tape recorder. 12,5% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". 38% of the students and 25% of the instructors state the answer as "never". According to the table above, the students sometimes listen to the work which is examined in the classroom on the tape recorder.

Table 4.35 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students Watch the Work They are Examining on Video."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	93	62,0	3	37,5	96	60,7
Sometimes	40	26,7	3	37,5	43	27,2
Always	17	11,3	2	25,0	19	12,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

$x^2_{\text{calculated}}=1,433$

$x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

As can be seen in table 4.35 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=1,433$ was found lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the students (62%) and 37,5% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 26,75% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors state the answer as "sometimes". The statistics in the table shows that the students never watch the work they are examining on video.

Table 4.36 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "After Reading Some Parts of the Work, the Students are Asked to Predict the Other Parts of the Works."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	38	25,3	0	0	38	24,0
Sometimes	90	60,0	7	87,5	97	61,4
Always	22	14,7	1	12,5	23	14,6
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,406$ $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,406$ is lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the students (60%) and the instructors (87,5%) give the answer as "sometimes". 25,3% of the students point out that they are never asked to predict the other parts of the work after reading some parts of the work. However, no instructors give the answer as "never". As can be seen in the table, the statistics shows that the students are sometimes asked to predict the other parts of the work after reading some parts of the work.

Table 4.37 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Make their Interpretations in the Classroom Discussion."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	39	26,0	0	0	39	24,7
Sometimes	78	52,0	6	75,0	84	53,2
Always	33	22,0	2	25,0	35	22,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=1,629

x^2 table=5,991

The result in table 4.37 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of x^2 calculated=1,629 was found lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the instructors (75%) and 52% of the students give the answer as "sometimes". 26% of the students point out that they never make their interpretations in the classroom discussion while reading. However, no instructors give the answer as "never". The table 4.2.20 indicates that while reading the students sometimes make their interpretations in the classroom discussion.

Table 4.38 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Play the Work in the Classroom."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	86	57,3	1	12,5	87	55,0
Sometimes	50	33,3	5	62,5	55	34,8
Always	14	9,4	2	25,0	16	10,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df= 2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=2,998

χ^2 table=5,991

The result mentioned in table demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of χ^2 calculated=2,998 was found lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 57,3% of the students point out that they never play the wok in the classroom while reading. However, 12,5% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 62,5% of the instructors and 33,3% of the students state the answer as "sometimes". The table indicates that students never play the work in the classroom while reading.

Table 4.39 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Create a Discussion about the Characters of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	51	34,0	1	12,5	52	32,9
Sometimes	85	57,7	5	62,5	90	57,0
Always	14	9,3	2	25,0	16	10,1
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=3,879

x^2 table=5,991

The analysis of the table 4.39 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of x^2 calculated=3,879 was found lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the students (57,7%) and the instructors (62,5%) give the answer as "sometimes". Moreover, 34% of the students point out that they never create a discussion about the characters of the work while reading. 12,5% of the instructors give the answer as "never". The statistics in the table shows that the students sometimes create a discussion about the characters of the work while reading.

Table 4.40 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Put themselves in the Shoes of the Characters and Write Diaries."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	119	79,3	4	50,0	123	77,8
Sometimes	18	12,0	3	37,5	21	13,3
Always	13	8,7	1	12,5	14	8,9
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=1,354

χ^2 table=5,991

Table 4.40 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of χ^2 calculated=1,354 was found lower than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis was supported by chi square test. 79,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 12% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". Table 4.2.23 indicates that while reading the students never put themselves in the shoes of the characters and they never write diaries.

Table 4.41 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "While Reading the Students Write Dialogues between Two Characters of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	76	50,7	4	50,0	80	50,6
Sometimes	65	43,3	3	37,5	68	43,0
Always	9	6,0	1	12,5	10	6,4
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=5,085$ $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

As can be seen in table 4.41 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=5.085$ was found lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 50,7% of the students mention that they never do this activity. 50% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 43,3% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors point out that this activity is sometimes done.

4.3 FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SUB-HYPOTHESES UNDER THE HEADING OF MAIN HYPOTHESES 3-4.

Table 4.42 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "After Reading the Students Write a Summary about what They Have Understood from the Passage."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	86	57,3	1	12,5	87	55,0
Sometimes	53	35,3	5	62,5	58	36,7
Always	11	7,3	2	25,0	13	8,3
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=4,185$ $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

As clearly shown in table 4.42 there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=4,185$ was found lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis was supported by chi square test. 57,3% of the students point out that after reading they never write a summary about what they have understood from the passage. However, 12,5% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 35,3% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors state the answer as "sometimes".

Table 4.43 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "After Reading the Students are Given Only Passage Reading as Homework."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	61	40,7	4	50,0	65	41,1
Sometimes	74	49,3	2	25,0	76	48,1
Always	15	10,0	2	25,0	17	10,8
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

$x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,289$

$x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

The result in table 4.43 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of $x^2_{\text{calculated}}=0,289$ was found lower than the value of $x^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 40,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 49,3% of the students and 25% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". The table shows that after reading the students are sometimes given only passage reading as homework.

Table 4.44 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Given Worksheets about the Period in which the Work was Written as Homework."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	94	62,7	2	25,0	96	60,8
Sometimes	45	30,0	5	62,5	50	31,6
Always	11	7,3	1	12,5	12	7,6
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

x^2 calculated=14,628

x^2 table=5,991

The table 4.44 shows that there is statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students because the value of x^2 calculated=14,628 was found higher than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. This means that, the opinions of instructors and students differ from each other. Although most of the students (62,7%) point out that they are never given worksheets about the period in which the work was written as homework, 25% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 62,5% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". However, 30% of the students give the answer as "sometimes".

Table 4.45 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Given Worksheets about the Characters of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	107	71,3	2	25,0	109	69,0
Sometimes	33	22,0	4	50,0	37	23,4
Always	10	6,7	2	25,0	12	7,6
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 $\chi^2_{\text{calculated}}=2,385$ $\chi^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$

The statistics in table 4.45 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of $\chi^2_{\text{calculated}}=2,385$ was found lower than the value of $\chi^2_{\text{table}}=5,991$. Thus, this hypothesis was supported by chi square test. Most of the students (71,3%) state that they are never given worksheets about the characters of the work. However, 25% of the instructors give the answer as "never". 22% of the students and 50% of the instructors give the answer as "sometimes". The table shows that the students are never given worksheets about the characters of the work.

Table 4.46 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Given Worksheets about Authors/Poets of the Work."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	112	74,7	4	50,0	116	73,4
Sometimes	27	18,0	3	37,5	30	19,0
Always	11	7,3	1	12,5	12	7,6
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=7,194

χ^2 table=5,991

As clearly shown in table 4.46 there is statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of χ^2 calculated=7,194 was found higher than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. This means that the instructors and the students did not agree with each other. Most of the students (74,7%) say that they are never given worksheets about authors/poets of the work. Besides, 37,5% of the instructors claim that they sometimes do this activity and 12,5% of the instructors give the answer as "always."

Table 4.47 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Wanted to Study the Linguistic Features of the Work as Homework."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	56	37,3	4	50,0	60	38,0
Sometimes	77	51,3	3	37,5	80	50,6
Always	17	11,3	1	12,5	18	11,4
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2 p=0.05 x^2 calculated=4,302 x^2 table=5,991

The result in table 4.47 demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students. The value of x^2 calculated=4,302 was found lower than the value of x^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 50% of the instructors and 37,3% of the students give the answer as "never". 51,3% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors state the answer as "sometimes". As the statistics shows in table 4.3.6, the students are sometimes wanted to study the linguistic features of work as homework.

Table 4.48 The Frequencies and Percentages of the Students' and Instructors' Responses to the Statement "The Students are Given Worksheets as Homework with the Worksheets of the Vocabulary."

ANSWERS	Students		Teachers		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Never	95	63,3	2	25,0	97	61,4
Sometimes	41	27,3	2	25,0	43	27,2
Always	14	9,3	4	50,0	18	11,4
TOTAL	150	100	8	100	158	100

Df=2

p=0.05

χ^2 calculated=7,525

χ^2 table=5,991

As can be seen in table 4.48 there is statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students since the value of χ^2 calculated=7,525 was found higher than the value of χ^2 table=5,991. Thus, this hypothesis was rejected by chi square test. As a result, the opinions of the instructors and students about this statement differ from each other. Most of the students (63,3%) point out that they are never given worksheets as homework with the worksheets of the vocabulary. On the contrary, 50% of the instructors claim that they always do this activity. Moreover, 9,3% of the students give the answer as "always."

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. PRESENTATION

This chapter consists of the summary, conclusions of the study, suggested activities for rejected hypotheses and recommendations for further research.

5.2. SUMMARY

The aim of this study is to identify the problems that students have in reading comprehension classes. The data were collected by using a questionnaire. The questionnaire has been distributed to both English instructors and the first year and second year students at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

There are three first year classes with 90 students. There are four second year classes with 70 students. These second year classes are divided into four departments; Science, Turkish and Mathematics, Social Sciences and the Foreign Language (English).

The questionnaire consists of 48 statements related to the situations in which the students were thought to have problems. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for each item in the questionnaire and the results were shown in tables (see chapter 4). Responses from 150 students and 8 instructors were analyzed through chi square test and the questionnaire was assumed to be valid and reliable. The data obtained were evaluated in SPSS 9.01 version

5.3. CONCLUSIONS

In this section, the findings of the study are reviewed. The findings will be discussed by means of the hypotheses. There were four main hypotheses and 48 sub-hypotheses in this study (see chapter 1).

5.3.1. Conclusions of Seventeen Statements (Statements 1-17), Regarding the Opinions of Instructors and Students about the Problems Related with the Reading Classes Concerning Before Reading Activities in Reading Classes.

According to the results gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “before reading activity the instructor gives background knowledge about the subject of the work.” (see table 4.1). Therefore, this hypothesis is not rejected by chi square test. The majority of instructors (62.5%) and students (58.7%) point out that they sometimes refer to this activity in reading classes. It can be concluded that the instructors know the importance of giving background knowledge. If necessary background knowledge is given, the students will comprehend better.

The findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “before reading activity the instructor gives information about the subject of the work by reading it quickly.” (see table 4.2). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Almost 62% students mention that this activity is sometimes done. Moreover, 50% of the instructors point out that they sometimes give information about the subject of the work by reading it quickly. This means that above mentioned activity is commonly used in reading classes.

Since there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “before reading the instructor gives information about the subject of the work using the title of the work” (see table 4.3), this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 48,7% of the students point out that before reading the instructor sometimes gives information about the subject of the work using the title of the work. Most of the instructors (62,5%) agree with the students. Talking about the title of the work gives information about what the topic is about. This will help the students to activate their schemata.

As can be observed in Table 4.4, there is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “before reading the instructor gives information about the subject of the work using some related pictures” (see table 4.4.). Therefore, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. 56% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors state that they sometimes do this activity. However, 28% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors point out that they never do this activity in reading classes.

As can be indicated from the findings, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “before reading the instructor gives information about the subject of the work using the students’ previous knowledge about the author/poet.” (see table 4.5). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. This activity is never done in reading classes according to the students and instructors. However, the students comprehend better if they know something about the writing style, life, beliefs, and culture of the author/poet.

According to the finding gathered from data analysis there is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “before reading the instructor gives background knowledge about the period in which the work was written” (see table 4.6). Therefore, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. Majority of the students (61,3%) state that they never do this activity. However half of the instructors (50%) point out that they sometimes do this activity. The result shows that the instructors and the students do not agree with each other.

According to the results gathered from the data analysis there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the instructor gives background knowledge about the author/poet of the work.” (see table 4.7). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 54% of the students state that they never use this activity. 62.5% of the instructors point out that they sometimes use this activity. The result shows that this activity is not very common in reading classes. However, if the instructor gives some background information about the writing style, beliefs, previous works of the author/poet, the students will comprehend the work better.

As can be observed in Table 4.8, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “before reading the instructor gives background knowledge about the characters of the work.” (see table 4.8). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Half of the instructors (50.0%) and the majority of the students (54.0%) state that this activity is never used during reading classes. As a result both the instructors and the students agree with each other.

According to the findings gathered from the data analysis there is no statistically significant difference between the participants regarding the statement “before reading the instructor gives background knowledge about the linguistic /stylistic features of the work.” (see table 4.9). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 50% of the instructors state that before reading they sometimes give background knowledge about the linguistic/stylistic features of the work. On the other hand, the majority of the students (60.7%) point out that they sometimes use this activity. 28.0% of the students and 37.5% of the instructors mention that this activity is never done during reading classes. However, this activity should be used more frequently during reading classes because some difficult structural and stylistic points decrease comprehension.

The findings show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding to the statement “before reading the instructor gives background knowledge about the cultural feature of the work.” (see table 4.10). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the students (53,3%) state that before reading the instructor sometimes gives background knowledge about the cultural features of the work. Half of the instructors (50%) agree with the students. However, 36.7% of the students and 37.5% of the instructors mention that they never do this kind of activity. When instructors give some knowledge about the cultural features of the work, this will foster learners’ motivation and comprehension will take place better.

According to the findings gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “before reading the instructor wants his/her students to make a research on cultural background of the work.” (see table 4.11). Therefore, this hypothesis is not rejected by chi square test. 48,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors point out that they never use this activity in reading classes.

Since there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “before reading the instructor creates a situation for classroom discussion on the title of the work,” this hypothesis is supported by chi square test (see table 4.12). 45.3% of the students and 25% of the instructors mention that they never do this activity. As a result, it can be said that instructors are not aware of the importance of this activity.

The findings show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “before reading the instructor asks questions using the question words; how, why, where, who, what, when” (see table 4.13). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Most of the instructors (75%) state that before reading they always ask questions using the question words; how, why, where, who, what, when. Half of the students (50%) point out that they sometimes do this activity. The results show that students sometimes have the chance to do this activity in reading classes.

The results gathered from data analysis indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the students have the cultural background of the target language by making research before the lesson” (see table 4.14). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Majority of the students (55,3%) and 12,5% of the instructors state that they never do this activity. This shows that the students should be encouraged to make research about the cultural background of the target language before the lesson.

As can be seen from the result, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the students have the cultural background of the target language watching some video cassettes” (see table 4.15). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. The majority of the students (59,3%) and half of the instructors (50%) claim that they never do this activity. Moreover, 36% of the students and 50% of the instructors state that they sometimes do this activity. The result shows that this activity is never done in reading classes.

The results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the students have the cultural background of the target language listening to radio programmes in English” (see table 4.16). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Majority of the students (72%) and instructors (62,5%) state that they never have a chance to use this activity in reading classes. This means that participants agree with each other. The result indicates that this activity is never done in reading classes.

As can be seen from the findings, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the students have the cultural background of the target language reading English magazines,

newspapers” (see table 4.17). Therefore, this hypothesis is not rejected. 62,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors point out that they never do this activity. The result shows that this activity is never used in reading classes.

In conclusion, of the 17 hypotheses related with before reading activities, only two hypotheses (see tables 4.4 and 4.6) are rejected and the other 15 hypotheses are supported. This means that the instructors and the students generally agree with each other about before reading activities.

5.3.2 Conclusion of Twenty-Four Statements (Statements 18-41), Regarding the Opinions of Instructors and Students about the Problems Related with the Reading Classes Concerning While-Reading Activities in Reading Classes.

Since there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the instructor gives the vocabulary of the work using the opposites of the unknown words,” this hypothesis is supported by chi square test (see table 4.18). 53% of the students and 87,5% of the instructors state that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes. This means that this is a common activity in reading classes.

The results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the instructor gives the synonyms of the vocabulary” (see table 4.19). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 55,3% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors point out that they sometimes have a chance to use this activity. This means that participants agree with each other.

According to the result gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the instructor wants his/her students try to grasp the meaning of the unknown vocabulary from the context” (see table 4.20). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 64% of the students state that the instructor sometimes wants them try to grasp the meaning of the unknown vocabulary from the context. Majority of the instructors (75%) agree with the students.

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the students use English-English dictionary to learn the unknown vocabulary” (see table 4.21). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 64,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors gave

the answer as “sometimes.” This means that this is a common activity in reading classes.

As can be seen from the findings, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the students use English-Turkish dictionary to learn the unknown vocabulary” (see table 4.22). Therefore, this hypothesis is not rejected. 49,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors point out that this activity is sometimes used in reading classes.

There is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the students do not see the unknown words as ‘problem’ while reading. They try to understand the main idea” (see table 4.23). Therefore, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. 37,5% of the instructors say that the students never try to understand the main idea. On the other hand, 52,7% of the students state that they sometimes try to understand the main idea. This means that the students and the instructors do not agree with each other.

Since there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the instructor gives the meaning of unknown words by drawing pictures on the board,” this hypothesis is supported by chi square test (see table 4.24). 32,% of the students and 75% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” 12% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “always.” The result shows that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes.

According to the finding gathered from data analysis there is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the instructor gives the meaning of unknown words by using mimes” (see table 4.25). Therefore, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. 29,3% of the students state that they never use this activity. However no instructors gave the answer as “never.” 87,5% of the instructors point out that they sometimes give the meaning of unknown words by using mimes. The result shows that the instructors and the students do not agree with each other.

The result gathered from data analysis indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the instructor gives the meaning of unknown words by using them in the sample sentences” (see table 4.26). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. More than half of the students (54,7%) and majority of the instructors (62,5%) state

that they sometimes use this activity. 37.3% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “always.” The result shows that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes.

As can be seen from the result, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “while reading structural differences between the students’ mother tongue and target language cause a problem” (see table 4.27). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 52,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors point out that while reading structural differences between the students’ mother tongue and target language sometimes cause a problem.

According to the findings gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “while reading unknown words are problem on the students’ understanding” (see table 4.28). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 53,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” The result shows that while reading unknown words are sometimes problem on the students’ understanding.

The findings show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “while reading insufficient cultural background knowledge causes a problem of understanding” (see table 4.29). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 50,7% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors point out that while reading insufficient cultural background knowledge sometimes causes a problem of understanding. This means that students should be given some cultural background knowledge in order to comprehend the text better.

According to the findings gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “while reading the students try to understand the whole work” (see table 4.30). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 46% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “always.” This shows that while reading the students always try to understand the whole work.

Since there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “while reading the students try to understand

only a part of the work,” this hypothesis is supported by chi square test (see table 4.31). 43,3% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” 20,7% of the students and 25% of the instructors gave the answer as “always.” This means that while reading the students sometimes try to understand only a part of the work.

As can be seen from the findings, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “while reading the students try to have their own interpretations about the whole work” (see table 4.32). Therefore, this hypothesis is not rejected. 58,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” The results show that while reading the students sometimes try to have their own interpretations about the whole work.

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the students can read two works (i.e. two stories which have similar linguistic features or similar subjects) by comparing them with each other” (see table 4.33). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 37,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors point out that they never do this activity. 45,3% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors state that they sometimes do this activity. The results show that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes.

Since there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the students listen to the work which is examined in the classroom on the tape recorder,” this hypothesis is not rejected by chi square test (see table 4.34). 40% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes” and this shows that the students sometimes listen to the work which is examined in the classroom on the tape recorder.

According to the result gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the students watch the work they are examining on video” (see table 4.35). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 62% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors point out that they never do this activity. 26,7% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors point out that they sometimes do this activity. The results show that the students never watch the work they are examining on video.

As can be seen from the findings, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of students and instructors regarding the statement “after reading some parts of the work, the students are asked to predict the other parts of the work” (see table 4.36). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. Majority of the students (60%) and instructors (87,5%) gave the answer as sometimes. The result shows that after reading some parts of the work, the students are sometimes asked to predict the other parts of the work.

The results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “while reading the students make their interpretations in the classroom discussion” (see table 4.37). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 52% of the students and 75% of the instructors gave the answer as sometimes and this means that while reading the students sometimes make their interpretations in the classroom discussion.

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of students and instructors regarding the statement “while reading the students play the work in the classroom” (see table 4.38). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 57,3% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors state that this activity is never done in reading classes. 33,3% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” The results show that this activity is never done in reading classes.

According to the results gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “while reading the students create a discussion about the characters of the work” (see table 4.39). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 57,7% of the students and 62,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” 34% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “never.” The result shows that while reading the students sometimes create a discussion about the characters of the work.

There is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of the instructors and students regarding the statement “while reading the students put themselves in the shoes of the characters and write diaries” (see table 4.40). Thus, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 79,3% of the students and 50% of the

instructors gave the answer as “never” and this shows that while reading the students never put themselves in the shoes of the characters and write diaries.

As can be seen from the finding, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “while reading the students write dialogues between two characters of the work” (see table 4.41). Therefore, this hypothesis is not rejected. 50,7% of the students and 50% of the instructors point out that this activity is never done. 43,3% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors state that this activity is sometimes done in reading classes. The results show that while reading the students never write dialogues between two characters of the work.

To sum up, only 2 hypotheses (see tables 4.23 and 4.25) related with while reading stage are rejected and 22 hypotheses are supported by chi square test. This means that both the instructors and the students agree with each other concerning while reading activities.

5.3.3 Conclusion of Seven Statements (Statements 42-48) Regarding the Opinions of Instructors and Students about the Problems Related with Reading Classes Concerning Post Reading Activities and Home Reading Activities in Reading Classes.

The findings show that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “after reading the students write a summary about what they have understood from the passage” (see table 4.42). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 57,3% of the students and 12,5% of the instructors point out that this activity is never done. The results show that after reading the students never write a summary about what they have understood from the passage.

According to the findings gathered from data analysis, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “after reading the students are given only passage reading as homework” (see table 4.43). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 49,3% of the students and 25% of the instructors point out that only passage reading is sometimes given as homework.

According to the finding gathered from data analysis there is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of students and instructors regarding the statement “the students are given worksheets about the period in which the work was

written as homework” (see table 4.44). Therefore, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. 62,7% of the students gave the answer as “never.” On the other hand, 62,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” The result shows that the instructors and the students do not agree with each other.

As can be seen from the result, there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the students are given worksheets about the characters of the work” (see table 4.45). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 71,3% of the students and 25% of the instructors gave the answer as “never.” 22% of the students and 50% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” The results show that the students are never given worksheets about the characters of the work.

There is statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the students are given worksheets about authors/poets of the work” (see table 4.46). Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by chi square test. 74,7% of the students say that they are never given worksheets about authors/poets of the work. On the other hand, 37,5% of the instructors gave the answer as “sometimes.” The results show that instructors and students do not agree with each other.

Since there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of participants regarding the statement “the students are wanted to study the linguistic features of the work as homework,” this hypothesis is supported by chi square test (see table 4.47). 51,3% of the students and 37,5% of the instructors point out that this activity is sometimes done. 37,3% of the students and 50% of the instructors state that this activity is never done. The results show that the students are sometimes wanted to study the linguistic features of the work as homework.

There is a statistically significant difference between the opinions of instructors and students regarding the statement “the students are given worksheets as homework with the worksheets of the vocabulary” (see table 4.48). Therefore, this hypothesis is rejected by chi square test. 63,3% of the students gave the answer as “never.” On the other hand, 50% of the instructors gave the answer as “always.” This means that instructors and students do not agree with each other.

To sum up, only 3 hypotheses (see tables 4.44; 4.46 and 4.48) related with post reading stage and home reading stage are rejected and 4 hypotheses are

supported by chi square test. This means that more than half of the hypotheses related with post reading stage and home reading stage are supported by chi square test. Therefore, both the instructors and students agree with each other concerning post reading activities and home reading activities.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Consequently, the following recommendations can be given to improve students' ability in the reading classes in Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School.

1- Before reading, the students should be given necessary information about the subject of the work using the students' previous knowledge about the author/poet.

2- Before reading, the students should be given background knowledge about the period in which the work was written.

3- Before reading, the students should be given background knowledge about the author/poet of the work.

4- Before reading, the students should be given background knowledge about the characters of the work.

5- Before reading, the students should be asked to make a research on cultural background of the work.

6- Before reading, the students should be encouraged for classroom discussion on the title of the work.

7- Before reading, the students should be given information about the subject of the work using some related pictures.

8- Before reading, the students should be given background knowledge about the period in which the work was written.

9- Before reading, the students should make research before the lesson in order to have the cultural background of the target language.

10- Before reading, the students should watch some video cassettes in order to have the cultural background of the target language.

11- Before reading, the students should listen to radio programmes in English in order to have the cultural background of the target language.

12- Before reading, the students should read English magazines and newspapers in order to have the cultural background of the target language.

13- While reading, the students should watch the work they are examining on video.

14- While reading, the students should play the work in the classroom.

15- While reading, the students should put themselves in the shoes of the characters and write diaries.

16- While reading, the students should write dialogues between two characters of the work.

17- While reading, the students should be given the meaning of unknown words by using mimes.

18- After reading, the students should write a summary about what they have understood from the passage.

19- The students should be given worksheets about the period in which the work was written as homework.

20- The students should be given worksheets about the characters of the work as homework.

21- The students should be given worksheets about authors/poets of the work as homework.

22- The students should be given worksheets as homework with the worksheets of the vocabulary.

23- The students should be given worksheets about the period in which the work was written as homework.

5.4.1 Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypothesis “Before Reading the Instructor Gives Information about the Subject of the Work Using Some Related Pictures.”

Some of the useful reading activities for the rejected hypothesis (see table 4.4) can be listed as follows:

5.4.1.1 Illustration

Having discussed the title, the teacher may present an illustration that gives a pictorial view of the text. Such an illustration can provide important clues for predicting the content and topic of the text (Dutta, 1994:40).

5.4.1.2 using visual aids

In order to change the focus of attention, the teacher can use a variety of visual aids, some of which can easily be improvised in the classroom. They might be a diagram, a table, a map, a collage or display, a flow-chart of events or character

development. Students may contribute to a background onto which they could place pictures and drawings of characters and events, poems, comments, and so on. These items could be arranged chronologically or there could be a map with the items placed according to where the events occurred (Hill, 1992:56-57).

5.4.1.3 Exchanges- visual appeal and textual richness

The film, the picture or the song is an aid in language teaching. One section of the play can be played several times in order to note a particular line or phrase with the visual/auditory features that supplement the study of the printed version. This detailed viewing/listening will be preceded by the study of the printed version. Broad outlines become clearer by watching the film several times (Carter and Long, 1991:54).

5.4.2 Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypothesis “Before Reading Instructor Gives Background Knowledge about the Period in Which the Work Was Written.”

Some of the useful reading activities for the rejected hypothesis (see table 4.6) can be listed as follows:

5.4.2.1 Giving background knowledge

Background knowledge can be given in various forms. It can be some knowledge about the period in which the work was written. A discussion can be made about the period. Some background knowledge can be given about the life of the author/poet as s/he reflects his/her life to the work s/he wrote (Kayışoğlu-Korkmaz, 2000:74).

5.4.2.2 Margin “knowledge” question

These questions direct the reader to the way in which s/he must activate his/her own knowledge of the subject, as well as his general knowledge, if s/he hopes to reconstruct the writer’s message embodied in the text. Consequently, the students are asked to relate concepts to others s/he is already familiar with, provide examples of concepts and make explicit the knowledge that the writer is assuming he possesses. They also ask him to use his/her knowledge of language and life, in conjunction with the aid provided by the context of the reading passage to guess the meaning of unfamiliar lexical items and to make appropriate inferences (Murdoch, 1986:10).

5.4.2.3 Pre-reading plan (prep)

PreP is defined as a pre-reading plan that helps the readers to facilitate the initial association of the topic of the reading passage and reader's prior knowledge. This activity helps the teachers to find out what their students know and what they do not know (Langer, 1981:153 cited in Toprak, 2004:91). In this activity, the teacher questions students and activates background information and personal experience in preparation for reading. Students first make associations with the new concept addressed in the text. Then they reflect upon their initial thoughts "where did that idea come from?" After reading the text, students reformulate their knowledge of the topic, connecting prior knowledge to the new information (<http://www.coun.uvic.ca/learn/read.html>).

5.4.2.4 Biographical montage

Before starting the lesson, some teachers talk about the author and the period in which the work was written. The teacher finds some photos, objects, place names, anything which is about the author's life and the period in which the work was written. These materials can be mounted on to a large piece of poster card or pinned to a wall or notice-board. Then, the class can speculate about the meaning of the items in the montage in groups or as a whole (Collie and Slater, 1990:23).

5.4.2.5 Guessing at missing information

The students are given some biographical information but certain important facts or aspects of the author's life and the period in which the work was written are omitted. The students speculate about the missing parts. Missing details can be filled in groups and then the guesses can be compared with the students of other group. This activity helps to spur students' curiosity about the author and the period in which the work was written and makes them to know more (Collie and Slater, 1990:26).

5.4.2.6 Previewing

Previews are useful for introduction of pre-reading materials in order to build background information in EFL teaching. In this activity, they provide the reader who lacks the necessary schemata with knowledge necessary for the comprehension of the passage properly. By means of previews, appropriate background of content can be taught directly (Graves et al., 1980:38 cited in Toprak, 2004:92-93).

5.4.3 Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypothesis “The Students Do Not See the Unknown Words as ‘Problem’ While Reading. They Try to Understand the Main Idea” and “The Instructor Gives the Meaning of Unknown Word by Using Mimes.”

Some of the useful reading activities for the rejected hypotheses (see table 4.23 and 4.25) can be given as follows:

5.4.3.1 Extracting and classifying vocabulary from the text

Teachers ask students to extract specific kinds of words or expressions from a part of the work studied when they want to highlight words either for comprehension or for stylistic analysis. In order to extract the meaning of the new words from the context, the students should read the text as a whole. S/he should understand the main idea well and pay particular attention to the previous sentences and the coming sentences in order to extract the meaning of the word from the context (Collie and Slater, 1990:50).

5.4.3.2 Dictionary exercise

This exercise requires the students to find the main meanings of lexical items that they are unfamiliar with and are going to encounter in the text. Although one wishes students to deduce the meaning of as many words as possible from context, it is not feasible to expect them to guess all new words. This exercise alerts them to possible meanings of a word, but they will still have to judge the correct one from context. They may even be forced to refer to their dictionaries at that stage, but this is a necessary step if they are to acquire good study skills (Murdoch, 1986:11).

5.4.3.3 Word prediction

The teacher writes a topic (for example, “pollution”) on the board and students predict the words that would be associated with the topic. This activity could be used either as a pre-reading activity or as a game in itself. In the former, the teacher tells the students that they are going to read a passage on; for example, “pollution” and students are to predict the words that may appear in the passage. The teacher writes the words on the board, occasionally asking the students the reason for their choice of words or for the meaning. Students are then given the passage to check their predictions. An important element in this activity is that students should be encouraged to explain why they have predicted the words. By explaining their choice of words they are not only refining their understanding of the words but also

activating other words in the schema related to the words in question, thus automatising their knowledge of lexical co-occurrence (Abdullah, 1993:11).

5.4.3.4 Vocabulary map

Students are asked to say aloud any words they can think of or remember related to the topic they have covered in the unit while the instructor writes them on the board. When sufficient words, especially key words related to the topic have been mentioned, the teacher asks the students to draw a vocabulary map by grouping the words under suitable headings or categories. Students are allowed to add new words not indicated on the board. Again, group work and discussion should be encouraged in this activity. The practice in this activity provides in helping students store words in semantic clusters of interrelated words is obvious (Abdullah, 1993:12).

5.4.3.5 Miming the meaning of unknown words

One of the most effective teaching activities in reading classes is not to use words but mimes. Body language, gestures, or mimes can be understood easily in the classroom. Before reading a text in the reading class, unknown words can be given by using mimes and this activity will be interesting and enjoyable for the students in order to learn and memorise the unknown words that take place in the reading text (Collie and Slater, 1990:201-202).

5.4.3.6 Word listing

In this activity, the teacher lists the unknown words of the text before reading. Later, s/he asks the students what the words remind them of. After the determination of the associations of the words, which concepts will cause problems and which students will experience those problems will be cleared up (Pearson and Spiro, 1982:47 cited in Toprak, 2004:110).

5.4.4 Suggested Activities for the Rejected Hypothesis “The Students are Given Worksheets about the Period in Which the Work was Written”; “The Students are Given Worksheets about Authors/Poets of the Work” and “The students are Given Worksheets as Homework with The Worksheets of Vocabulary.”

Some of the useful reading activities for the rejected hypotheses (see tables 4.44; 4.46; 4.48) can be listed as follows:

5.4.4.1 Question and answer worksheets

These worksheets are the easiest to be prepared. It is important to avoid the kind of situation where the students merely give what is obviously the desired right answer or questions that simply lead students to a specific point in the reading text where the correct answer is clearly to be found. It is a useful activity for the students to allow some time to compare the way they have answered the questions in the questionnaires (Collie and Slater, 1990:38:39).

5.4.4.2 Question worksheets leading to pair work in class

Half of the class can be given one set of questions related to the passage given as home reading. Students are asked to prepare answers for their questions as they read through given section, but they do not need to write them out. Each student can be paired with someone who received a different worksheet at the beginning of the next lesson. They ask their questions and check the answers given orally by the other students, in turn (Collie and Slater, 1990:39-41).

5.4.4.3 Do it yourself' questions

Students always enjoy the activity of devising a questionnaire by themselves when they have worked once or twice with worksheets distributed to them by their teacher. The students read a text with the task of thinking up and writing a few questions on it. For the next lesson, students work in pairs and ask each other their own questions or they put all the questions into a container and the questions are drawn out to be answered by the students working as a whole. Another useful technique is to give each half of the class a different text to read. Each student's job is to prepare a worksheet to accompany his or her section. In the next lesson, students exchange their worksheets with the students from the other half of the class. It is now time to read their partner's section from their books and answer the questions on it. The next lesson will be the feedback time for the pairs and this gives them some clues on what each student thinks about important in the passage (Collie and Slater, 1990:42).

5.4.4.4 Summaries with gaps

The most effective type of summary exercise is the gapped summary. This provides students with an almost complete and simply phrased description of the main points of the section they are tackling. The gaps consist of key words or

expressions which a reading of the appropriate passage can reveal. Self-access answer sheets can be useful here (Collie and Slater, 1990:43).

5.4.4.5 Summaries with incomplete sentences

In this activity, the student's job is to complete the sentences and thus ensure a fluent and accurate summary. The teacher collects the worksheets and checks them for content and language proficiency (Collie and Slater, 1990, 43).

5.4.4.6 Copy-delete strategy

The copy-delete strategy is one of the most efficient activity to start with for macrostructure training. It helps the readers how to work on finding what information is important and needs to be included in the summary and what information is not important and thus needs to be omitted. Being able to apply the deletion strategy facilitates the reader to improve the other macrorules such as superordination, selection and construction or invention (Brown and Day, 1983:12 cited in Toprak, 2004:113).

5.4.4.7 Language worksheets

Worksheets can be designed on vocabulary or other language difficulties in order to make reading easier for the learner. This kind of worksheet depends on the actual text, its level of difficulty, its particular stylistic qualities, and so on. Various types of these worksheets are matching, extracting and classifying vocabulary from the context, word or expressions to characterise a text, literal and metaphorical meaning, simple grammar or structure work, word puzzles with follow-up writing exercises, and worksheets focusing on the performative function of language (Collie and Slater, 1990:50-51).

5.4.4.8 Creating a bibliography

A play starts with a character and a character starts with a bibliography. Each of the details listed below can be used while creating a bibliography for your play's main character:

NAME: Character's name. If it is an inanimate object, add what the thing is.

AGE: Character's age.

FAMILY: Who is the character related to? If no one, put "no one."

WISH: What does your character want more than anything?

FEAR: What is the one thing that your character is afraid of? Everyone has at least one fear.

HABITAT: Where does your character live? Be specific.

JOB: Everyone has a job or something s/he is supposed to do.

INSIDE: What does your character think about?

OUTSIDE: What does your character look like?

(<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/drama>).

5.4.4.9 Analyzing and revising

You can copy this format and insert your play into the form:

TITLE: Your title.

TIME: What time is it when your play starts?

PLACE: Where are your characters when the play starts?

AT CURTAIN RISE: What action is going on when your play starts?

FIRST CHARACTER: Write your first line of dialogue here.

SECOND CHARACTER: Response to the first character's comments.

NOTE: Wherever you have action, write it in the present tense. Continue with your piece until finished.

Write one monologue as a new device for your play. A play writer uses the monologue to allow his or her audience to overhear what a character is thinking or to tell what happened or is going to happen. Afterwards, read aloud or trade with partners. Discuss the following questions:

- 1- Do the characters actually talk to one another? If not, how could they?
- 2- Does each have his or her own point of view? What is said in the play to support this?
- 3- What is the conflict? What is resolved?
- 4- How did the story make you feel?
- 5- Was the entire story told? Why or why not?

(<http://act.vtheatre.net/dict.html>).

5.4.4.10 Soliloquy/thought tracking

This drama technique can be exploited for interpretation of the literary text and understanding a fictitious character. In this particular technique, the learner gets into the skin of the character and thinks from his/her point of view. S/he totally

empathizes with the character. It is suggested that literary texts having an omniscient narrator would be more suitable in comparison to pieces of writings/essays giving accounts of personal experiences. As a procedure, the class is divided into groups of five or six students. In groups, learners are to select an important point of time in the main character's life in their text. It could be a time of success, failure, disappointment, loss, rejection, isolation or struggle, a time when the character has a monologue with himself or herself. After having selected a crucial point of time, the individual members of the groups are to articulate aloud the thoughts of the character to each other. After having heard each others' interpretations, the group has to work on a final one that will be presented in front of the class by a student as if s/he were actually the character going through that moment.

(<http://acf.gov.au/gtp/definitions.html>).

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study aimed at investigating the opinions of instructors and students towards the problems related with the reading classes at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. This study examined a limited sample of students at Düziçi ÇEAŞ Anatolian High School. Therefore, a further study can be extended to cover a larger group of schools in Turkey. Moreover, another research can be carried out about the reading activities and their role in learning English. A research about a comparison of L1 and L2 reading paying particular attention to cultural differences and schemata can also be carried out in reading classes.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, K.I. (1993). Teaching reading. *Forum*, 31(3):11-12.
- Alderson, J.C. (2000). *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.47.
- Alvarez, M.C. and Risko, V.J. (1989). Schema Activation, Construction, and Application. ERIC Digest. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.indiana.edu/~eric_rec/ieo/digests/d46.html#Digests#46
- Alyousef, H.S. (2005). Teaching reading comprehension to ESL/EFL learners. *The reading matrix*, 5(2) [On-Line].
Available: <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/alyousef/article.pdf>
- Amer, A.A. (1997). The effect of the teacher's reading aloud on the reading comprehension of EFL students. *Forum*, 51(1-4):43.
- Appleton, J. (2005). Visualisation and the Implications for Writing Extensive Readers. Developing Teachers com. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.developingteachers.com/articles_tchtraining/junglefever1_jo.html
- Badrawi, N. (1992). The reading dilemma: Meeting individual needs. *Forum*, 30(3):16-17.
- Baker, R.H. (2005). Teacher-Directed Instruction Plus Classwide Peer Tutoring and the Reading Growth of First-Grade Students. UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations. MS. California State University. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit/1428630>
- Bamford, J., and Day, R.R. (1997). Extensive Reading [On-Line].
Available at: <http://language.hyber.chubu.ac.jp/jatt/pub/tlt/97/may/extensive.html>
- Banville, S. (2005). Creating ESL/EFL lessons based on news and current events. *The internet TESL Journal*, 11 (9). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Banville-News/>
- Bell, T. (1998). Extensive reading: Why? and how? *The internet TEAL journal*, 4 (12). [On-Line]. Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Bell-Reading.html>

- Blogger. (2005). What is Extensive Reading? [On-Line]. Available at:
<http://doubtingtoshuo.blogspot.com/2005/11/what-is-extensive-reading.html>
- Borka, M.J. (2005). Second Language Learners Use of English During Guided Reading Lessons. UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations. PhD. University of Minnesota. [On-Line].
 Available at: <http://www.lib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit/3188566>
- Brandl, K. (2002). What are Best Practices Reading Strategies? [On-Line].
 Available at: <http://ilt.msu.edu/vol6num3/brandl/default.html>
- Bruton, A. (2002). Extensive Reading is Reading Extensively, Surely? The Language Teacher. [On-Line].
 Available at: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2002/11/bruton>
- Buehl, D. (2003). Literacy and Sound Learning: Strategies or Thoughtful Reading. [On-Line]. Available at: <http://soundlearning.publicradio.org/standard/docs>
- Callan, J. (2005). Reader-Specific Lexical Practice for Improved Reading Comprehension. US. Department of Education. [On-Line].
 Available at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/readingresearch/fy2003.html>
- Campagna, S. (2005). Sustained Silent Reading: A Useful Model. NCSALL. [On-Line]. Available at: <http://www.ncsall.net/index.php?id=738>
- Carrell, P.L. (1988). *Interactive Text Processing: Implications for ESL/Second Language Reading Classrooms*. Cambridge: CUP, p.245.
- Carroll, D.W. (1982). *Psychology of Language*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company. Pacific Grove, California, pp.232-233.
- Carter, R. and Long, N.M. (1991). *Teaching Literature*. Longman Inc., New York, p.54.
- Cartwright, G., and Cartwright, C. (1985). Selection of Instructional Materials. (On-Line). Available at : http://www.saskschools.ca/curr_content/adapthandbook/curricmaterial.html
- Case, A. (2006). Reading: Preparing Intermediate Students to Tackle Authentic Texts. Developing Teachers.com. [On-Line].
 Available at: http://www.developingteachers.com/articles_tchtraining/read_alex1.htm
- Chandler, D. (1995). The Active Reader. (Lecture Notes for ED10510). [On-Line].
 Available at: <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Modules/ED10510/active.html#F>
- Chia, H. (2001). Reading activities for effective top-down processing. *Forum*, 39(1):16.

- Chow, P., and Chou, C. (2000). Evaluating sustained silent reading in reading classes. *The internet TESL journal*, 6(2) [On-Line].
Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Chow-SSR.html>
- Claridge, G. (2005). Simplification in graded readers: Measuring the authenticity of graded texts. *Reading in a foreign language*, 17(2). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/October2005/claridge.html>
- Coira, J. (2001). Anticipating Guides: Pre-reading Strategy Lessons. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.suite101.com/article.cfm/1411/62368>
- Collie, J. and Slater, S. (1990). *Literature in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 23-52,201-202.
- Collins, N.D. (1993). Teaching Critical Reading through Literature. ERIC Digest. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No.ED 363 869). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://ericae.net/edo/ed363869.htm>
- Corrigan, K. and Davies, B. (2005). Into-Through-Beyond. YES! Online Education Connection. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.yesmagazine.org/article.asp?ID=1006>
- Cullen, B., and Sato, K. (2000). Practical techniques for teaching culture in the EFL classroom. *The internet TESL journal*, 6 (12). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Cullen-Culture.html>
- Çağlayan, H. (1997). *Effects of Different Pre-Reading Activities on the Comprehension of Different Text Types by Turkish EFL Learners*. Master's Thesis, The Middle East Technical University, The Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara, p. 3.
- Daskalos, K. and Ling, J.J. (2005). Authentic Texts or Adapted Texts- That is the Question. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://dspace.mah.se:8080/bitstream/2043/1964/1/authenticandadapted.pdf>
- Davidson, H. (2001). Past Script to a Defence of Simplification. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.nceltr.mq.edu.au/prospect/17/pros17_3hadav.asp
- Day, R.R. (1994). Selection of a passage for the EFL reading class. *Forum*, 32(1):20-21.

- Demiriz, E. (1998). *An Evaluation of the Efficiency of Pre-Reading Tasks and Schema Activation Activities in Teaching Reading*. Master's Thesis, The Middle East Technical University, The Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara, p. 3.
- Dlugosz, D.W. (2000). Rethinking of the role of reading in teaching of a foreign language to young Learners. *ELT journal*, 54(3):285- 289.
- Duke, N.K., and Pearson, P.D. (1992). Effective Practises for Developing Reading Comprehension. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://ed-web3.educ.msu.edu/pearson/pdpaper/Duke/ndpdp.html>
- Dumitrescu, V. (2000). Authentic materials: Selection and implementation in exercise language training. *Forum*, 38(2):20.
- Dutta, S.K. (1994). Predicting as a pre-reading activity. *Forum*, 32(1-4):40.
- Dwyer, M.A. (1983). Some strategies for improving reading efficiency. *Forum*, 11(3):56
- Ekmekçi, F.Ö. (1991). *Research Writing: A Guide for Writing Theses, Dissertations, and Articles*. Çukurova University Press, Adana.
- English Language Centre. (1998). Keys to Better Reading. HKPU. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://elc.polyu.edu.hk/elsc/material/Reading/kReading.htm>
- ESL Clubhouse. (2004). What Do EFL and ESL Mean? [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.englishclub.com/esl-forums/viewtopic.php?+=27300&sid=5b9128b5d39ef85d4055e6d4bf278b03>
- Evangelidou, E., Polymenidou, P., Tsitsopoulou, E., and Vacharoglou, A. (1990). Reading Skills. *FORUM*, 28(4):31.
- Fredrickson, A.T. (2001). Narrow Reading-A Powerful Way to Improve Your English [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.bangkokpost.net/education/site2000/ptau2401.htm>
- Gephard, J.G. (1987). Successful comprehension: What teacher can do before students read. *Forum*, 22(3):52.
- Ghani, S.A. (1993). ESP reading: Some implications for the design of materials. *Forum*, 31(4):42-43.
- Graney, J.M. (2005). Extensive reading activities for teaching language. *TESL-EJ*, 9(2). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://tesl-ej.org/ej34/r6.html>

- Grundy, J. (2004). Extensive Reading: A Valuable Language Learning Opportunity. ESOL. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.tki.org.nz/r/esol/esolonline/teachers/prof_read/jeanette_grundy/bacgroun...
- Guariento, W., and Morley, J. (2001). Text and task authenticity in the EFL classroom. *ELT journal*, 55(4):347-353.
- Hagelstein, J. (2004). Research Project in Reciprocal Teaching. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.bridgew.edu/Library/CAGS_Projects/jhagelsteini/web/revres.htm
- Hardcastle, V.G. (1995). Critical Reading Strategies. [On-Line]
Available at: <http://mind.phil.vt.edu/www/1204crs.html>
- Heather, L.W. (1993). Do Simplified Texts Simplify Language Comprehension for ESL Learners? [On-Line].
Available http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_ol/0000000b/80/26/e8/6e.pdf
- Hill, J. (1992). *Teaching Literature in the Language Classroom*. Macmillan Publishers Ltd., London and Basingstoke, pp.56-57.
- Holloway, J. (1999). Improving reading skills of adolescents. *The Internet TESL journal*, 57(2). [On-Line].
Available: <http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/edlead/9910/holloway.html>
- Hopkins, G. (2002). Sustained Silent Reading Helps Develop Independent Readers. Education World. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.educationworld.com/a_wrr/curro38.shtm/
- Hopkins, G. (2003). 'Sustained Silent Reading' Helps Develop Independent Readers. Education World, Inc. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.education-world.com/a_curr/curr038.shtml
- Howard, J. (2005). Developing Reading Activities: Making Content Reading Accessible to Language Readers. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://ciin.miis.edu/proceeding.html>
<http://www.ub.es/div5/departam/dll/recursos/prov71.htm>
http://www.longman.co.uk/tt_seceng/resources/glosauth.htm
<http://www.sarasota.k12.fl.us/sarasota/rdgprocess.htm>

- http://www.dfes.gov.uk/curriculum_literacy/tree/reading/readingcomp/guidance/2/
- <http://www.coun.uv.c.ca/learn/read.html>
- <http://esl.about.com/library/lessons/nblreadtypes.htm> (2005).
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/drama>
- <http://act.vtheatre.net/dict.html>
- <http://afc.gov.au/gtp/definitions.html>
- Hyland, K. (1990). Purpose and strategy: Teaching extensive reading skills. *Forum*, 28(2):16.
- Johnson, D. (2005). Culture in adult ESL: Pedagogical and ethical considerations. *TESL-EJ*, 9 (1). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.kyoto-su.ac.jp/information/tesl-ej/ej33/cf.html/>
- Johnson, K. and Johnson, H. (1999). *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics: A Handbook for Language Teaching*. Blackwell Publishers Inc., Malden, USA, p.283.
- Jordan, R.R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource for Teachers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p.105.
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2004). Authentic materials and cultural content in EFL classrooms. *The Internet TESL journal*, 10 (7). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kilickaya-Authenticmaterial.html>
- King, K. (2006). "Reading Strategies." [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.isu.edu/~kingkath/readstrt.html>
- Kiper, J. (2002). How Can Students Learn to Read Critically? [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.women-studies.ohio-state.edu/pedagogy/Reading/readcritically.htm>
- Knott, D. (2005). Critical Reading toward Critical Writing. New College Writing Centre. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.utoronto.ca/writing/critrdg.html>
- Knutson, E.K. (1998). Reading with a Purpose. CAL Digests. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/reading_digest.html
- Kayısoğlu-Korkmaz, M. (2000). *An Analysis of the Opinions of Instructors and Students Towards the Problems Related with Reading Activities in Reading Classes*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Gaziantep University, Institute of Social Sciences, Gaziantep, pp. II-III, 74.

- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, p.48.
- Krashen, S. (2004). The case for narrow reading. *Language magazine*, 3 (5) [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.sdkrashen.com/articles/narrow/all.html>
- Kurland D.J. ((2000). What is Critical Reading? [On-Line].
Available at: www.critical-reading.com/
- Kurtul-Oğuz, H. (1999). *The Role and Importance of Culture and LI Reading Skills in Foreign Language Literacy*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Institute of Social Sciences, Çanakkale, p. I.
- Kutlar, E.L. (2001). *An Analysis of the Opinions of Instructors and Students Towards the Problems Related with The Main Idea Construction in Freshman Classes*. Master's Thesis, Gaziantep University, Institute of Social Sciences, Gaziantep, pp. I-II.
- Lardbrook, J. (2002). Sustained Silent Reading Programme. [On-Line].
Available at : <http://english.unitechnology.ac.nz/literacy/secondary/ssr.html>
- LeLoup, J.W. and Ponterio, R. (2005). Vocabulary support for independent online Reading. *Language learning and technology*, 9(2). [On-Line].
Available: <http://lft.msu.edu/vol9num2/net/default.html>
- Lessard, M. (1997). Towards an understanding of culture in L2/FL education. *The internet TESL journal*, 3(5). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lessard-Clouston-Culture.html>
- Lewis, M., and Hill, J. (1985). *Practical Techniques for Language Teaching*. Language Teaching Publications, London, p.107.
- Lilleberg, D.(2005). Encouraging a Reading Process. International Children's Education (ICHED). [On-Line].
Available www.iched.org/cms/scripts/page.php?site_id=iched&item_id=reading_process
- Ling, L. (2005). Simplified Literary Text. Malaysian English Language Teaching Association (MELTA). [On-Line].
Available:http://www.melta.org.my/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=210&forum=5&jump=1&start=0
- Lintern, S. (2002). Motivation. [On-Line].
Available: www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/motivation/Pages/what%20is%20motivation.htm

- Lopes, D. (1991). From reading to writing strategies. *Forum*, 24(4):42.
- Lye, J. (1996). Critical Reading: A Guide. [On-Line].
Available at : <http://www.brocku.ca/english/jlye/criticalreading.html>
- Mackay, R., Barkman, B., and Jordan, T.R. (1979). *Reading in a Second Language: Hypotheses, Organisation and Practice*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc: Rowley.
- Martin, D. (1991). How to be a Successful Student. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://martin.cc.ca.us/~don/study/7read.html>
- Martinez, A.G. (2002). Authentic Materials. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/authenticmaterials.html>
- Matikainen, T., and Dufy, C. (2000). Developing cultural understanding. *Forum*, 38(3): 40.
- Matias, P.M. (2005). Reading Comprehension Strategies of Gifted Anglo and Hispanic Bilingual Female High School Students Enrolled in an Advanced Placement Spanish Literature Class. UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations. PhD. George State University. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit/3180939>
- McKay, S. (1987). Cultural knowledge and the teaching of reading. *Forum*, 25(2):18.
- McKeinze, D.(2002). Popular Literature in the School Library, Does it Have a Place? Popular Literature in School. [On-Line].
Available: http://www.geocities.com/dimac4/Papers/popular_literature_in_scho.htm?200624
- Mei-yun, N. (1989). Teaching efficient EFL reading. *Forum*, 27(2):13.
- Mickulecky, B.S. (1984). Reading skills instruction in ESL. In P.Larson, E.L.Judd, and D.S. Messerchmitt (eds). *On Tesol 1984*, The teachers of English to speakers of other languages (pp 261-271). Washington D.C.
- Morris, P. (1997). Schemata Activation, Construction, and Application. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.Coedu.usf.edu/~morris/red.comp.html#4>
- Murdoch, G.S. (1986). A more integrated approach to the teaching of reading. *Forum*, 24(1-4):1-12.
- Myers, S.S and Palmer, C. (2002). Types of Reading Strategies. Gallaudet University. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://depts.gallaudet.edu/englishworks/reading/readquest.html>

- NCLRC. (2004). Teaching Reading. The National Capital Language Resource Centre. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.nclrc.org/essentials/reading/developread.htm>
- NCTE. (2006). Guidelines for Selection of Materials in English Language Arts Programs. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.ncte.org/about/issues/censorship/five/116515.htm>
- New Mexico Reading Initiative. (2005). What is Reading? [On-Line].
Available at: <http://reta.nmsu.edu/reading/r/nm/section1.html#whatisreading>
- Nicholas, L.N. (1989). Reading aloud: Why, when and how. *Forum*, 27(1):3,33-34.
- Norris, R.W. (1999). Getting Students More Personally Involved: An Alternative to the Yakudoku-and Lecture-Dominated Methods of Teaching Literature and Reading. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.2.gol.com/users/norris/read1.html>
- Norton, L. and Scantlebury, E. (1995). Critical Reading. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.hope.ac.uk/gnu/stuhelp/reading2.htm#surface>
- N.W. (2005). The Benefits of Reading Aloud. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.nwrel.org/learns/tutor/spr2001/part1.html>
- Nuttall, C. (1982). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., London, pp.23,54,138.
- Palmer, C., and Myers, S.S. (2002). Types of Reading Questions. Gallaudet University, Washington, D.C. [On-Line].
Available at : <http://depts.gallaudet.edu/englishworks/reading/readquest.html>
- Park, H. (2005). Second Language Reading: The Interrelationships among Text Adjuncts, Students' Proficiency Levels and Reading Strategies. UMI ProQuest Digital Dissertations. PhD. University of Florida. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit/3192443>
- Peirce, W. (1998). Strategies for Teaching Critical Reading. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://academic.pg.cc.md.us/~wpeirce/MCCCTR/critread.html>
- Phil's EFL Support Site. (2005). Approaches to Reading. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.philseflsupport.com/reading_approaches.htm

- Phinney, M.Y. (2005). Working with Reluctant Readers. Scholastic Education. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.scholastic.ca/education/at-risk-readers/workingwithreluctant-pdf>
- Plastina, A.F. (2000). Teaching culture in literature in the ESL/EFL classroom. *The internet TESL journal*, 6(3). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Plastina-CultureInLiterature/>
- Plotnick, J. (2005). Critical Reading towards Critical Writing. (On-Line).
Available at: <http://www.utoronto.ca/writing/critrdg.html>
- PSSA Classroom Connections. (2006.) Description of Reading Purposes. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.southmoreland.net/pssa/reading/readpurp.htm>
- PSSA Classroom Connections. (2006) The Role of Prior Knowledge in Learning. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.southmoreland.net/pssa/reading/prior>
- Rauf, S.M. (1988). Culture and reading comprehension. *Forum*, 26(2):44-45.
- Razi, S. (2005). The Effects of Cultural Schema and Reading Activities on Reading Comprehension. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.readingmatrix.com/conference/PP/proceedings/razi-pdf>
- Reis, L.A.V.P. (1993). Pre-warm-up activities. *Forum*. 31(4):38.
- Reutzel, D.R., and Cooler, J.R. (1996). *Teaching Children to Read*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., USA.
- Reutzel, D.R. (1985). Reconciling schema theory and the basal reading lesson. *The reading teacher*, 39(2):194-198.
- Richards, J.C., and Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. CUP, pp.55-60.
- Richard, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p.253.
- Rivers, W.M. (1981). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, p.52.
- Rivas, R.M.M. (1999). Reading in recent ELT coursebooks. *ELT journal*, 53(1):12, 14-19.

- Robb, T.N., and Susser, B. (1989). Extensive reading vs skills building in an EFL context. *Reading in a foreign language*, 12(2). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.kyoto-su.ac.jp/~trobb/robbsuss.html>
- Robertson, S. (2005). Critical Reading. The University of Melbourne. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.lib.unimelb.edu.au/postgrad/litreview/criticalreading.html>
- Rubba, J. (2005). The Language of Literature. California Polytechnic State University. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://cla.calpoly.edu/~jrubba/495lit/schemahandout.html>
- Shelton, S. (2005). Encouraging Extensive Reading -1. Developing Teachers com. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.developingteachers.com/articles_tchtraining/extread1.scott.htm
- Shelton, S. (2006). Encouraging Extensive Reading -2. Developing Teachers com. [On-Line].
Available at: http://www.developingteachers.com/articles_tchtraining/extread2_/scott.htm
- Shih, M. (1992). Beyond comprehension exercises in the ESL academic reading class. *Tesol quarterly*, 26(2):289-310.
- Singhal, M. (1998). A comparison of L1 and L2 reading: Cultural differences and schema. *The internet TESL journal*, 7(10). [On-Line].
Available: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Singhal-ReadingL1L2.html> Chia
- Sivrikaya, M. (1996). *An Experimental Study on the Significance of Students' Interest in Reading Comprehension through Authentic Texts*. Master's Thesis, Anadolu University, The Institute of Social Sciences, Eskişehir, p. 4.
- Smith, F. (1971). *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, p.43.
- Sonka, A.L. (1979). Reading has to be taught, too. *A Forum anthology. Selected articles from the English teaching Forum*, (1979-1983). 120-124.
- Spadorcia, S.A. (2004). Looking More Closely at High-Interest, Low-Level Texts: Do They Support Comprehension? Resource Room. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.resourceroom.net/comprehension/idahilocomp.asp>
- Stanley, G. (2005). Extensive Reading. British Council Teaching English. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/read/extensive.shtml>
- Stott, N. (2001). Helping ESL students become better readers: Schema theory applications and limitations. *The internet TESL journal*, 7(2). [On-Line].
Available at: iteslj.org/Articles/Stott-Schema.html

- Susser, B., and Robb, T.N. (1989). Reading in a foreign language. *Jalt journal*, 12(2). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.kyoto-su.ac.jp/~trobb/sussrobb.html>
- Thanasoulas, D. (2001). The Importance of Teaching Culture in the EFL Classroom. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.eslforum.net/paper003.htm>
- The Writing Centre. (2005). Critical Reading: What is Critical Reading and Why Do I need to Do It? Cleveland State University. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.csuohio.edu/writingcenter/critread.html>
- Toprak, E.L. (2004). *Narratology and Language Teaching*. Pegem A Publishers Inc., Ankara, pp.1-9,91-110.
- Thuss, A. (1999). Reading Comprehension. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.hio.ft.hanze.nl/thar/reading.htm>
- University Studies Curriculum Support Design. (2006). Critical Reading [On-Line].
Available at: <http://www.ous.pdx.edu/resource/csd/CRITREAD.HTM>
- Watt, D. (2004). Using modern art to teach language and culture to ESL students. *The internet TESL journal*, 10(10). [On-Line].
Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Watt-ModernArt.html>
- Wesley, A. (2001). Critical Reading Techniques. [On-Line].
Available at: http://occawlonline.personed.com/bookbind/pubbooks/lardner_awl/chapter/
- Wheeler, K. (2003). Critical Reading of an Argument. [On-Line].
Available at: <http://guweb2.gonzaga.edu/faculty/wheeler/reading-basic.html>
- Widyamers, S.A. (1999). Schema Theory: An Introduction. [On-Line].
Available : [www.kihd.gmu.edu/immersion/knowledgebase/strategies/cognitivism Theory.htm](http://www.kihd.gmu.edu/immersion/knowledgebase/strategies/cognitivism%20Theory.htm)
- Williams, D. (1983). Developing reading comprehension skills at the post-primary level. *Forum*, 21(3):11-16.

APPENDICES

Dear Colleague;

The present questionnaire consists of some situations in which the students were thought to have problems. Please read the questionnaire carefully and choose one of the items.

I would like to thank you for your responses which will help our present study.

		Never	Sometimes	Always
1	Before reading activity I give background knowledge about the subject of the work.	1	2	3
2	Before reading I give information about the subject of the work by reading it quickly.	1	2	3
3	Before reading I give information about the subject of the work using the title of the work.	1	2	3
4	Before reading I give information about the subject of the work using some related pictures.	1	2	3
5	Before reading I give information about the subject of the work using the students' previous knowledge about the author/poet.	1	2	3
6	Before reading I give background knowledge about the period in which the work was written.	1	2	3
7	Before reading I give background knowledge about the author/poet of the work.	1	2	3
8	Before reading I give background knowledge about the characters of the work.	1	2	3
9	Before reading I give background knowledge about the linguistic/stylistic features of the work.	1	2	3
10	Before reading I give background knowledge about the cultural features of the work.	1	2	3
11	Before reading I want my students to make a research on cultural background of the work.	1	2	3
12	Before reading I create a situation for classroom discussion on the title of the work.	1	2	3
13	Before reading I ask questions using the question words; how, why, where, who, what, when.	1	2	3
14	My students have the cultural background of the target language by making research before the lesson.	1	2	3
15	My students have the cultural background of the target language watching some video cassettes.	1	2	3
16	My students have the cultural background of the target language listening to radio programmes in English.	1	2	3
17	My students have the cultural background of the target language reading English magazines, newspapers.	1	2	3
18	I give the vocabulary of the work using the opposites of the unknown words.	1	2	3
19	I give the synonyms of the vocabulary.	1	2	3
20	I want my students try to grasp the meaning of the unknown vocabulary from the context.	1	2	3

		Never	Sometimes	Always
21	My students use English-English dictionary to learn the unknown vocabulary.	1	2	3
22	My students use English-Turkish dictionary to learn the unknown vocabulary.	1	2	3
23	My students don't see the unknown words as "problem" while reading. They try to understand the main idea.	1	2	3
24	I give the meaning of unknown words by drawing pictures on the board.	1	2	3
25	I give the meaning of unknown words by using mimes.	1	2	3
26	I give the meaning of unknown words by using them in the sample sentences.	1	2	3
27	While reading structural differences between my students' mother tongue and target language cause a problem.	1	2	3
28	While reading unknown words are problem on my students' understanding.	1	2	3
29	While reading insufficient cultural background knowledge causes a problem of understanding.	1	2	3
30	While reading my students try to understand the whole work.	1	2	3
31	While reading my students try to understand only a part of the work.	1	2	3
32	While reading my students try to have their own interpretations about the whole work.	1	2	3
33	My students can read two works (i.e. two stories which have similar linguistic features or similar subjects) by comparing them with each other.	1	2	3
34	My students listen to the work which is examined in the classroom on the tape recorder.	1	2	3
35	My students watch the work they are examining on video.	1	2	3
36	After reading some parts of the work, my students are asked to predict the other parts of the works.	1	2	3
37	While reading my students make their interpretations in the classroom discussion.	1	2	3
38	While reading my students play the work in the classroom.	1	2	3
39	While reading my students create a discussion about the characters of the work.	1	2	3
40	While reading my students put themselves in the shoes of the characters and write diaries.	1	2	3
41	While reading my students write dialogues between two characters of the work.	1	2	3
42	After reading my students write a summary about what they have understood from the passage.	1	2	3
43	After reading my students are given only passage reading as homework.	1	2	3
44	My students are given worksheets about the period in which the work was written as homework.	1	2	3
45	My students are given worksheets about the characters of the work.	1	2	3
46	My students are given worksheets about authors/poets of the work.	1	2	3
47	My students are wanted to study the linguistic features of the work as homework.	1	2	3
48	My students are given worksheets as homework with the worksheets of the vocabulary.	1	2	3

Değerli Öğrenci;

Cevaplayacağınız bu ankette okuma dersleri sırasında karşılaştığınız zorlukları ortaya çıkarmak üzere hazırlanmış 48 önerme vardır. Önermeleri dikkatlice okuyup her zaman, bazen veya hiçbir zaman seçeneklerinden birisini işaretleyiniz. Süreniz 40 dakikadır. Hazırlanmakta olan bilimsel bir çalışmaya katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederiz.

		Hiçbir zaman	Bazen	Her zaman
1	Okumaya başlamadan önce konunun ne ile ilgili olduğunu öğretmenin verdiği ön bilgiden anlıyorum.	1	2	3
2	Okumaya başlamadan önce konunun ne ile ilgili olduğunu parçayı hızlı bir şekilde okuyarak öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
3	Okumaya başlamadan önce konunun ne ile ilgili olduğunu başlıktan anlamaya çalışıyorum.	1	2	3
4	Okumaya başlamadan önce konunun ne ile ilgili olduğunu resimden öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
5	Okumaya başlamadan önce konunun ne ile ilgili olduğunu yazarla ilgili daha önceki bilgilerimden öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
6	Okuma öncesi eserin yazıldığı dönem hakkında öğretmen tarafından ön bilgi veriliyor.	1	2	3
7	Okuma öncesi yazar hakkında öğretmen tarafından bilgi veriliyor.	1	2	3
8	Okuma öncesi karakterler hakkında öğretmen tarafından ön bilgi veriliyor.	1	2	3
9	Okuma öncesi parçanın dil yapısı hakkında öğretmen tarafından ön bilgi veriliyor.	1	2	3
10	Okuma öncesi konuda geçen kültürel konularla ilgili öğretmen tarafından ön bilgi veriliyor.	1	2	3
11	Okuma öncesi konuda geçen kültürel konular hakkındaki bilgiyi kendim ön araştırma yaparak öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
12	Okuma öncesi başlık hakkında sınıf tartışmaları yapılıyor.	1	2	3
13	Okuma öncesi öğretmenin soru kelimeleriyle (örneğin; ne, nerede, ne zaman, nasıl...) sorduğu sorularla cevap veriliyor.	1	2	3
14	Öğrendiğimiz yabancı dilin kültürü hakkındaki bilgiyi ön araştırma yaparak öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
15	Öğrendiğimiz yabancı dilin kültürü hakkındaki bilgiyi video filmleri izleyerek öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
16	Öğrendiğimiz yabancı dilin kültürü hakkındaki bilgiyi radyo dinleyerek öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
17	Öğrendiğimiz yabancı dilin kültürü hakkındaki bilgiyi gazete okuyarak öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
18	Bilinmeyen kelimeleri öğretmen zıt anlamlı kelimeler verdiğinde öğreniyorum.	1	2	3
19	Bilinmeyen kelimeleri öğretmen eş anlamlı kelimeler verdiğinde anlıyorum.	1	2	3
20	Bilinmeyen kelimeleri parçanın genelinden anlıyorum.	1	2	3

		Hiçbir zaman	bazen	Her zaman
21	Bilinmeyen kelimelerin anlamlarını İngilizce'den İngilizce'ye sözlükten buluyorum.	1	2	3
22	Bilinmeyen kelimelerin anlamlarını İngilizce'den Türkçe'ye sözlükten buluyorum.	1	2	3
23	Bilinmeyen kelimelerin anlamları üzerinde durmayıp parçanın ana fikrini buluyorum.	1	2	3
24	Bilinmeyen kelimelerin anlamlarını öğretmenin çizdiği şekillerden anlıyorum.	1	2	3
25	Bilinmeyen kelimelerin anlamlarını öğretmenin yaptığı hareketlerden anlıyorum.	1	2	3
26	Bilinmeyen kelimeleri öğretmenin kurduğu örnek cümlelerden anlıyorum.	1	2	3
27	Okuma sırasında yabancı dil ve ana dilimiz arasındaki yapı farkı anlamamıza engel oluyor.	1	2	3
28	Okuma sırasında yabancı kelimenin bilinmemesi anlamamıza engel oluyor.	1	2	3
29	Okuma sırasında yabancı dilin kültürü hakkındaki ön bilgilerin yeterli olmaması anlamamıza engel oluyor.	1	2	3
30	Yabancı dilde bir parça okurken parçanın tümünü anlamaya çalışıyorum.	1	2	3
31	Yabancı dilde bir parça okurken bir bölümü anlamaya çalışıyorum.	1	2	3
32	Yabancı dilde bir parça okurken başlıktan parçanın tümüne ilişkin yorumlar çıkarmaya çalışıyorum.	1	2	3
33	Konuları ya da dil yapıları bakımından birbirine benzer okuma parçalarını (örneğin iki hikayeyi) karşılaştırma yaparak okuyabiliyorum.	1	2	3
34	Okuduğumuz eseri teyp kasetinden dinleyebiliyorum.	1	2	3
35	Okuduğumuz eseri video kasetinden izleyebiliyorum.	1	2	3
36	Parçanın bir bölümü okunduktan sonra öğretmen parçadan daha sonra ne olabileceğini tahmin etmemizi istiyor.	1	2	3
37	Okuma sırasında sınıfta tartışma ortamı yaratıp okuma parçası ile ilgili yorumlar yapıyoruz.	1	2	3
38	Okuma sırasında sınıf içerisinde okuduğumuz eserleri okuyanlarla canlandırıyoruz.	1	2	3
39	Okuma sırasında parçanın karakterleri hakkında tartışıyoruz.	1	2	3
40	Okuma sırasında kendimizi parçadaki karakterlerin yerine koyup onlar gibi düşünmeye çalışırken "günlük" yazıyoruz.	1	2	3
41	Okuma sırasında iki karakter arasında geçebilecek bir diyalog yazıyoruz	1	2	3
42	Okuma sürecinin sonunda parçadan anladıklarımızı özet halinde yazıyoruz.	1	2	3
43	Oluma parçası ile ilgili ev ödevleri sadece okuma şeklinde veriliyor.	1	2	3
44	Okuma parçası ile ilgili ev ödevleri dönem hakkında bilgi veren çalışma kağıtları ile destekleniyor.	1	2	3
45	Okuma parçası ile ilgili ev ödevleri karakterler hakkında bilgi veren çalışma kağıtlarıyla destekleniyor.	1	2	3
46	Okuma parçası ile ilgili ev ödevlerinde yardımcı olabilecek yazar ile ilgili çalışma kağıtları veriliyor.	1	2	3
47	Okuma parçası ile ilgili ev ödevleri verilirken parçanın dil yapısı (örneğin tense değişikliği) ile ilgili alıştırmalar yapmamız isteniyor.	1	2	3
48	Okuma parçası ile ilgili ev ödevleri verilirken bilinmeyen kelimelerle ilgili çalışma kağıtları da birlikte veriliyor.	1	2	3

VITAE

Eyyup Serkan Öncel was born in Şanlıurfa in 1974. He graduated from the Department of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Education at Çukurova University in 1997. He has given some conferences titled “The Place of English in the World” and “A Curriculum Development for the Second Year Students of Computer Programming Department at Göksun Vocational High School Related to the Course of Occupational English.” He knows German in medium degree and English in advanced degree. He has been working as a lecturer at Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University since 1997. He is married and has a son.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Eyyup Serkan Öncel 1974 yılında Şanlıurfa’da doğdu. Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü’nden 1997 yılında mezun oldu. “İngilizce’nin Dünyadaki Yeri” ve “Göksun Meslek Yüksekokulu Bilgisayar Programcılığı 2. Sınıflar İçin Mesleki İngilizce Dersine İlişkin Bir Müfredat Geliştirme” konulu konferanslar vermiştir. Eyyup Serkan Öncel orta derecede Almanca ve ileri derecede İngilizce bilmektedir. 1997 yılından beri Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi’nde Öğretim Görevlisi olarak çalışmaktadır. Evli ve bir çocuk babasıdır.