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ABSTRACT

As a response to the needs of grade six students to improve in reading, this study was conducted. The study explored the use of reading strategies through Reciprocal Teaching Procedure (RTP), finding its effects on students reading comprehension, students’ use of reading strategies, their perception in English reading and the strengths and weaknesses of the said procedure. 20 grade six students from a Thai private school underwent a six week intervention of Reciprocal Teaching in their reading classes. In each session, the students joined a group discussion which practiced the four main strategies of Reciprocal Teaching - prediction, clarification, questioning and summarizing.
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Introduction

English as a Lingua Franca has gained much interest in many countries around the world. Because of globalization, several countries have seen the importance of having citizens who are competent in the said language and have made efforts to improve their people’s English language skills. Thailand, a country where English is considered a foreign language, is no exception. Along with several nations, Thailand has joined this movement of empowering citizens through English language competence. Though several efforts have been done, the country still lags behind other Asian countries. The latest English proficiency index of English First showed that Thailand ranked 62 out of 70 nations and was the third last in Asia (Fredrickson, 2015).

Looking at the efforts taken by the government for the past several years, we see that English has been included as a major subject in schools and made compulsory in primary level 1. Foreign teachers have been hired by schools to share expertise and fill in the gaps in English language learning. Different major exams have included the English subject not only to evaluate students’ ability but also to somehow give students a little push in studying English. Recently, the government has asked schools to increase the number of hours spent in learning the language and is encouraging all Thai teachers to improve their English skills. Though improvements can be seen, much work is still needed to be done to achieve a better ranking in English proficiency. Efforts in developing teachers and teaching methods must continue because several institutions are still relying on traditional methods that produce unsatisfactory results.

One of the major areas that needs attention in English language teaching is reading. Reading, as we know is a skill of great importance. Being able to read well in the English language means a higher possibility in getting high test scores in the said subject, greater chances of entering prestigious institutions.
and more opportunities in achieving a high job position. In addition to academic and career success, a good reader in English may also experience pleasure from a vast number of books written in the English language. Being a good reader has many benefits, but this quality is not acquired overnight. Learning to read is a step by step process that includes several components. At a young age, children are taught to decode written symbols and associate meaning with each one. As they move to the next level, the reading tasks become more challenging, requiring students to not merely decode symbols but find meaning in the text as a whole. Reading in one’s first language (L1) may be a struggle to some students and is a process that takes time to develop. Having to read in the second language (L2) may naturally pose an even bigger challenge to learners. For many Thai students, this proves to be quite true. Having a different writing system from English, some students struggle with simply decoding English words. Others may be able to read out loud but have a hard time understanding the text as a whole.

Reading

Reading according to Wallace (1992) is a social, interactive process and also a private activity. People read for different purposes: reading for survival, reading for learning, and reading for pleasure. Depending on the context, reading may mean being able to identify the words, capability of decoding the text, recitation, and interpretation.

Robinson, McKenna, & Conradi (2013) discussed two models on how reading occurs, the top-down model and the bottom-up model. The top-down model proposed by Goodman & Smith (as cited in Robinson et. al., 2013) suggests that the human brains are not able to handle the great amount of information contained in the text, therefore humans continuously guess what the next word would be. In guessing, the reader uses the previous words to help identify the next. This is said to be making use of the context.

Reading is a continuous process of guessing and confirming guesses by taking some of the letters of the word to confirm one’s prediction. The reader does not confirm his or her predictions by fully decoding the letters. However, if the guess of the reader is wrong, it is then the time the reader slows down and closely looks at the actual letters of the word. Because high level mental processes are involved in word recognition, this model is often called “top-down.” The top-down model claims that the eyes are directed by the brain in searching for words. The said model is also sometimes called “concept-driven” model that gives importance to meaning and comprehension. Though top-down model attracts many teachers, it has been proven to be problematic and has been replaced by other alternatives.

Replacing the “top-down” model is the “bottom-up.” This is accepted to be another description of the reading process. The “bottom –up” model suggests that nearly every letter of each word is processed by the reader. The process is mostly done unconsciously and automatically. Predictions are not needed and there is no need for the brain to direct the eyes to the required information.

Aside from the top-down and bottom-up reading models, Anderson (1999) claims that a more comprehensive model currently accepted by many is the interactive model. This model is a combination of both the top-down and bottom-up. It is believed that the brain works simultaneously and each process in the
top-down and bottom-up model compensates for deficiencies of the other (Stanovich, 1980, p. 35 as cited in Anderson, 1999). Furthermore, the interactive model highlights two conceptions. One, as already mentioned above, is the interaction between bottom-up and top-down process and the second is the interaction between the reader and text. Reading involves decoding and interpretation skills and the readers’ background knowledge interacts with the text facilitating comprehension. This role of schema in reading shows that meaning does not simply reside in the text alone. (Gabe, 1991, as cited in Anderson, 1999).

Reading in the Second Language

A common characteristic or behavior of L2 learners when it comes to reading is having the thought that they need to know all words in the text to understand what is read. Many studies of EFL students have revealed what seems to be the meaning of reading in L2 – a slow and laborious decoding process, which often results in poor comprehension and in low self-esteem (Masuhara, 2003: 340).

Nation (2009) gave factors that affect the difficulty of learning to read in L2. Students who are beginning to learn the L2 have limited vocabulary in the target language. This means that controlled texts and many pre-reading activities are needed by the L2 learner. For learners whose script is not related to the L2 script, time in learning letter shapes is needed for reading. Aside from factors that affect difficulty, Nation (2009) also discussed characteristics of L2 learners that help in learning the target language. One of these is that L2 beginners have general cognitive skills and they no longer need to learn what they can transfer from the L1.

Reading Strategies

Robinson, McKenna & Conradi (2012) discussed the strategies approach as something that encourages student involvement with reading. Reading strategies do not only encourage students to interact with the text, but aim to help students gain understanding of what they read. Robinson et al. (2012) also added that strategies approach developed from models of learning and thinking which came from works in developmental psychology. An example of research work founded on developmental psychology is that of Brown and Palincsar (1984) that looked at strategies for general learning tasks such as rehearsal, categorization, and elaboration. From their investigation, Brown and Palincsar (1984) have thought of the possible positive effects of strategies in improving young and less able learners' comprehension. The research work of Brown and Palincsar (1984) has eventually led to the development of an approach that teaches students four strategies – summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting. This approach is Reciprocal Teaching.

Aside from the different reading strategies mentioned above, Tompkins (2001) has identified other strategies used by elementary students. These are tapping prior knowledge, predicting, organizing ideas, figuring out unknown words, visualizing, making connections, applying fix-up strategies, revising meaning, monitoring, playing with language, summarizing, and evaluating. These strategies are said to also be used when writing.

Aebersold and Field (2017) mentioned the importance of explicit training of reading strategies. Students must be taught when, where and how to use different reading strategies. The strategies can be introduced while students are reading in the classroom. Strategies introduced by the teacher could be those
that build comprehension and monitor comprehension. Furthermore, monitoring comprehension is not enough. Students must also know how to adjust reading strategies so that their expectations could be met. These two processes, monitoring comprehension and adjusting reading strategies are considered to be very useful especially in academic reading and other reading activities that require a high proficiency level.

**Metacognition**

The use of reading strategies is supported by the metacognitive view which says that readers think what they are doing while reading. Baker and Brown (1984 as cited in Boyle & Peregy, 2001) gave a similar definition of how metacognition is applied in reading. They explained that monitoring one’s own reading processes and being able to take strategic steps to aid one’s reading are part of metacognition. Furthermore, metacognition means that the reader knows when and how to use strategies to assist in comprehension.

The awareness of the reading process and being conscious of the reading process mentioned by Baker and Brown have been pointed out by several researches to be a powerful tool for improving reading efficiency. These researches support the use of metacognition. Aebersold and Field (2017) gave their own explanation of the term metacognition as a word taken from the field of psychology and composing of two words which are meta and cognition. Meta – means after or behind, and cognition the act or process of knowing or perception. Combining the two words, metacognition means understanding what is behind or understanding how readers know and perceive. Based on the meaning of metacognition, students’ awareness of their reading process and gaining knowledge of what they can do to improve reading comprehension will help them become better readers. For students to know how to improve their reading comprehension, teachers must take the responsibility in making students become aware of different strategies and other tools available for their use.

**Teaching Reading Comprehension**

Tompkins (2001) describes comprehension as something that is invisible, mysterious and a process where students make meaning of what they read. She adds that affecting this process of making meaning are the text, the reader and the purpose.

Thomson & Vaughn (2004) defined comprehension as the ultimate goal in reading and includes understanding and appreciating text. It is a process wherein one actively constructs meaning. This active process includes the use of schema, understanding words and concepts, drawing inferences, and connecting main ideas. As for Judith Iwin (1991, as cited in Tompkins, 2001), her definition of comprehension emphasized the use of both the reader’s prior experience and the author’s text in creating meaning used by the reader for a certain purpose.

Grellet (1981) explains reading comprehension as much as possible, efficiently getting needed information from a written text. When getting this needed information, we apply different reading strategies. The strategies that we use to understand each text varies depending on our purpose of reading.

Grellet (1981) also discussed things to take into consideration when developing reading comprehension exercises. One of the things to bear in mind is that reading should begin with global understanding and head towards detailed comprehension. This is in contrast with many of reading materials that focus on structure and meaning of the sentences causing students to lack confidence in inferring meaning
Reciprocal Teaching

Reciprocal teaching is a procedure of teaching reading strategies developed by Brown and Palinscar (1982). In this procedure, the teacher and students take turns in leading a discussion about certain parts of a text. Aside from using reciprocal questioning, students and teachers take turns in coming up with summaries, making predictions and clarifying ambiguous or complex parts of the text. The first sessions are led by the teacher and key activities of summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting are modeled by him or her. When implementing the procedure, Brown and Palincsar (1982) have observed that it was difficult for the students to take the role of the leader during the initial stages. The adult teacher had to help construct questions for students to mimic. However, students gradually became more capable of being the dialogue reader as several sessions have passed. (Brown and Palincsar, 1984).

As mentioned there are four main strategies involved in reciprocal teaching: predicting, clarifying, questioning and summarizing. Ockczus (2010) discussed each strategy as follows:

1. Predicting – This is a strategy that many students equate with guessing. However, this is more than just guessing, because it involves students to preview the text and use their background knowledge, and schema, to make logical predictions. When teaching this strategy, teachers can make use of graphic organizers that will provide students clues in making their predictions. This strategy helps students develop a purpose for reading and allows them to monitor their comprehension.

2. Questioning – This strategy encourages students to ask different types of questions. At the beginning of instruction, the teacher facilitating the procedure may ask questions inferred from the text or quiz questions. When the students have become familiar with the activity, the teacher may start asking questions that require them to draw inferences and find main points. As the students progress, the teacher asks thinking or discussion questions such as “Why do you think…?” Through questioning, students improve comprehension by generating questions based on main ideas, important details, and textual inferences.

3. Clarifying – A strategy helping students monitor their comprehension as they encounter difficulties while reading the text. It involves two basic steps. The first step is to identify or admit that one is stuck and the second is to find out how to remedy the situation. When encountering difficult portions of the text, it can be helpful for the teacher to use the strategy frame “I didn’t get the sentence…so I…” By doing clarifying, problem solving becomes more explicit for students.

4. Summarizing – This is considered to be a challenging task because it involves the use of many skills and strategies. Some of these skills are recalling important events or details, ordering points, using synonyms or selecting vocabulary. Though it may be quite challenging, it can be done creatively to encourage student participation. Students can do verbal summaries, dramatization, note key points and create actions for each point.
Research on Reciprocal Teaching

This procedure of developing reading strategies has been used in several EFL contexts. In primary education, a study conducted by Peng and Wang (2015) dealt with the effects of reciprocal teaching on EFL fifth grade learners in Taiwan. The study included a total of 53 participants, with 26 belonging to the experimental group and 27 to the control group. The participants were tested to see if there have been improvements, both in their word recognition as well as reading comprehension after reciprocal teaching. The results showed that those in the experimental group made progress in word recognition and areas in comprehension. After instruction, six participants were interviewed regarding their attitudes towards reciprocal teaching and all interviews expressed that they liked the procedure. Among the four strategies, the participants said that prediction was what they liked best. What they least liked was summarization since they found it to be quite difficult. The participants also expressed areas where they thought reciprocal teaching helped them with their English ability.

Another study by Yoosabai (2009) investigated the effects of reciprocal teaching on 12th grade students in Thailand. The study had 66 participants who were divided into the experimental and control group. The experimental group was instructed with the use of reciprocal teaching while the control group used the skill based approach. Pretest and posttest were conducted to both groups and the posttest showed significant positive results. Mean score of the experimental group was higher than that of the control group. Aside from a reading comprehension test, a reading strategies questionnaire was given to the participants to answer. The answers of the participants after completing instruction showed that there was an increase in students’ exercise of reading strategies. Moreover, the study also reflected that reciprocal teaching did not only help improve proficient readers but made positive effects on less proficient readers as well.

Pamanee (2009) did a study that compared the effects of Reciprocal Teaching Procedure and regular reading instruction on students reading development. The students that were part of the study came from Mathayom 4. Using randomized block design, the participants were divided into two groups. One group was instructed using the reciprocal procedure and the other used the regular reading instruction. After instruction, the group that showed significant improvements in the posttest was the group that used reciprocal teaching. Moreover, the study revealed that students who used RTP found questioning most useful and guessing word meaning for those who did regular reading instruction. What was even more interesting was that students continued using the different strategies after the study.

Pamanee (2009) also discussed how cooperative techniques helped students develop their comprehension ability. For Thai students, cooperative learning is something that takes time to get used to since they have been mostly taught using teacher-oriented methods. Through RTP, students had the chance to interact with their classmates and each took roles that enabled them to be more responsible of their reading and learning. The procedure eventually led students to be more confident, independent and effective readers. The students also expressed the view that RTP was fun and felt that they could have been better readers in English if the method was taught to them since the beginning. Some of the suggestions that students gave to improve RTP were: more feedback should be given by the teacher and clarification of unfamiliar words should be done by the teachers as well.
In China, a study was conducted by Fei (2004) which involved 33 participants from a women’s college. The study used reciprocal teaching procedure in teaching reading strategies. The instruments used to gather data were reading comprehension test and a reading strategy questionnaire. In depth interviews were done with six students from the 33 participants and all instruments were used before and after instruction. The instruction which lasted for six weeks was divided into two sessions per week, with each session focusing on a main reading strategy.

The results of the study showed that there was a general increase in students’ frequency of reading strategy use after instruction. Fei (2004) reported that the reading strategy most commonly used by students before instruction were re-reading, selecting key information, and ignoring words. Checking prediction was said to be the least used strategy. After instruction, strategies reported to be most frequently used were re-reading, ignoring words, and selecting key points respectively. Comparing the results before and after instruction, six reading strategies showed a significant difference between before and after. These six reading strategies were using title or subtitle to predict, using picture to predict, reading with purpose, checking prediction, using prior knowledge, and guessing meaning.

The reading strategies that did not show a significant increase in the frequency were predicting while reading, using organization, selecting key information, underlining or making notes, relating key points, ignoring words, checking guessing, re-reading and checking comprehension. Possible reasons Fei (2004) gave explaining the phenomenon is that students have already been using some of the strategies frequently thus, no dramatic change in the use of these strategies occurred. Other strategies may be more challenging to master than others, requiring more time needed for practice.

Results of students’ views regarding seven strategies showed that student’s awareness in the strategies was greatly enhanced after instruction, showing a positive effect of the reading sessions. Among the eight strategies, seven showed an increase in the degree of importance and one, which was consulting a dictionary declined.

**Research Design**

The study used a mixed method approach, wherein both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed. The study also followed the one group pretest-posttest design, therefore having only an experimental group. The experimental group was composed of 20 participants in primary 6 who were further divided into four groups of five.

Before the implementation of the Reciprocal Teaching Procedure, the participants were asked to do a reading comprehension test. This is to find out their level of English reading proficiency before the instruction. In addition, a reading strategies questionnaire was given to examine strategies students use when reading English materials. Interview questions were also administered to investigate the participants’ general view and experiences in reading.

Reciprocal Teaching Procedure was implemented for a duration of six weeks, having one session per week, with each session lasting for 50 minutes. The first two sessions were led by the teacher and for the remaining sessions, participants had the opportunity to take in the role as leaders. During sessions, the participants’ discussions were recorded and teacher’s observations were noted.

A posttest followed after six sessions of reciprocal teaching. The posttest which is also a reading comprehension exam was used to compare results from the pretest. Another set of interview questions was
administered to find out what changes had the participants experienced and what their feelings toward the whole procedure were. Participants then again answered the reading strategies questionnaire, to investigate whether there were any changes in their use of reading strategies after instruction. The different data collected was analyzed in accordance with the research questions.

**Research Questions**

1. How does Reciprocal Teaching Procedure affect students’ reading comprehension skills and performance?
2. What effect does the use of RTP in reading comprehension classes have on students’ perceptions towards reading comprehension?

**Research Findings**

**Quantitative Data Findings**

**Results of the Reading Comprehension Test**

In order to find any improvements in the participants’ reading comprehension after receiving instruction, the mean scores and standard deviation of the results of the pre and posttest were calculated to determine whether there were any improvements in test performance before and after instruction. The results are presented below.

Table 1 shows that there has been a general increase between the participant pretest mean score (M =13.95, SD =3.87) and post test mean score (M = 16.30, SD = 3.91). From the results, we can conclude that the difference shows that there has been an improvement in students reading comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Mean Score of the Pretest and Posttest**

**Figure 1. Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Results**
**Comparison of the use of reading strategies before and after instruction**

Data gathered from the pre and post administration of the reading strategies questionnaire was analyzed by calculating the mean scores and standard deviation to find whether there were any improvements in the frequency of use of reading strategies before and after instruction. The results are shown in table 2.

### Table 2. Participants Use of Reading Strategies Before and After Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Uses knowledge and title background</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses pictures and graphics</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scans through the text</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pauses and predicts</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Checks predictions</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Uses other words in sentences</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Uses knowledge of the English structure</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relates own knowledge with the text</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uses external references</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Re-reads information</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Connects relevant ideas</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Discusses what is read with others</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Asks oneself questions</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Thinks about and find answers to questions</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Asks other people questions</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Tries to get the main idea</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ignores unimportant ideas</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Looks for topic sentences</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Makes mental maps or summaries</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Restates in his/her words</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Comparison of the Use of Reading Strategies Before and After Instruction**
The results from the RSQ showed a general increase of the students’ use of reading strategies. The strategy used most by students is re-reading information, followed by relating the text with one’s own knowledge and using pictures/graphics in guessing the content. The four strategies that showed a notable difference before and after instruction are using other words to guess the meaning, guessing the topic by reading the title, guessing the content by looking at pictures/graphics and making mental maps or summaries.

Among the 20 strategies on the questionnaire, results from three have remained the same before and after instruction. These three are checking predictions, asking oneself questions and getting the main idea of the text. Though there has been a general increase in the use of the strategies, two strategies did not show improvement and have even declined. The two strategies are scanning before reading and using external references in helping understanding the text. One possible reason that there was a decline in students scanning of text is that they focused more on the title and pictures seen in the text and could have been satisfied with the initial information they received from them. As for using external references, students who at the beginning have been so conscious about having the need to know almost every word had the tendency to open the dictionary or use programs that translate words in the text. After instruction, students have learned strategies in guessing the words in the text by using pictures, context clues, word structure, and others. These strategies have probably caused students to realize that it is not necessary to know every word to understand the text and that they can guess the meaning of words through different ways. The need for students to look up the dictionary or other external references has lessened and could be the probable cause of the decline in the use of such strategies.

Qualitative Data Findings

Post-Intervention Interview

The students agreed that the four strategies have helped them understand the text better and some expressed the view that the strategies have made the reading task easier. Students said that the four strategies helped them understand the text as a whole and made them understand the intention of the writer. In addition, the strategies helped students make use of pictures to guess the content of the text find answers to reading comprehension questions.

Among the four strategies, predicting was chosen by most students to be the most helpful, followed by summarizing, clarifying and questioning. When asked about how they can apply these strategies outside the classroom, many of the students said that it is useful when doing entrance exams for high school, especially in the reading part. They’ve also mentioned that the strategies can be applied when they read books that are considered for pleasure reading and gives them techniques so that they don’t need to always open their dictionaries to find the meaning of a word.

In regards to changes in students' perception, the students have expressed that their positive view of English still remains and RTP has made it even better. Reading in English becomes easier and is fun. In addition, it has stirred the desire for students to know more about what they read.

As for the students’ feelings toward group discussions, no one felt uncomfortable expressing their ideas with their classmates. Some students have even thought of the activity as stress reliever and made the reading tasks easier. They enjoyed sharing and listening to their classmates and allowed them to be creative by using their imagination.
Overall, no one disliked reciprocal teaching. However, some students stated that they did not like instances when they were asked to do several things by their peers or make questions when they were not ready. As for the effect of RTP on students’ confidence, the children have expressed the point that their confidence level has increased. Students have more confidence in their ability to guess, understand, and summarize the context of texts and this confidence has made them braver to take more risks. Students have realized that they don’t need to fear making mistakes and they experience joy, a sense of fulfillment, knowing that they can do the reading tasks.

Summary of Major Findings

1) The learning of reading strategies through RTP has improved the students’ reading comprehension skills.

   From the results of the pretest and posttest, a difference between the mean scores has been seen. The improvements in the mean score support the positive effects of learning reading strategies through RTP. This also supports the results of previous studies conducted by Peng and Wang (2015), Yoosabai (2009), Pamanee (2009) and Fei (2004). Aside from the quantitative data gathered from the reading comprehension test, the teacher’s observations throughout the period of intervention have stated students progress. Students’ responses to questions have improved as the weeks went by and the questions the students asked have shown a deeper understanding of the text they’ve read. Furthermore, the students themselves have attested that after instruction, they gained a better understanding of what they read.

2) Students’ use of reading strategies has increased to some extent.

   A comparison of the pre and post administration of the RSQ, showed a general increase of student’s use of reading strategies. However, there were certain items that remained the same and others that have even declined. The strategy that was used the most both before and after instruction was re-reading information and what was least used after instruction was ignoring important details. A notable difference can be seen before and after instruction in the use of strategies such as using other words to guess the meaning, guessing the topic by reading the title, guessing the content by looking at pictures/graphics and making mental maps or summaries.

   As for strategies that showed no changes and have declined after instruction, these occurrences could be attributed to students’ shift of focus in the use of other strategies. The results mentioned from the RSQ are supported by the teacher’s observations that indicated improvement in students’ use of reading strategies during discussions.

3) RTP shows to be a strategy training instructional method with many strengths but not without flaws

   From the SWOT analysis, RTP’s major strength is that it allows cooperative learning. Students get to examine the text in detail and interact with the text along with their peers. This reflects what Wallace (1992) said of reading as a social interactive process. Furthermore, the discussion of text with their peers provides a
relaxing and fun learning atmosphere. Students learn from their classmates and gain more confidence knowing that their struggles are not that different from others and that it is alright to be wrong at times.

As for weaknesses of RTP, one comes from its nature as a group activity. When not facilitated well, some students may dominate the discussion and leave those who are mostly quiet feel left out. Discussions can also go out of topic when students tend to be very playful. In addition, if the teacher does not add in a variety of activities, the use of RTP for a long period of time can be boring for the students.

Things that RTP can make use of are the different activities or exercises that have been developed for students to practice the four strategies. These materials can add color to the instruction and provide different ways that students can practice in using these strategies. Other sources that RTP may make use of are materials that provide students with a background of the texts that they will be reading. One possible threat for RTP is the teacher’s lack of managerial skills, a very important trait needed when having group work. When the teacher is not able to manage students’ behavior in group activities, chaos may occur and the class will not be able to meet the activity’s objectives. Another threat to the procedure is time, having a limited amount of time may cause discussions to be rushed and students not being able to fully express their ideas.

4) RTP has been viewed positively by students and has produced positive feelings towards reading.

From the interview conducted before instruction, students expressed having positive experiences in reading and good feelings toward it. After instruction, students said that their positive perception towards reading didn’t change. However, the instruction has made them even have a better feeling towards reading; especially reading in the English language. In regards to their views on reciprocal teaching, all have agreed that the instruction has helped them improve in reading and RTP is something that they can apply outside the classroom. The students described group discussions to be fun and stress relieving. There were no major activities that they did not like. Only a few dislikes that they mentioned were certain instances when they were asked to think of questions or summarize when they were not ready to do so.

Pedagogical Implications

1.) Reading strategy instruction and other various reading activities should be done more in EFL classrooms

Traditional reading exercises, wherein students are asked to read a passage and answer questions at the end have helped students at a certain level in reading. However, this type of instruction has failed to address other aspects of reading and has made reading boring to some. Teaching of reading strategies and other skills needed in reading should be done more in classrooms so that students do not see reading as a passive activity but one that is interactive. Having a variety of reading activities encourages students to take more interest in reading and eventually develop them to be good readers. This call for changes in traditional reading instruction is supported by Tompkins (2001) who believed that comprehension instruction goes beyond the students answering comprehension questions at the end of the text.
In regards to developing good readers, students must be aware of the different strategies they may use when reading and are given the time to practice them. This means that teachers must be willing to explore different reading instruction methods such as RTP that will encourage students to make use of the reading strategies. Moreover, regular practice of reading strategies by students is needed so that it becomes a habit, something that students do regularly.

2. Explicit teaching of the reading strategies and scaffold instruction are necessary in developing reading strategies

The use of reading strategies is known to be a metacognitive process which according to Baker and Brown (1984 as cited in Boyle &Peregoy, 2001) involves consciously monitoring one’s thinking and doing necessary actions to aid one’s reading. From the description given, we can say that it is important that one is aware of the reading strategies to make necessary decisions in using them in reading. From the interview conducted before instruction, students could hardly name specific reading strategies that their teachers taught them. The researcher had to give examples for them to identify some of the strategies with the activities they had done in their reading classes. This shows that reading strategies should be explicitly taught by teachers and they must also model the use of such strategies to the students. Tompkins (2001) echoes this when he said that explicit teaching of reading strategies will improve literacy among students. Students must also be given the opportunity to practice these strategies and in the early stages, teacher’s assistance, scaffolding, is necessary. Confidence, for EFL learners is very critical for language learning and letting students plunge in a reading activity without proper assistance can cause frustration and low self-esteem.

3. Reading teachers should make use of the power of interaction

Learning is also a social process. We learn when we interact with people around us. Teachers should realize the power of student interaction, its benefits, and how it encourages language development. Through group discussions like what has been applied in RTP, students are diverted from the idea of their teacher being the main source of answers but realize that their peers can be a great source of learning. Furthermore, as students share their ideas and receive affirmation from their peers, it builds up their confidence and makes them see their potential. This power of interaction among students has been reflected in studies such as that of Pamanee (2009) that showed how cooperative learning developed independent and effective readers.

4. Give importance in choosing appropriate reading materials for EFL student

From the interview, most of the students expressed the view that they liked reading texts accompanied by pictures. In the EFL context, having pictures as part of the text does not only serve as a way of attracting children’s interest but serves as a scaffold for students in understanding the meaning. In reading instruction, teachers must not only give importance to the method of teaching reading but also choose appropriate reading materials for the students. Having texts that are too difficult may discourage
children and the other hand, texts that are too easy can make them feel bored. Working on students’ zone of proximal development (ZPD) in reading stimulates learning. As stated by Cohen & Cowen (2008), optimal learning happens when students work in their ZPD.

As mentioned earlier, visuals play an important role in understanding the text and this is pretty much needed for primary students in an EFL context such as in Thailand. Another aspect of reading materials that teachers need to look into is that type or genre of text given to the students to read. Exposing the students to different text genres makes reading interesting and gives them an idea that reading is not just done to learn things for a particular subject in class. Aside from reading difficulty, visuals, and text genre, teachers must also consider the topics tackled in each text. Topics that are of the students interest and is something that they can relate to, help motivate students to read and allows them to use their background knowledge in understanding the text. However, if texts present something new to the students, background knowledge can be built through introductions and reviews of important vocabulary as suggested by Peng and Wang (2015).
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