Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate 55 secondary stage EFL teachers' self reports of (a) familiarity, (b) utility, and (c) perceived applicability of content reading straiegies based upon their responses to the Content Area Questionnaire. The results showed that the subjects were familiar with most of the reading strategies. Workshop attendance and participation in content reading courses appear to affect perceived application of content reading instructional strategies. This study also examined the relationship between both first language (L1) and foreign language (FL) reading attitudes as well as reading strategies, interests and reading preferences of 75 EFL students at the secondary stage .The results indicated that those students were sentient with most of the reading strategies and that they had positive attitudes towards reading in both their first language (L1) and foreign language (FL). By hearing directly from teens, educators can better understand their interests and habits and, thus, find and develop more effective strategies to raise and maintain their interest in reading.

Introduction

In 1999 the International Reading Association issued a position statement on adolescent literacy which called for a renewed interest in and dedication to the rights and needs of adolescent readers:

Adolescents entering the adult world in the 21st century will read and write more than at any other time in human history. They will need advanced levels of literacy to perform their jobs, run their households, act as citizens, and conduct their personal lives. They will need literacy to cope with the flood of information they will find everywhere they turn. They will need literacy to feed their imaginations so they can create the world of the future. In a complex and sometimes even dangerous world, their ability to read will be crucial. Continual instruction beyond the early grades is needed (Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999, p. 99).

Although the quality of content reading instruction in school has long been a concern of professionals in educational research and practice , secondary school EFL teachers today still ask such questions, "Why can't these students read and write by now? Why am I hearing that I still need to teach reading? How can I fit teaching reading into an already full curriculum?" Teachers who understand that reading is a strategic process establish environments that provide opportunities for students to learn language and learn about language while they are using language for real purposes .One of the most important functions of teachers is to bring students and texts together through instructional plans and practices that result in active student engagement and collaboration.

During the past two decades, extensive research in the area of reading has examined strategies used by readers to

comprehend expository texts (Kletzien, 1991; Weaver & Kintsch,1991;Day,2002;Brantmeier,2003;Rott,2003;).

Results of a long-term study carried out by the National Institute of Health in the United States (Teaching Johnny to Read, reprinted in Perspectives, Orton Dyslexia Society, 1997) indicate that 90% of the teachers do not know how to teach reading to children who do not get it automatically. While the situation in other countries is far from identical to that of the United States, this statistic should ring warning bells. Is it possible that teacher trainers are not giving EFL teacher trainees the tools necessary to teach reading successfully?

In order to help ESL students expand their working knowledge of English while learning new content, Snow & Brinton (1997) and Brantmeier (2003) specify what EFL teachers need to teach reading well:

1 - They need to know the subject matter they plan to teach. This permits them to select key concepts out of the many possibilities in the curriculum.

2 - They need to have a repertoire of instructional strategies which will assist in making grade-level content comprehensible and, therefore accessible.

3 - They need knowledge of foreign language learning processes. This includes knowledge not only of the cultures represented in their classrooms but also of foreign language development and of how students are assisted in learning.

4 - They need to be able to assess the particular cognitive, linguistic, and social strategies students use.EFL teachers have to have a thorough understanding of the content of instruction and a variety of options open to them so that they can present this content in such a way as to reach as

broad a section of the pupil population as possible. They must have all of the knowledge discussed above as well as the knowledge of how words are put together to form coherent text. Without this knowledge, teachers will not be able to give the explicit instruction that some pupils need to become proficient readers. But, do they know how to use this knowledge effectively? The answer to this question is relevant not only for methodology or proficiency courses, but for most of the courses students are required to take in a teacher training institution. Since the purpose of such an institution is to train future teachers, the relationship must be made, wherever possible, between the theoretical courses given in these institutions and their impact in the classroom.

Courses are given in linguistics or literature, but very often, little attempt is made to relate what is taught to the future classroom needs of teacher trainees. Phonetics teachers do not always relate what they teach to the phonemic awareness training needed in the classroom. Research has identified phonemic awareness as the most potent predictor of success in learning to read. It is more highly related to reading than tests of general intelligence, reading readiness, and listening comprehension (Stanovich, 1986; Sharp,2002). The lack of phonemic awareness is the most powerful determinant of the likelihood of failure to learn to read because of its importance in learning the English alphabetic system or how print represents spoken words. If students cannot hear and manipulate the sounds in spoken words, they have an extremely difficult time learning how to map those sounds to letters and letter patterns - the essence of decoding. (Adams, 1990). Courses in Semantics do not always relate what they are doing to the need for vocabulary acquisition in the classroom.

One of the possible reasons for this is that while teachers may have a thorough grounding in their specific fields of expertise, they may not be aware of recent research into the field of reading and how it relates to their particular courses.

Reading teachers need knowledge in order to successfully teach reading. If they do not have this knowledge, then we must ask ourselves what the implications are for our ability to successfully teach weak readers who need clear, explicit instruction, which presupposes this knowledge. Teachers must have this information at their disposal. If they do not, they run the risk of having pupils in their classes who could become proficient readers but who never reach their potential.

In many secondary schools in Egypt, EFL students spend little time actually reading texts. Much of their instructional time is spent on workbook-type assignments. Furthermore, most EFL teachers are spending inadequate amounts of time on direct comprehension instruction; they used either workbooks or textbook questions to determine a student's understanding of content, but rarely taught students "how to comprehend."

Reading teachers must not only be aware of cultural and socio-linguistic differences underlying the communicative behavior of native and non-native users of English, but also transmit such awareness to their learners. It is argued that a higher proficiency reader can be made aware of the values and cultural norms of a specific community through studying illustrations of speech acts in literary texts. It is further argued that the learner of English can make use of such texts to become aware of the way people speak in different cultures, even when the language used is the same, i.e. English. The reading teacher's role can and should

include making language learners aware of such pragmatic differences in speech act realizations. The role of EFL teacher is critical to the development of this facility with reading content text. Reading proficiency increases when teachers view content reading as "content communication " focusing on "good teaching practices... designed to teach.... the essential concepts of subject matter areas" (Readence,Bean &Baldwin,1998) or content literacy, defined as "the ability to use reading and writing for the acquisition of new content in a given discipline"(Mckenna and Robinson,1993,p.184). Readence,Bean and Baldwin (1998)include five developmental stages needed to successfully implement content area communication :(1) awareness of the strategies ,(2)knowledge ,(3)simulation or modeling,(4)practice and (5)incorporation. Each discipline has content specific terminology, which may not transfer from one discipline to another. Thus the researchers feel that it is important for EFL classroom teachers to acquaint themselves with the strategies recommended by content experts to enhance content literacy instruction.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study was to determine whether specific content area strategies are being implemented at the secondary stage, and the extent and appropriateness of including them in classroom practice. It also investigated English reading strategies, interests and reading preferences amongst EFL students as well as their attitudes towards reading in both L1and FL at the secondary stage .

Research questions:

To guide this study the following research questions were developed:

1 - Are EFL teachers at the secondary stage familiar with content reading strategies?

One of the possible reasons for this is that while teachers may have a thorough grounding in their specific fields of expertise, they may not be aware of recent research into the field of reading and how it relates to their particular courses.

Reading teachers need knowledge in order to successfully teach reading. If they do not have this knowledge, then we must ask ourselves what the implications are for our ability to successfully teach weak readers who need clear, explicit instruction, which presupposes this knowledge. Teachers must have this information at their disposal. If they do not, they run the risk of having pupils in their classes who could become proficient readers but who never reach their potential.

In many secondary schools in Egypt, EFL students spend little time actually reading texts. Much of their instructional time is spent on workbook-type assignments. Furthermore, most EFL teachers are spending inadequate amounts of time on direct comprehension instruction; they used either workbooks or textbook questions to determine a student's understanding of content, but rarely taught students "how to comprehend."

Reading teachers must not only be aware of cultural and socio-linguistic differences underlying the communicative behavior of native and non-native users of English, but also transmit such awareness to their learners. It is argued that a higher proficiency reader can be made aware of the values and cultural norms of a specific community through studying illustrations of speech acts in literary texts. It is further argued that the learner of English can make use of such texts to become aware of the way people speak in different cultures, even when the language used is the same, i.e. English. The reading teacher's role can and should

include making language learners aware of such pragmatic differences in speech act realizations. The role of EFL teacher is critical to the development of this facility with reading content text. Reading proficiency increases when teachers view content reading as "content communication " focusing on "good teaching practices... designed to teach.... the essential concepts of subject matter areas" (Readence,Bean &Baldwin,1998) or content literacy, defined as "the ability to use reading and writing for the acquisition of new content in a given discipline"(Mckenna and Robinson,1993,p.184). Readence,Bean and Baldwin (1998)include five developmental stages needed to successfully implement content area communication :(1) awareness of the strategies ,(2)knowledge ,(3)simulation or modeling,(4)practice and (5)incorporation. Each discipline has content specific terminology, which may not transfer from one discipline to another. Thus the researchers feel that it is important for EFL classroom teachers to acquaint themselves with the strategies recommended by content experts to enhance content literacy instruction.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study was to determine whether specific content area strategies are being implemented at the secondary stage, and the extent and appropriateness of including them in classroom practice. It also investigated English reading strategies, interests and reading preferences amongst EFL students as well as their attitudes towards reading in both L1and FL at the secondary stage .

Research questions:

To guide this study the following research questions were developed:

1 - Are EFL teachers at the secondary stage familiar with content reading strategies?

2 - How frequently are specific content reading strategies used by these teachers?
3 - Which content reading strategies are perceived as most useful by EFL teachers at the secondary stage?
4 - Do years of teaching experience, grade level experience and workshop attendance have an effect on the variables of familiarity, utility, and perceived applicability of content reading strategies ?
5 - Which content reading strategies are perceived as most useful by EFL students at the secondary stage?
6 - What is the relationship between EFL students' attitudes in L1 and FL reading?
7 - What are EFL learners' reading interests and passions at the secondary stage?
8 - What are EFL learners' reading preferences at the secondary stage?

Definition of the key term:

Strategies

Strategies are defined as consistent plans, consciously adapted and monitored for improving performance in learning (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory ,2000).

Strategies are defined as learning techniques, behaviors, problem-solving or study skills which make learning more effective and efficient (Oxford and Crookall, 1989). In the context of second language learning, a distinction can be made between strategies that make learning more effective, versus strategies that improve comprehension. The former are generally referred to as learning strategies in the second language literature. Comprehension or reading strategies on the other hand, indicate how readers conceive of a task, how they make sense of what they read, and what they do when they don't

understand. In short, such strategies are processes used by the learner to enhance reading comprehension and overcome comprehension failures.

Background and Pertinent Literature:

For several decades educators have been concerned about literacy development beyond the early grades. As early as the 1930's there was an emphasis on the different reading demands of various subjects and on improving the reading abilities of high school students (Moore, Readence, & Rickelman, 1986). The limited use of reading strategies in the subject matter classroom appears to be a result of the lack of teacher training in reading methods (Ryder & Graves, 1994,pp. 2-3)

The term "content reading" became prominent in the 1970's with the publication of Herber's (1970) book, Teaching Reading in the Content Areas where Herber distinguished between literacy development as reading instruction and literacy development to support subject matter learning (Alvermann & Phelps, 1994; Ruddell, 2001). Some states began to require coursework in content area reading instruction for secondary teachers in the 1970's. Many other states joined in making this a requirement for a credential by the early 1980's (Estes & Piercey, 1973;Farrell & Cirrincione, 1984). Content area teachers began integrating strategies in more organized and effective ways in the 1980's yielding evidence, which demonstrated that they were more confident, and student learning improved (Pearce & Bader, 1986; Conley, 1986;Alvermann & Swafford, 1989; Bean, Singer, & Frazee, 1986).

Much of the work in this area was based on developments in cognitive psychology in the 1970's and 1980's, which provided insight into the relationship between

Appendix E
ESL Students' Reading Interests and Passions Survey

	Yes	No
1-Do you ever read about the thing or things you're passionate about?		
a) all the time		
b) sometimes		
c) No, never		
d) No answer		

2- Do you enjoy reading English? Why or why not?
3- If you don't read much or don't like reading, why not?
4- If you don't read English much or don't like reading English, why not?

Part B

(Cognitive reactions)

Item	*Yes*	*No*
1- I think reading enables me to acquire depth of knowledge and sophistication.		
2- I think reading is useful to shape personality.		
3- I think I can read quickly.		
4- I think my reading ability is advanced.		
5- I think I read a lot.		

Appendix D

Reading Preferences Survey

Which of the following do you read most often?

Check all that apply.

Reading Material	Yes	No
I like to read books assigned for class		
I read books outside of class for pleasure		
I like to read religious books		
I prefer to read newspapers		
I like to read fashion		
I prefer to read entertainment magazines		
I like to read school papers or other newsletters		
I prefer to read sports magazines		
I like to read puzzles/games/humor magazines		
I prefer to read comic books or graphic novels		
I like to read news magazines		
I prefer to read magazines about video games		
I like to read computer manuals or other electronic equipment manuals		
I prefer to read online websites		
None of the above		

Please answer the following questions:

21. What do you do if you don't understand something when reading?
22. What do you do after you finish reading in language?
23. What causes you the greatest difficulty when you try to understand what you read?
24. What could you do to be better at understanding what you read?
25. What do you do when you come to a word that you do not understand?
26. What might stop you when you are reading?

Appendix C

Reading Attitude Questionnaire.

Name: _____ School: _____

Year----------

Part A (Affective reactions)

Item	*Yes*	*No*
1- I feel anxious if I don't know all the words		
2- I feel anxious if I'm not sure whether I understood what I read.		
3- Even if I cannot understand what I read completely, I don't care.		
4- If it is not necessary, I prefer to avoid reading as much as possible.		
5- Reading is enjoyable		
6- Reading is my hobby.		
7- I feel tired when I am presented with a long text.		

13- Before you read, do you try to guess or predict what the text you are reading will be about?		
14- While you are reading , do you imagine pictures in your head or imagine you are part of the story?		
15- While you are reading, do you try to guess or predict what the next part of the text will be about.		
16- While you are reading, do you check whether your guesses or predictions about the text were right?		
17- While you are reading, Do you ask questions of yourself and of the text?		
18- While you are reading or after you are finished, do you try to summarize what you have read?		
19- While you are reading, do you try to connect what you are reading with what you already know? (For example, if I'm reading an article about education in America I try to compare education in America with education in my own country).		
20- While you are reading, do you try to make connections between the earlier and later parts of the text?		
21- While you are reading or after you are finished, do you evaluate the text? For example, you decide if you think the text is written well or written poorly.		
22- After you read, do you think about how well you understood it?		

Appendix B

EFL Students' Reading Strategies Questionnaire at the Secondary Stage.

Name: _____ School: _____

Year----------

Please answer the following questions about how you read English. Try to remember what you actually do.

	Yes	No
1 - Do you think that you are a good reader? Why or why not?		
2 - Can understand words in context?		
3 - Are you able to locate the main idea of passages?		
4 - Can recognize an authors purpose and point of view as you read?		
5 - As you read, can you distinguish between fact and opinion in order to detect bias?		
6 - Are you able to draw valid inferences and conclusions when you read?		
7 - Are you able to assess the credibility or objectivity of the source and of the author as you read a passage?		
8 - Can you underline/annotate texts for effective comprehension?		
9 - Are you able to monitor your comprehension by creating questions before you read?		
10- Can you organize your reading notes in order to study for a test?		
11- Can you recognize the author's tone in a piece?		
12- Before you read, do you think about what the text will be about(This means that you look at the title, the subtitles, the pictures, and any graphics such as maps in the text.)?		

								morphemic analyses
								drama
								advanced organizers
								interest inventories
								KWL three level guide
								scaffolding
								anticipation guides

								Oral onflict resolution
								discussions forums
								word map
								matching definitions
								mini- projects
								use of text structure
								study guide
								structural overview
								List- Group-Label
								vocabulary cloze
								analogies
								meaning negotiation
								pattern guide
								reports/self-reporting
								close procedure
								surveying text
								semantic mapping
								conferencing
								reciprocal teaching

Appendix A

EFL Teachers' Content Area Strategies Questionnaire-

Familiarity		How often do you use this strategy?			Would you recommend using this strategy ?			Content area strategies
Yes	No	Often	Seldom	Never	Often	Seldom	Never	
								questioning techniques
								phonics
								guided writing
								journal writing
								enrichment activities
								prediction
								molding
								summarizing
								modeling from text
								prior knowledge
								computer programs
								think aloud
								puzzles
								inserted questions

- Wade, S. E. (1990). Using think alouds to assess comprehension. The Reading Teacher, 43(7), 42-51.
- Weaver . C . A III & kintsch W. (1991) Expostitory text . In Barr. Kamil. Mossenthal. & pearson (Eds.) Handbook of Reading Research: Vol (PP. 230 – 245) . New York: longman.
- Weinstein, C. E. & Meyer, D. K.(1991). "Cognitive learning strategies and college teaching", in R. J. Menges and M. D. Svinicki (Eds.), College teaching: from theory to practice, New directions for teaching and learning, 1991, (No 45, pp.15-26) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Weitzel, A. (1990). Higher education communication curricula outside the U.S.: An inventory and data report. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. Ed. 322 562).
- Wenden, A. (1999). Metacognitive Knowledge and Language Learning. Applied Linguistics, 19, 515-537.
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language Learning Strategy Use of Bilingual Foreign Language Learners in Singapore. Language Learning, 50(2), 203-245.
- Wilhelm, J. (2002, October). Getting boys to read: It's the context. Scholastic Instructor, 16-18.
- Willing, K. (1988). Learning Styles in Adult Migrant Education. Adelaide: National Curriculum Resource Centre for the Adult Migrant Education Program.
- Young, R., & Perkins, K. (1995). Cognition and Conation in Second Language Acquisition Theory. IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 33(2), 142-165.
- Zimmerman, B.J. A (1989).social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1989, 81(3), 329-339.

- Smith, M. C. (1990). A longitudinal investigation of reading attitude development from childhood to adulthood. Journal of Educational Research, 83(4), 215-219.
- Smith, M. & Wilhelm, J. (2002). "Reading don't fix no Chevys": Literacy in the lives of young men. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Snow, M. & Brinton, D. (1997). The Content-Based Classroom Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing.
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2000). The Reading Coherence Initiative. http://www.sedl.org/reading/.
- Stanovich, K.E.(1986). "Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy". Reading Research Quarterly, vol. 21, 360-407,.
- Steffensen, M., C. Joagdev and R. Anderson. (1979). A Cross-Cultural perspective on Reading Comprehension. Research Quarterly, 15, 1, pp. 203-9.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What Can We Learn from the Good Language Learner? Canadian Modern Language Review, 31, 304-318.
- Taylor, L. (1999). Personalizing classroom instruction to account for motivational and developmental differences. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 15(2), 255-276.
- Teaching Johnny to Read, (Spring,1997) reprinted in Perspective , Orton Dyslexia Society,.
- Tierney, R. J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.) Handbook of reading research (Vol. 2) (pp. 246-280). New York: Longman.
- Vacca R.T.,& Vacca J.L.(1999) . Content Area Reading: literacy and Learning across the curriculum.(6th ed.).New York: Longman.

students. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Rott,S.(2003) Making form-meaning connections while reading: A qualitative analysis of word processing .Reading in a Foreign Language .Volume 15, Number 1, April 2003 ISSN 1539-0578
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'Good Language Learner' Can Teach Us. TESOL Quarterly, 9, 41-51.
- Rubin, J. (1981). Study of Cognitive Processes in Second Language Learning. Applied Linguistics, 11, 118-131.
- Ruddell, M. (2001). Teaching content reading and writing (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. [ED401526]
- Ruddell, R. B. & Unrau, N. J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed.). (pp. 996-1056). Newark, DE. International Reading Association.
- Ryder, R. J. & Graves, M. F. (1994) Reading and Learning in Content Areas. New York:Macmillan.
- Schenk, K. D., & Vitalari, N. P. (1998). Differences between Novice and Expert Systems Analysts: What do We Know and What do We Do? Journal of Management Information Systems, 15(1), 9-51.
- Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., Cziko, C., & Hurwitz, L. (1999). Reading for understanding: A guide to improving reading in middle and high school classrooms. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sharp .A.(2002).Chinese L1 Schoolchildren Reading in English:The Effects of Rhetorical Patterns.Reading in a Foreign Language.Volume 14, Number 2. October 2002 ISSN 1539-0578

- Postman, N. (1979). Teaching as a Conservative Activity. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Pressley, M. (1999). Self-regulated comprehension processing and its development through instruction. In L. B. Gambrell, L. M. Morrow, S. B. Neuman, & M. Pressley, Best practices in literacy instruction (pp. 90-97). New York: Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M., & Wharton-McDonald, R. (1997). Skilled comprehension and its development through instruction. The School Psychology Review, 27(3), 448-466.
- Raso, E.. (1996). A Mainstream Primary Classroom with a Majority of ESL Students: Planning for English Language Learning. In Mainstreaming ESL Case Studies in Integrating ESL Students into the Mainstream Curriculum. Bristol, PA:Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Rayneri, L. J., Gerber, B. L., & Wiley, L. P. (2003). Gifted Achievers and Gifted Underachievers: The Impact of Learning Style Preferences in the Classroom. Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 14(4), 197-205.
- Readence, J. E., Bean, T. W., & Baldwin, R. S. (1998) Content Area Literacy: An Integrated Approach . Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- Reeves, C. (2002). Literacy attitudes: Theoretical perspectives. Paper presented at the 19th World Congress on Reading, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Richard – Amato, P & Snow, M. (1992). The Multicultural Classroom Readings for Content-Area Teachers. White Plains, NY:Longman Publishing.
- Rivers, W. P. (2001). Autonomy at All Costs: An Ethnography of Metacognitive Self-Assessment and Self-Management among Experienced Language Learners. Modern Language Journal, 85(2), 279-291.
- Roth, D., Worrell, F., & Gabelko, N. (2002). Elementary reading attitude survey scores in academically talented

- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide with the ESL-EFL Version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). System, 23, 153-175.
- Oxford, R. L., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on Language Learning Strategies: Methods, Findings, and Instructional Issues. Modern Language Journal, 73(4), 404-419.
- Oxford, R. (1989). The use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. "System," 12(2), pp235-47.
- Oxford, R. (2001). Language Learning Strategies. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (pp. 166-172). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearce, D. L., & Bader, L.A. (1986) The effect of unit construction upon teachers' use of content area reading and writing strategies. Journal of Reading, 30, 130-135.
- Pearson, P.D., & Gallagher, M.C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8, 317-344.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Johnson, G. R.(1990). "Assessing and improving students' learning strategies", in The changing face of college teaching, New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 1990, (No. 42, p. 83-92). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pintrich, P.R.(1995). "Understanding self-regulated learning", in R. J. Menges & M. D. Svinicki (Eds.) Understanding self-regulated learning, New directions for teaching and learning, 1995, (No. 63, pp. 3-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- McKenna, M. C. & Robinson, R. D. (1993) Teaching through Text: A Content Literacy Approach to Content Area Reading White Plains, N.Y: Longman.
- McKenna, M. C. (1994). Toward a model of reading attitude acquisition. In E. H. Crammer & M. Castle (Eds.), Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education. pp. 18-40. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- McLaughlin, B. (1990). Restructuring. Applied Linguistics, 11, 113-127.
- Mislevy, R. J. (1993). Foundations of a New Test Theory. In N. Frederiksen & R. J. Mislevy & I. Bejar (Eds.), Test Theory for a New Generation of Tests. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Moje, E., Young, J. P., Readence, J., & Moore, D. (2000). Reinventing adolescent literacy for new times: Perennial and millennial issues. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43 (5), 400-410. [EJ598956]
- Moore, D. W., Readence, J. E., & Rickelman, R. J. (1983). An historical exploration of content reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 18(4), 419-438. [EJ285210]
- Moss, G. (1999, September). Raising attainment: Boys, reading and the National Literacy Hour, Interim findings from the Fact and Fiction Research Project. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Conference, Brighton, England.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). The Good Language Learner. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- National Reading Panel (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read. Retrieved June 20, 2000, from the World Wide Web at http:// www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrppubskey.cfm.

- Harris, A., & Sipay, E. (1990). How to increase reading ability: A guide to developmental & remedial methods. New York: Longman.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with words. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Henk, W., & Melnick, S. (1995). The reader self-perception scale (RSPS): A new tool for measuring how children feel about themselves as readers. The Reading Teacher, 48, 470-482.
- Herber, H. L. (1970). Teaching reading in the content areas. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hornik, S., & Ruf, B. M. (1997). Expert Systems Usage and Knowledge Acquisition: An Empirical Assessment of Analogical Reasoning in the Evaluation of Internal Controls. Journal of Information Systems, 11(2), 57-75.
- Hsiao, T. Y., & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing Theories of Language Learning Strategies: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Modern Language Journal, 86(3), 368-384.
- Kletzien. S. B (1991) Strategy use by good and poor comprehenders reading& pository textr of difering levels. Reading Research Quarterly. 26(1). – 86.
- Laufer, E. A., & Glick, J. (1996). Expert and Novice Differencesin Cognition and Activity: A Practical Work Activity. In D. Middleton & Y. Engestrom (Eds.), Cognition and Communication at Work. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lenski, S. D., Wham, M. A., & Johns, J. L. (1999) Reading & Learning Strategies for Middle& High School Students. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Mathewson, G. C. (1994). Model of attitude influence upon reading and learning to read. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed.) (pp. 1121-1161). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Ellis, R. (1994). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estes, T. H., & Piercey, D. (1973) Secondary Reading Requirements: Report on the States. Journal of Reading, 17, 20-24.
- Etringer, B. D., & Hillerbrand, E. (1995). The Transition from Novice to Expert Counselor. Counselor Education & Supervision, 35(1), 4-18.
- Farrell, R. T., & Cirrincione, J. M. (1984) State certification requirements in reading for content area teachers. Journal of Reading, 28, 152-158.
- Gadzella, B. M., Stephens, R., & Baloglu, M. (2002). Prediction of Educational Psychology Course Grades by Age and Learning Style Scores. College Student Journal, 36(1), 62-69.
- Gaskins, I.W.(1998). There's more to teaching at-risk and delayed readers than good reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, 51(7), 534-547.
- Gee, J. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses (2nd ed.). London: Falmer Press.
- Gremmo, M. J., & Riley, P. (1995). Autonomy, Self-direction, and Self-access in Language Teaching and Learning: The History of an Idea. System, 23, 151-164.
- Greenleaf, C., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 71 (1), pp. 79-129. [EJ624237]
- Guthrie, J., & Wigfield, A. (2001). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume 3. (pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hansen, J. (1987). When writers read. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Bull, S., & Ma, Y. (2001). Raising Learner Awareness of Language Learning Strategies in Situations of Limited Resources. Interactive Learning Environments, 9(2), 171-201.
- Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). Content Area Language Instruction Approaches and Strategies. Reading, MA:Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Carrell, P.(1983). Background knowledge in second language comprehension. Language Learning and Communication, 2, 1, pp. 25-34.
- Carrell, P. (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. Modern Language Journal, 68, 332-43.
- Carson, J. G., & Longhini, A. (2002). Focusing on Learning Styles and Strategies: A Diary Study in an Immersion Setting. Language Learning, 52(2), 401-439.
- Conley, M. W. (1995). Content Reading Instruction: A Communication Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cross and Steadman, (1996). Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching, 1996, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Day .R.(2002).Top Ten Principles for Teaching Extensive Reading. Reading in foreign Language.Volume14,Number 2,October 2002.ISSN 15390578
- Day, R. & Bamford, J. (1998). Extensive reading in the second language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dufflemeyer, F. (1994). Effective anticipation guide statements for learning from expository prose. Journal of Reading, 37(6), 452-457. [EJ481057]
- Duffy, G. G. (Ed.) (1990) Reading in the middle school (2nd ed.) Newark, DE: IRA
- Ehrman M.E. & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. The Modern Language Journal, 74, 311-327.

- Alvermann, D. E., & Swafford, J. (1989) Do content area strategies have a research base? Journal of Reading, 32, 388-394.
- Anderson, N. (1999). Exploring Second Language Reading Issues and Strategies. Toronto: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Anderson, R. C. (1984). Role of the reader's schema in compre-hension, learning, and memory. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and texts (pp. 243-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. Reading Research Quarterly, 34, 452-477.
- Bean, T. W., Singer, H., and Frazee, C. (1986) The effect of metacognitive instruction in outlining and graphic organizer construction on students' comprehension in a tenth-grade world history class. Journal of Reading Behavior, 18, 153-169.
- Block, C. C. (1999). Comprehension: Crafting comprehension. In L. B. Gambrell, L. M. Morrow, S. B. Neuman, & M. Pressley (Eds.). Best practices in literacy instruction (pp. 98-118). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brantmeier .C.(2003) Does gender make a difference? Passage content and comprehension in second language reading. Reading in a Foreign Language .Volume 15, Number 1, April 2003 ISSN 1539-0578
- Brophy, J. (1999). Toward a model of the value aspects of motivation in education: Developing appreciation for particular learning domains and activities. Educational Psychologist, 34(2), 75-85.
- Bruns, J. (1992). They can but they don't. New York: Viking.

- Wharton, G. (2000). Language Learning Strategy Use of Bilingual Foreign Language Learners in Singapore. Language Learning, 50(2), 203-245.
- Wilhelm, J. (2002, October). Getting boys to read: It's the context. Scholastic Instructor, 16-18.
- Willing, K. (1988). Learning Styles in Adult Migrant Education. Adelaide: National Curriculum Resource Centre for the Adult Migrant Education Program.
- Young, R., & Perkins, K. (1995). Cognition and Conation in Second Language Acquisition Theory. IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 33(2), 142-165.
- Zimmerman, B.J. A (1989).social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1989, 81(3), 329-339.

References:

- Adams, M.(1990)Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press .
- Alderson, C. and A. Urquhart.(1988) This test is unfair. I'm not an economist. In Interactive approaches to second language reading, ed. P. Carrell, J. Devine and D. Eske. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alexander, J. E. & Filler, R. C. (1976). Attitudes and reading. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Alexander, P. A. (1997). Knowledge-seeking and self-schema: A case for the motivational dimensions of exposition. Educational Psychologist, 32(2), 83-94.
- Alvarez, Marino C. & Risko, Victoria J.(1989). Schema Activation, Construction, and Application. ERIC Digest. ED312611
- Alvermann, D. E. & Phelps, S. F. (1994) Content Reading and Literacy: Succeeding in Today's Diverse Classrooms. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Stern, H. H. (1975). What Can We Learn from the Good Language Learner? Canadian Modern Language Review, 31, 304-318.
- Taylor, L. (1999). Personalizing classroom instruction to account for motivational and developmental differences. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 15(2), 255-276.
- Teaching Johnny to Read, (Spring,1997) reprinted in Perspective , Orton Dyslexia Society,.
- Tierney, R. J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.) Handbook of reading research (Vol. 2) (pp. 246-280). New York: Longman.
- Vacca R.T.,& Vacca J.L.(1999) . Content Area Reading: literacy and Learning across the curriculum.(6th ed.).New York: Longman.
- Wade, S. E. (1990). Using think alouds to assess comprehension. The Reading Teacher, 43(7), 42-51.
- Weaver . C . A III & kintsch W. (1991) Expostitory text . In Barr. Kamil. Mossenthal. & pearson (Eds.) Handbook of Reading Research: Vol (PP. 230 – 245) . New York: longman.
- Weinstein, C. E. & Meyer, D. K.(1991). "Cognitive learning strategies and college teaching", in R. J. Menges and M. D. Svinicki (Eds.), College teaching: from theory to practice, New directions for teaching and learning, 1991, (No 45, pp.15-26) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Weitzel, A. (1990). Higher education communication curricula outside the U.S.: An inventory and data report. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. Ed. 322 562).
- Wenden, A. (1999). Metacognitive Knowledge and Language Learning. Applied Linguistics, 19, 515-537.

- Ryder, R. J. & Graves, M. F. (1994) Reading and Learning in Content Areas. New York:Macmillan.
- Schenk, K. D., & Vitalari, N. P. (1998). Differences between Novice and Expert Systems Analysts: What do We Know and What do We Do? Journal of Management Information Systems, 15(1), 9-51.
- Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., Cziko, C., & Hurwitz, L. (1999). Reading for understanding: A guide to improving reading in middle and high school classrooms. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sharp, A.(2002).Chinese L1 Schoolchildren Reading in English:The Effects of Rhetorical Patterns.Reading in a Foreign Language.Volume 14, Number 2, October 2002 ISSN 1539-0578
- Smith, M. C. (1990). A longitudinal investigation of reading attitude development from childhood to adulthood. Journal of Educational Research, 83(4), 215-219.
- Smith, M. & Wilhelm, J. (2002). "Reading don't fix no Chevys": Literacy in the lives of young men. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Snow, M. & Brinton, D. (1997). The Content-Based Classroom Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing.
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2000). The Reading Coherence Initiative. http://www.sedl.org/reading/.
- Stanovich, K.E.(1986). "Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy". Reading Research Quarterly, vol. 21, 360-407,.
- Steffensen, M., C. Joagdev and R. Anderson. (1979). A Cross-Cultural perspective on Reading Comprehension. Research Quarterly, 15, 1, pp. 203-9.

- Readence, J. E., Bean, T. W., & Baldwin, R. S. (1998) Content Area Literacy: An Integrated Approach . Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.
- Reeves, C. (2002). Literacy attitudes: Theoretical perspectives. Paper presented at the 19th World Congress on Reading, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Richard – Amato, P & Snow, M. (1992). The Multicultural Classroom Readings for Content-Area Teachers. White Plains, NY:Longman Publishing.
- Rivers, W. P. (2001). Autonomy at All Costs: An Ethnography of Metacognitive Self-Assessment and Self-Management among Experienced Language Learners. Modern Language Journal, 85(2), 279-291.
- Roth, D., Worrell, F., & Gabelko, N. (2002). Elementary reading attitude survey scores in academically talented students. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Rott.S.(2003) Making form-meaning connections while reading: A qualitative analysis of word processing .Reading in a Foreign Language .Volume 15, Number 1, April 2003 ISSN 1539-0578
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the 'Good Language Learner' Can Teach Us. TESOL Quarterly, 9, 41-51.
- Rubin, J. (1981). Study of Cognitive Processes in Second Language Learning. Applied Linguistics, 11, 118-131.
- Ruddell, M. (2001). Teaching content reading and writing (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. [ED401526]
- Ruddell, R. B. & Unrau, N. J. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed.). (pp. 996-1056). Newark, DE. International Reading Association.

- Pearce, D. L., & Bader, L.A. (1986) The effect of unit construction upon teachers' use of content area reading and writing strategies. Journal of Reading, 30, 130-135.
- Pearson, P.D., & Gallagher, M.C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8, 317-344.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Johnson, G. R.(1990). "Assessing and improving students' learning strategies", in The changing face of college teaching, New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 1990, (No. 42, p. 83-92). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pintrich, P.R.(1995). "Understanding self-regulated learning", in R. J. Menges & M. D. Svinicki (Eds.) Understanding self-regulated learning, New directions for teaching and learning, 1995, (No. 63, pp. 3-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Postman, N. (1979). Teaching as a Conservative Activity. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Pressley, M. (1999). Self-regulated comprehension processing and its development through instruction. In L. B. Gambrell, L. M. Morrow, S. B. Neuman, & M. Pressley, Best practices in literacy instruction (pp. 90-97). New York: Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M., & Wharton-McDonald, R. (1997). Skilled comprehension and its development through instruction. The School Psychology Review, 27(3), 448-466.
- Raso, E.. (1996). A Mainstream Primary Classroom with a Majority of ESL Students: Planning for English Language Learning. In Mainstreaming ESL Case Studies in Integrating ESL Students into the Mainstream Curriculum. Bristol, PA:Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Rayneri, L. J., Gerber, B. L., & Wiley, L. P. (2003). Gifted Achievers and Gifted Underachievers: The Impact of Learning Style Preferences in the Classroom. Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 14(4), 197-205.

- Moore, D. W., Readence, J. E., & Rickelman, R. J. (1983). An historical exploration of content reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 18(4), 419-438. [EJ285210]
- Moss, G. (1999, September). Raising attainment: Boys, reading and the National Literacy Hour, Interim findings from the Fact and Fiction Research Project. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Conference, Brighton, England.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). The Good Language Learner. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- National Reading Panel (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read. Retrieved June 20, 2000, from the World Wide Web at http:// www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrppubskey.cfm.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide with the ESL-EFL Version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). System, 23, 153-175.
- Oxford, R. L., & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on Language Learning Strategies: Methods, Findings, and Instructional Issues. Modern Language Journal, 73(4), 404-419.
- Oxford, R. (1989). The use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. "System," 12(2), pp235-47.
- Oxford, R. (2001). Language Learning Strategies. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (pp. 166-172). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kletzien. S. B (1991) Strategy use by good and poor comprehenders reading& pository textr of difering levels. Reading Research Quarterly. 26(1). – 86.
- Laufer, E. A., & Glick, J. (1996). Expert and Novice Differencesin Cognition and Activity: A Practical Work Activity. In D. Middleton & Y. Engestrom (Eds.), Cognition and Communication at Work. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lenski, S. D., Wham, M. A., & Johns, J. L. (1999) Reading & Learning Strategies for Middle& High School Students. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Mathewson, G. C. (1994). Model of attitude influence upon reading and learning to read. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed.) (pp. 1121-1161). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- McKenna, M. C. & Robinson, R. D. (1993) Teaching through Text: A Content Literacy Approach to Content Area Reading White Plains, N.Y: Longman.
- McKenna, M. C. (1994). Toward a model of reading attitude acquisition. In E. H. Crammer & M. Castle (Eds.), Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education. pp. 18-40. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- McLaughlin, B. (1990). Restructuring. Applied Linguistics, 11, 113-127.
- Mislevy, R. J. (1993). Foundations of a New Test Theory. In N. Frederiksen & R. J. Mislevy & I. Bejar (Eds.), Test Theory for a New Generation of Tests. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Moje, E., Young, J. P., Readence, J., & Moore, D. (2000). Reinventing adolescent literacy for new times: Perennial and millennial issues. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43 (5), 400-410. [EJ598956]

- Gee, J. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses (2nd ed.). London: Falmer Press.
- Gremmo, M. J., & Riley, P. (1995). Autonomy, Self-direction, and Self-access in Language Teaching and Learning: The History of an Idea. System, 23, 151-164.
- Greenleaf, C., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 71 (1), pp. 79-129. [EJ624237]
- Guthrie, J., & Wigfield, A. (2001). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume 3. (pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hansen, J. (1987). When writers read. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Harris, A., & Sipay, E. (1990). How to increase reading ability: A guide to developmental & remedial methods. New York: Longman.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with words. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Henk, W., & Melnick, S. (1995). The reader self-perception scale (RSPS): A new tool for measuring how children feel about themselves as readers. The Reading Teacher, 48, 470-482.
- Herber, H. L. (1970). Teaching reading in the content areas. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hornik, S., & Ruf, B. M. (1997). Expert Systems Usage and Knowledge Acquisition: An Empirical Assessment of Analogical Reasoning in the Evaluation of Internal Controls. Journal of Information Systems, 11(2), 57-75.
- Hsiao, T. Y., & Oxford, R. L. (2002). Comparing Theories of Language Learning Strategies: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Modern Language Journal, 86(3), 368-384.

- Cross and Steadman, (1996). Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching, 1996, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Day .R.(2002).Top Ten Principles for Teaching Extensive Reading. Reading in foreign Language.Volume14,Number 2,October 2002.ISSN 15390578
- Day, R. & Bamford, J. (1998). Extensive reading in the second language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dufflemeyer, F. (1994). Effective anticipation guide statements for learning from expository prose. Journal of Reading, 37(6), 452-457. [EJ481057]
- Duffy, G. G. (Ed.) (1990) Reading in the middle school (2nd ed.) Newark, DE: IRA
- Ehrman M.E. & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. The Modern Language Journal, 74, 311-327.
- Ellis, R. (1994). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estes, T. H., & Piercey, D. (1973) Secondary Reading Requirements: Report on the States. Journal of Reading, 17, 20-24.
- Etringer, B. D., & Hillerbrand, E. (1995). The Transition from Novice to Expert Counselor. Counselor Education & Supervision, 35(1), 4-18.
- Farrell, R. T., & Cirrincione, J. M. (1984) State certification requirements in reading for content area teachers. Journal of Reading, 28, 152-158.
- Gadzella, B. M., Stephens, R., & Baloglu, M. (2002). Prediction of Educational Psychology Course Grades by Age and Learning Style Scores. College Student Journal, 36(1), 62-69.
- Gaskins, I.W.(1998). There's more to teaching at-risk and delayed readers than good reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, 51(7), 534-547.

organizer construction on students' comprehension in a tenth-grade world history class. Journal of Reading Behavior, 18, 153-169.
- Block, C. C. (1999). Comprehension: Crafting comprehension. In L. B. Gambrell, L. M. Morrow, S. B. Neuman, & M. Pressley (Eds.). Best practices in literacy instruction (pp. 98-118). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brantmeier .C.(2003) Does gender make a difference? Passage content and comprehension in second language reading. Reading in a Foreign Language .Volume 15, Number 1, April 2003 ISSN 1539-0578
- Brophy, J. (1999). Toward a model of the value aspects of motivation in education: Developing appreciation for particular learning domains and activities. Educational Psychologist, 34(2), 75-85.
- Bruns, J. (1992). They can but they don't. New York: Viking.
- Bull, S., & Ma, Y. (2001). Raising Learner Awareness of Language Learning Strategies in Situations of Limited Resources. Interactive Learning Environments, 9(2), 171-201.
- Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). Content Area Language Instruction Approaches and Strategies. Reading, MA:Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Carrell, P.(1983). Background knowledge in second language comprehension. Language Learning and Communication, 2, 1, pp. 25-34.
- Carrell, P. (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and applications. Modern Language Journal, 68, 332-43.
- Carson, J. G., & Longhini, A. (2002). Focusing on Learning Styles and Strategies: A Diary Study in an Immersion Setting. Language Learning, 52(2), 401-439.
- Conley, M. W. (1995). Content Reading Instruction: A Communication Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill.

References

- Adams, M.(1990)Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Alderson, C. and A. Urquhart.(1988) This test is unfair. I'm not an economist. In Interactive approaches to second language reading, ed. P. Carrell, J. Devine and D. Eske. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alexander, J. E. & Filler, R. C. (1976). Attitudes and reading. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Alexander, P. A. (1997). Knowledge-seeking and self-schema: A case for the motivational dimensions of exposition. Educational Psychologist, 32(2), 83-94.
- Alvarez, Marino C. & Risko, Victoria J.(1989). Schema Activation, Construction, and Application. ERIC Digest. ED312611
- Alvermann, D. E. & Phelps, S. F. (1994) Content Reading and Literacy: Succeeding in Today's Diverse Classrooms. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Swafford, J. (1989) Do content area strategies have a research base? Journal of Reading, 32, 388-394.
- Anderson, N. (1999). Exploring Second Language Reading Issues and Strategies. Toronto: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Anderson, R. C. (1984). Role of the reader's schema in compre-hension, learning, and memory. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and texts (pp. 243-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. Reading Research Quarterly, 34, 452-477.
- Bean, T. W., Singer, H., and Frazee, C. (1986) The effect of metacognitive instruction in outlining and graphic

- convey dynamic methods to teach phonics and make use of connected text
- demonstrate effective ways to teach spelling that will reinforce reading
- include a diagnostic toolkit that will enable teachers to teach what students need
- include whole language strategies and powerful uses of literature
- provide practice with students in a clinical setting with ample opportunity for feedback and support
- assist teachers to effectively implement balanced literacy programs

Such workshop training should be supported at the school sites by regular staff discussions about the research as well as about implementation issues.

19. Effective Beginning Teacher Programs should:
    - start during the undergraduate years
    - provide practical experience teaching and observing in highly effective classrooms
    - include a seminar that provides the research base and diagnostic information and serves as a forum for discussion
    - contain course work that includes cognitive research, language theory and the background of the English linguistic system

20. Teachers should try to understand learners' reading attitudes in L1 as well as in FL.

15. Beginning teachers need practical experience student teaching and observing in classrooms taught by veterans identified as effective teachers of literacy. These apprenticeships should be joined to a seminar that provides the research base and diagnostic information to reinforce what teachers are seeing and doing with students and which can serve as a vehicle for collegial learning and problem solving.
16. Because so much reading instruction will require teachers to diagnose students and group them for specific instruction, teacher education must arm teachers-in-training with a repertoire of effective diagnostic tools and with an understanding of how to manage a classroom in which students will be working at different levels in small groups.
17. In-service professional development should include:
    - enough theory and up-to-date research to provide teachers with the rationale for specific instructional changes in the ways they currently teach reading
    - important topics about which we have new and clear information
    - training in understanding phonemic awareness and ways to teach it
    - phonics instruction that is dynamic, systematic, and reinforced through connected text
    - instruction in teaching spelling
    - instruction in the use of appropriate diagnostic tools

    The training should be presented through workshops, which include demonstrations, practice with students, and opportunities for discussion and problem solving.

18. Effective In-service Education should:
    - include current theory and research
    - provide training in phonemic awareness assessment and instruction

common letter patterns and generating alternative pronunciations that will enable students to read materials independently.

8. Students need ample opportunities to practice in books they can read independently, and teachers need to reinforce phonics instruction as they share literature with students.
9. Vocabulary development continues through extensive reading opportunities, during oral discussions and explanations, and through strategies such as synonym building and semantic trees.
10. Advanced strategic reading skills such as summarizing, predicting, questioning, and visualizing should be modeled and directly taught in the context of reading varied materials. This presupposes regular time for reading and discussion in groups as well as independently.
11. Students must read material in which they can recognize at least 90% of the words if their reading time is to be effective.
12. Students should be given ample opportunity to read in order to put their skills to use. Teachers should:
    - conference regularly with students
    - engage in in-depth discussions
    - introduce students to a variety of genres
    - require reading in different subject areas
    - provide guided reading sessions
13. Flexible grouping should be used throughout the grades to ensure students are acquiring the skills they need.
14. Teachers must be equipped with the necessary practical skills and underlying linguistic understandings in order to have a repertoire of techniques that will enable all students to learn to read.

,magazines and their local newspapers because of the limited time involved. Teen magazines are especially popular because they focus on issues targeted specifically toward teens. The majority said most of their time is spent on assigned readings for school.

Recommendations:

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Teachers must care about the processes involved in reading and studying, and must be willing to devote instructional time to them through direct strategy-instruction and modeling.
2. Teachers must do task analyses of strategies to be taught. In other words, teachers must think about how a particular strategy is best applied and in what contexts. Teachers can observe students as they read in order to determine students' strengths and weaknesses in terms of strategy use, which is turn will help in providing effective and appropriate strategy instruction.
3. Teachers must teach strategies over an entire year, not just in a single lesson or unit allowing strategic instruction to permeate the curriculum.
4. Teachers must provide students with opportunities to practice strategies they have been taught.
5. Teachers must be prepared to let students teach each other about reading and the studying process.
6. The only way classrooms will become arenas for extensive strategy instruction is for such instruction to be wholly-intertwined with content-areas. In essence, failing to teach students strategies they do not use and from those they could benefit is to fail the students, to neglect to show them ways of reaching reading
7. Teachers need to provide instruction in word attack skills, including sounding out, syllabication, recognizing

(paraphrasing, repetition, making notes, summarizing, self-questioning, etc), understand relationships between parts of text, recognize text structure, change reading strategies when comprehension is perceived not be proceeding smoothly; evaluate the qualities of text, reflect on and process additionally after a part has been read; and anticipate or plan for the use of knowledge gained from the reading

As for reading difficulties faced those students ,they stated that difficult words and meanings were considered to be the most difficult things that hinder their readings.

Results also confirm that EFL students at the secondary stage do have generally positive attitudes towards reading both in L1 and in FL. Four reading attitude variables were identified (Comfort, Anxiety, Value, Self-perception).Results of analyses using these four variables are summarised on two levels. First, the study supports the transfer of the affective domain of reading (attitudes) from L1 to FL. Second, from a more pedagogical point of view, the positive feeling towards reading, both in L1 and FL, facilitates learners' performance in reading. Merely thinking that reading is beneficial to oneself does not represent a strong enough motivation. The study has thus demonstrated the importance of understanding learners' attitudes (particularly feelings) to reading both in L1 and FL for encouraging FL learners' involvement in reading.

Concerning EFL learners reading interests and passions at the secondary stage, The news is good about reading! results designate that 51% of the subjects enjoy reading English .They generally read subjects that they are either passionate about or are of interest to them.

As for EFL learners reading preferences at the secondary stage, Most teens enjoy reading religious books

structural overview, drama, matching definitions, phonics, discussion forums, summarizing, inserted questions, word map.

Analysis of transcripts of reading questionnaire provided information on EEL readers' theoretical orientations toward reading in their foreign language. The results showed that EEL readers at the secondary stage tended to focus on reading as a decoding process rather than as a meaning-making process. The results also indicated that EFL learners at this stage appeared to be familiar with most of the reading strategies. There appears to be a strong relationship between reading strategies used by readers, metacognitive awareness, and reading proficiency. In essence, those readers appear to use them more frequently. Those readers also have an enhanced metacognitive awareness of their own use of strategies and what they know, which in turn leads to greater reading ability and proficiency. Eventually, students understand the reading strategies and have the confidence to know when to apply each one.

Strategies such as the following were frequently reported to be used by those students :Overview text before reading, employ context clues such as titles, subheading, and diagrams, look for important information while reading and pay greater attention to it than other information, attempt to relate important points in text to one another in order to understand the text as a whole, activate and use prior knowledge to interpret text, reconsider and revise hypotheses about the meaning of text based on text content, attempt to infer information from the text, attempt to determine the meaning of words not understood or recognized by using reference materials such as dictionaries or translating into Arabic, monitor text comprehension, identify or infer main ideas, use strategies to remember text

"I love magazines about the fashions"
"I like to read fashion magazines because they have things in them that girls want to read about."
" I spend most of my time in studying . "
"I read newspapers while I am eating."
"I like reading for pleasure during the holiday. "

Discussion of results:

The results of this study support the hypothesis that specific reading strategies are reported as implemented in the secondary grades . EFL teachers at this stage appear to be familiar with all the reading content strategies, Teaching for an extended period of time at the same grade level, as well as having had the opportunity to attend workshops or taking classes in content reading all positively influenced EFL teachers familiarity with strategies. It was interesting to note that EFL secondary schools teachers with 6 to 10 years of experience at grade level appear to be more familiar with content reading strategy terms than do more experienced teachers and less experienced teachers with between 1 and 5 years of experience at grade level. The results also indicate that EFL secondary schools teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience at grade level appear to use reading strategies more than experienced teachers. It was found also that attendance a content reading workshop, and course work in content area reading have positive effect in EFL secondary schools teachers recommendation about a strategy's effectiveness or applicability and their reported use of the strategy. Not surprisingly, specific instruction in content area reading appears to increase use of strategies.

What strategies used by EFL teachers at the secondary stage were reported as most effective? For the last variable, perceived applicability, the highest responses included questioning techniques, molding, vocabulary cloze,

Table (9)
EFL Learners' Reading Preferences

Reading Material Which of the following do you read most often?	YES	NO
I like to read books assigned for class	100%	
I read books outside of class for pleasure	60%	40%
I like to read religious books	95%	5%
I prefer to read newspapers	64%	36%
I like to read fashion	60%	40%
I prefer to read entertainment magazines	55%	45%
I like to read school papers or other newsletters	100%	
I prefer to read sports magazines	20%	80%
I like to read puzzles/games/humor magazines	54%	46%
I prefer to read comic books or graphic novels	53%	47%
I like to read news magazines	59%	41%
I prefer to read magazines about video games	65%	35%
I like to read computer manuals or other electronic equipment manuals	64%	36%
I prefer to read online websites	20%	80%
None of the above		

Concerning reading preferences ,the majority of EFL students enjoy reading religious books whether they are Muslims or Christians. They like to read books outside of class for pleasure, newspapers, fashion, entertainment magazines ,puzzles/games/humor magazines , comic books or graphic novels , news magazines , magazines about video games , computer manuals or other electronic equipment manuals ,and online websites. All of them stated that most of their time is spent on assigned readings for school.

Examples of the students comments:

"I like to read holy Koran".
"I like magazines and newspapers because I can choose what I like to read. "

reason for not reading too much. Most of them indicate that they are too busy with homework and studying their lessons. Others said that they prefer watching television to reading .Some learners justify their inability to read English to difficult words and hating English as a subject.

The following are some extracts from the learners comments:

" I don't read because I don't have enough time. After school I study my lessons. "
"I don't read because my lessons take most of my time . "
"I think that reading is boring The only thing I like to read is a magazine"
"I don't read any other books during the school year. "
"Because I like to watch television."
"I read more in the summers when I have free time"

If you don't read English much or don't like reading English, why not?

" I don't enjoy reading English because I do not know the meaning of some words"
"because there are some words that I can not read . "
"Because I do not read too much. "
"Because I didn't like read English"
"Because I feel anxious if I don't know all the words"
"Because I don't like English. "
" Because I hate English. "
"Because I dislike English. "

are also required to read about subjects that they aren't necessarily interested in for school, 95% of the EFL students report they read about subjects that appeal to them.

Table(8)
EFL Learners' Reading Interests and Passions towards Reading

	Yes	No
Do you ever read about the thing or things you're passionate about?		
a) all the time	95%	5%
b) sometimes	4%	96%
c) No, never	1%	99%
d) No answer	-	-

Table(8) shows that the majority of the learners read about the thing or things they are passionate about all the time .

Here are some extracts from the students comments related to whether they enjoy reading English or not.(All quotations are given verbatim and have not been corrected) .

Do you enjoy reading English? Why or why not?
"I like reading English because I read English quickly . "
"Because I like English very much. "
"Because I like English. "
"I understand the teacher in the class. "
"I can read well. "
"Because I can read the new words. "
"As I read more English in my spare time. "
"Because I like to read a lot of stories. "
"Because the teacher helps me. "
"Because I like to read English books. "

If you don't read much or don't like reading, why not?

49% of the subjects confess that they do not enjoy reading English .They state that lack of time is the primary

Table(6)
EFL Learners' Attitudes towards Reading
Part A (Affective reactions)

Item	*Yes*	*No*
1 - I feel anxious if I don't know all the words	*92%*	*8%*
2 - I feel anxious if I'm not sure whether I understood what I read.	*93%*	*7%*
3 - Even if I cannot understand what I read completely, I don't care.	*27%*	*73%*
4 - If it is not necessary, I prefer to avoid reading as much as possible.	*27%*	*73%*
5 - Reading is enjoyable	*84%*	*16%*
6 - Reading is my hobby.	*66%*	*39%*
7 - I feel tired when I am presented with a long text.	*60%*	*40%*

Table(7)
EFL Learners' Attitudes towards Reading
Part B (Cognitive reactions)

Item	*Yes*	*No*
1 - I think reading enables me to acquire depth of knowledge and sophistication.	**100%**	
2 - I think reading is useful to shape personality.	**84%**	*12%*
3 - I think can read quickly.	**28%**	*72%*
4 - I think my reading ability is advanced.	**79%**	*21%*
5 - I think I read a lot.	**44%**	*56%*

As for EFL learners reading interests and passions at the secondary stage, results designate that 51% of the subjects enjoy reading English . Most of the teens surveyed indicate that they generally read subjects that they are either passionate about or are of interest to them. Although most

As for Question No.(28),(20%) of the subjects state that their inability to understand the meaning of the text hinders them,(80%) of the respondents indicate that difficult words stop them when reading and (3%) of them mention noise and translation as obstacles of their reading.

Concerning EFL learners' attitudes towards reading at the secondary stage, Table (6) and (7) demonstrate their affective and cognitive reactions towards reading in both L1and FL language as follows:

- 92% of the subjects feel anxious if they don't know all the words .
- 93% of the respondents feel anxious if they are not sure whether they understood what they read.
- 73% of the participants state that their inability to understand hinders them.
- 73% of the subjects like reading.
- 84% of the respondents state that reading is enjoyable.
- 66% of the participants reveal that reading is their hobby.
- 66% of the subjects confess that they feel tired they are presented with a long text.
- 100% of the respondents think that reading enables them to acquire depth of knowledge and sophistication.
- 84% of the participants think that reading is useful to shape personality.
- 72% of the subjects think that they can not read quickly.
- 79% of the respondents think that their reading ability is advanced.
- 57% of the subjects do not think that they read a lot.

Students' responses to question No.(24), indicate nine reading strategies used after they finish reading in language, these strategies are as follows:

- Checking understanding by answering the text questions(53%).
- connecting what they read with what they already know(8%).
- Thinking about the text(3%).
- Asking themselves questions(7%).
- Guessing the meaning of difficult words(4%).
- Translating the text into Arabic(4%)
- Summarizing the main ideas(8%)
- Evaluating the text(6%).
- Asking EFL teacher questions(7%).

Question No.(25) indicate that (100%) of the respondents deem difficult words and meanings as the main obstacles when they try to understand what they read .

Students' responses to question No.(26) signify (9) strategies used to be better at understanding what those students read; they are as follows:

- Asking EFL teacher questions(8%).
- Summarizing (9%).
- Checking understanding(9).
- Asking EFL teacher questions(8%).
- Guessing the meaning of difficult words(8%).
- Translating the text into Arabic(27%).
- Thinking about the text(28%).
- Consulting the dictionary (3%)

As for Question No.(27),(100%) of the subjects affirm that they consult the dictionary when they come to a word they do not understand.

- 76% of the subjects think that try to guess or predict what the next part of the text will be about while they are reading.
- 71% of the respondents indicate that they check whether their guesses or predictions about the text were right while they are reading.
- 72% of the learners state that they ask questions of themselves and of the text while they are reading.
- 55% of the subjects indicate that try to summarize what they have read while they are reading.
- 80% of the learners state that they try to connect what they are reading with what you already know while they are reading.
- 75% of the respondents indicate that they try to make connections between the earlier and later parts of the text while they are reading.
- 61% of the subjects confess that they do not evaluate the text while hey are reading or after they are finished.
- 88% of the respondents indicate that they think about how well they understood it.

The subjects' responses to question No. (23) reveal their reading strategies if they do not understand something when reading; analyzing data designate that those students utilize the following strategies :

- Asking EFL teachers (59%).
- Guessing the meaning(6%)
- Using prior knowledge(5%).
- Translating into Arabic(4%).
- Asking members of the family(4%).
- Consulting the dictionary(16%).
- 6% of the students had negative responses as(I do not know , I do not read the text again, I do nothing, I stop reading, I give up reading, I feel anxious.)

Table (5) reveals the following:

- 68% of the learners state that they are good readers.
- 69% of the participants reveal that they can understand words in context,
- 75% of the learners state that they are able to locate the main idea of passages.
- 66% of the participants show that they can recognize an author purpose and point of view as they read.
- 54% of the learners state that they can distinguish between fact and opinion in order to detect bias, as you read.
- 64% of the participants show that they are able to draw valid inferences and conclusions when they read.
- 58% of the subjects show that they are able to assess the credibility or objectivity of the source and of the author as they read a passage.
- 62% of the learners state that they can underline/annotate texts for effective comprehension.
- 70% of the participants show that they are able to monitor their comprehension by creating questions before they read.
- 88% of the subjects show that they can organize their reading notes in order to study for a test.
- 75% of the learners state that they can recognize the author's tone in a piece.
- 55% of the respondents indicate that they think about what the text will be about before they read.
- 55% of the subjects show that they try to guess or predict what the text they are reading will be about before they read.
- 79% state that they imagine pictures in their head or imagine they are part of the story while they are reading.

11	Can you recognize the author's tone in a piece?	75%	25%
12	Before you read, do you think about what the text will beabout (This means that you look at the title, the subtitles, the pictures, and any graphics such as maps in the text.)?	55%	45%
13	Before you read, do you try to guess or predict what the text you are reading will be about?	55%	45%
14	While you are reading , do you imagine pictures in your head or imagine you are part of the story?	79%	21%
15	While you are reading, do you try to guess or predict what the next part of the text will be about?	76%	24%
16	While you are reading, do you check whether your guesses or predictions about the text were right?	71%	29%
17	While you are reading, Do you ask questions of yourself and of the text?	72%	28%
18	While you are reading or after you are finished, do you try to summarize what you have read?	55%	45%
19	While you are reading, do you try to connect what you are reading with what you already know? (For example, if I'm reading an article about education in America I try to compare education in America with education in my own country).	80%	20%
20	While you are reading, do you try to make connections between the earlier and later parts of the text?	75%	25%
21	While you are reading or after you are finished, do you evaluate the text? For example, you decide if you think the text is written well or written poorly.	39%	61%
22	After you read, do you think about how well you understood it?	88%	12%

arrange, and evaluate their own learning. Such strategies include directed attention and self-evaluation, organization, setting goals and objectives, seeking practice opportunities, and so forth. In the context of reading, self-monitoring and correction of errors are further examples of metacognitive strategies. Learners also use affective strategies, such as self-encouraging behavior, to lower anxiety, and encourage learning. Lastly, social strategies are those that involve other individuals in the learning process and refer to cooperation with peers, questioning, asking for correction, and feedback; for example, while reading, a student may ask another individual for feedback about his/her reading responses.

Table (5)
EFL Learners' Reading Strategies at the Secondary Stage.

		Yes	No
1	Do you think that you are a good reader?	68%	32%
2	Can you understand words in context?	69%	31%
3	Are you able to locate the main idea of passages?	75%	25%
4	Can you recognize an author purpose and point of view as you read?	66%	34%
5	As you read, can you distinguish between fact and opinion in order to detect bias?	54%	46%
6	Are you able to draw valid inferences and conclusions when you read?	64%	36%
7	Are you able to assess the credibility or objectivity of the source and of the author as you read a passage?	58%	42%
8	Can you underline/annotate texts for effective comprehension?	62%	38%
9	Are you able to monitor your comprehension by creating questions before you read?	70%	30%
10	Can you organize your reading notes in order to study for a test?	88%	12%

Table (4) was designed to ascertain if differences exist between teachers who attend a content reading workshop, and course work in content area reading in their recommendation about a strategy's effectiveness or applicability and their reported use of the strategy. The results indicate that attendance a content reading workshop, and course work in content area reading have positive effect on their recommendation about a strategy's effectiveness or applicability and their reported use of the strategy.

Concerning the fifth question , it is clear that the current explosion of research in foreign language reading has begun to focus on readers' strategies. Reading strategies are of interest for what they reveal about the way readers manage their interaction with written text and how these strategies are related to text comprehension. This research indicated that EFL learners at the secondary stage used a variety of strategies to assist them with the acquisition, storage, and retrieval of information. Within the broader context of reading strategies, the following six strategies can more appropriately be referred to as sub-strategies. Cognitive strategies are used by learners to transform or manipulate the language. In more specific terms, this includes note taking, formal practice with the specific aspects of the target language such as sounds and sentence structure, summarizing, paraphrasing, predicting, analyzing, and using context clues. Techniques that help the learner to remember and retrieve information are referred to as memory strategies. These include creating mental images through grouping and associating, semantic mapping, using keywords, employing word associations, and placing new words into a context. Compensation strategies include skills such as inferencing, guessing while reading, or using reference materials such as dictionaries. Metacognitive strategies are behaviors undertaken by the learners to plan,

*** F. means Familiarity.**

Table(3) indicates the relationship between EFL secondary schools teachers familiarity with the strategy and their current years of experience at grade level. The results show that EFL secondary schools teachers with 6 to 10 years of experience at grade level appear to be more familiar with content reading strategy terms than do more experienced teachers and less experienced teachers with between 1 and 5 years of experience at grade level. The results also indicate that EFL secondary schools teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience at grade level appear to use reading strategies more than experienced teachers.

Table(4)

Differences Between Teachers Attending Reading Workshops / Courses and their Reported Use of the Strategy.

Content Area Workshop Attendance(32)				Content Reading Course(31)			
Reported Use of the strategy		Applicability of The strategy		Reported Use of the strategy		Applicability of The strategy	
yes(32)	no (23)	Yes(32)	No(23)	Yes(31)	No(24)	Yes(31)	No(24)
100	81	100	83	100	81	100	83
100	81	100	83	100	81	100	83
100	81	100	81	100	81	100	81
100	81	100	81	100	81	100	81
100	81	100	81	100	81	100	81
81	72	100	81	81	72	100	81
90	76	100	81	90	76	100	81
90	76	100	71	90	76	100	71
90	76	92	71	90	76	92	71
94	78	92	71	94	78	92	71
94	80	92	71	94	80	92	71
94	67	92	63	94	67	92	63
94	67	92	63	94	67	92	63
94	69	92	67	94	69	92	67
94	69	98	67	94	69	98	67
92	87	98	67	92	87	98	67
92	83	98	80	92	83	98	80
92	89	98	76	92	89	98	76
92	100	96	89	92	100	96	89
96	94	94	89	96	94	94	89
96	98	94	87	96	98	94	87
81		90		81	76	90	81
81		89		81		89	
98		89		98		89	
76		89		76		89	
76		81		85		81	
85		81		83		81	
83		81		78		87	
78		87		72		76	
72		76					

Table (3)
The Relationship Between Teachers' Familiarity with the Strategy and Current Years of Experience at Grade Level.

Number of Respondents (25)		Number of Respondents(17)		Number of Respondents(12)		Number of Respondents(-)		Number of Respondents (1) Total =55	
Current years of teaching at grade level(1: 5)		Current years of teaching at grade level(6:10)		Current years of teaching at grade level(11:16)		Current years of teaching at grade level(17:20)		Current years of teaching at grade level(over 20)	
F .	Reported use of the strategy	F .	Reported use of the strategy	F.	Reported use of the strategy	F.	Reported use of the strategy	F.	Reported use of the strategy
-	90	80	100	96	81	-	-	60	87
96.36	96	100	76	100	76	-	-		
50	100	69	85	76	100	-	-		
69	87	100	100	100	81	-	-		
67	98	76	96	74	72	-	-		
61	100	100	72	100	81	-	-		
65	96	94	96	80	81	-	-		
61	100	100	78	72	81	-	-		
83	88	100	83	78	81	-	-		
69	89	65	89	78	92	-	-		
61	100	100	89	89	92	-	-		
78	89	96	94	72	92				
78	100	96	96	89	92				
87	100	96	89	90	92				
100	94	100	100	90	65				
78	83	94	69						
72	89	98	92						
92	72								
83	100								
98	98								
96	100								
-	100								
72	85								

Table (2)

The Relationship Between Teachers' Familiarity with Strategy and Years of Teaching Experience.

Number of Respondents(8)		Number of Respondents(9)		Number of Respondents(10)		Number of Respondents(10)		Number of Respondents(18)	
Years of teaching Experience (1:5)		Years of teaching Experience(6:10)		Years of teaching Experience(11:16)		Years of teaching Experience (17:20)		Years of teaching Experience (over 20)	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
65.45	34.54	63.63	36.36	74.54	25.45	74.54	25.45	89.09	10.90
65.45	34.54	96.36	3.63	92.72	4.27	63.63	36.36	81.81	18.18
98.18	1.81	50.90	49.09	81.81	18.18	96.36	3.63	90.9	9.09
67.27	32.72	70.90	29.09	96.36	3.63	96.36	3.63	90.9	9.09
87.27	12.72	67.27	32.72	98.18	1.81	96.36	3.63	89.09	10.9
100	-	63.63	36.36	100	-	96.36	3.63	81.81	18.18
78.18	21.8	63.63	36.36	98.18	1.81	96.36	3.63	76.36	23.63
85.45	14.54	96.36	3.63	98.18	1.81	100	-	81.81	18.18
		70.9	29.09	100	-	100	-	27.27	72.72
				-	100	96.36	3.63	81.81	18.18
						81.81	18.18	78.18	21.81
								76.36	23.63
								74.54	25.45
								74.54	25.45
								76.36	23.63
								96.36	3.63
								81.81	18.18

Table (1) shows the percentage for each of the three groups:(1) familiarity with the strategy;(2) reported use of the strategy; and (3) applicability of the strategy to the secondary classroom situation. EFL teachers appear to be familiar with reading strategies as implemented at the secondary stage. Table(2) indicates the relationship between EFL secondary school teachers familiarity with the strategy and their years of teaching experience .The results show that EFL secondary school teachers with 11 to 20 years of experience appear to be more familiar with content reading strategy terms than do more experienced teachers with more than 20 years of experience and less experienced teachers with between 1 and 5 years of experience. Workshop attendance and participation in content reading courses appear to affect perceived application of content reading instructional strategies.15 EFL teachers with 11 to 20 years of experience attended content reading courses as they were in scientific missions to the U. S. A.

94.5	5.5	65.4	25.45	9.09	54.5	32.7	12.7	word map
92.7	7.3	70.9	25.45	3.6	81.8	-	18.1	matching definitions
90.9	9.1	54.5	14.5	30.90	38.18	30.9	30.9	mini-projects
94.5	5.5	81.8	14.5	3.6	89.09	5.4	5.4	use of text structure
94.5	5.5	67.2	29.09	3.6	67.2	25.4	7.2	study guide
90.9	9.1	72.7	20	7.2	72.72	25.45	1.8	structural overview
90.9	9.1	63.6	25.4	10.9	29.09	49.09	21.8	List-Group-Label
89	11	74.5	14.5	10.9	65.45	27.27	7.2	vocabulary cloze
83.6	16.4	72.7	16.3	10.9	45.5	27.27	16.3	analogies
83.6	16.4	49.09	30.9	20	41.8	40	18.1	meaning negotiation
72.7	27.3	56.3	36.3	7.2	60	36.3	3.6	pattern guide
83.6	16.4	47.2	21.8	30.9	49.09	29.09	21.8	reports/self-reporting
89	11	40	30.9	29.09	38.18	40	21.8	close procedure
85.4	14.6	50.9	36.3	12.7	50.9	29.9	20	surveying text
87.2	12.8	58.18	27.2	14.5	36.36	27.27	36.36	semantic mapping
87.2	12.8	25.45	38.18	36.3	40	38.18	21.8	conferencing
87.2	12.8	43.6	49.09	7.2	41.8	38.1	3.6	reciprocal teaching
87.2	12.8	52.7	36.3	10.9	45.45	45.45	9.09	morphemic analyses
90.9	9.1	72.7	14.5	12.7	60	32.7	7.27	drama
87.2	12.8	63.6	23.6	12.7	36.3	52.7	10.9	advanced organizers
83.6	16.4	45.45	36.5	20	47.27	45.45	7.2	interest inventories
83.6	16.4	29.09	40	30.9	10.9	50.9	38.18	KWL three level guide
89	11	41.81	47.27	1.90	49.09	38.18	12.7	scaffolding
92.7	7.3	54.5	36.3	9.09	43.6	50.9	5.45	anticipation guides

2- 6-10 years of experience;(15)
3- 11-15 years of experience;(7)
4 - 16-20 years of experience;(2)
5 - over 20 years of experience.(9)

C. Content Area workshop Attendance(Yes or No)
D. Content Reading Course(Yes or No)

Table 1
EFL Teachers' Content Area Questionnaire-Frequency responses of content area strategies

Familiarity		***How often do you use this strategy?***			***Would you recommend using this strategy ?***			***Content area strategies***
Yes	**No**	**Often**	**Seldom**	**Never**	**Often**	**Seldom**	**Never**	
94.5	**5.5**	**87.2**	**10.9**	**1.8**	**87.27**	**9**	**3.6**	**questioning techniques**
92.7	**7.3**	**72.2**	**10.9**	**16.3**	**63.6**	**10.9**	**25.45**	phonics
94.5	**5.5**	**63.3**	**29**	**072**	**58.18**	**21.8**	**1.8**	**guided writing**
94.5	**5.5**	**58.18**	**12.7**	**29**	**52.7**	**10.9**	**23.7**	**journal writing**
94.5	**5.5**	**56.36**	**38.18**	**5.45**	**67.2**	**-**	**32.7**	**enrichment activities**
90.9	**9.1**	**50.9**	**29**	**20**	**65.6**	**20**	**14.5**	**prediction**
92.7	**7.3**	**78.18**	**16.3**	**5.4**	**76.3**	**21.8**	**1.8**	**molding**
98	**2**	**67.2**	**21.81**	**12.72**	**65.5**	**30.9**	**3.6**	**summarizing**
90.9	**9.1**	**58.18**	**38.18**	**3.6**	**50.9**	**45.4**	**3.6**	**modeling from text**
90.9	**9.1**	**41.81**	**38.18**	**20**	**65.4**	**30.9**	**3.6**	**prior knowledge**
92.7	**7.3**	**32.7**	**23.6**	**41.8**	**60**	**16.3**	**23.6**	**computer programs**
92.7	**7.3**	**34.5**	**41.8**	**23.6**	**36.3**	**47.2**	**16.3**	**think aloud**
89	**21**	**29.09**	**34.5**	**36.3**	**36.3**	**27.2**	**45.4**	**puzzles**
83.3	**6.7**	**65.4**	**27.2**	**7.2**	**49**	**40**	**10.9**	**inserted questions**
89	**21**	**56.3**	**30.9**	**9.09**	**60**	**29**	**10.9**	**oral conflict resolution**
92.7	**7.3**	**69.9**	**29.09**	**1.8**	**61.8**	**34.5**	**3.6**	**discussions forums**

Procedures:

The Content Reading Area Questionnaire was personally handed to each of the first through third grade EFL teachers at their schools .The researchers collected the questionnaires after a week and the results were analyzed.

The EFL students' Content Reading Strategies Inventory as well as Learners' Reading Interests and Passions Survey , Learners' Reading Preferences survey and their Attitudes Questionnaire towards reading at the secondary stage in L1 and FL reading were administered during the teaching practice period in May 2005 at El Zahraa Secondary School for Girls, Hehia, Sharkia Governorate

Results:

Responses from a total of 55 respondents were included in the data analyses. The instrument used for the study yielded three scores which were treated as dependent variables. These scores were the totals from each of the three columns in section two of the Content Area Questionnaire. Four independent variables derived from section one of the Content Area Questionnaire were used to determine what factors might affect teachers' familiarity with, frequently of use , and applicability to classroom instruction of the 40 content area strategies. The independent variables are as follows:

A. Years of Teaching Experience
   1 - 5 years of experience or less;(8)
   2 - 6-10 years of experience;(2)
   3 - 11-15 years of experience;(7)
   4 - 6-20 years of experience;(11)
   5 - over 20 years of experience. (17)

B. Current years of Experience at Grade Level
   1 - 5 years of experience or less;(22)

The EFL Students' Content Reading Strategies Inventory at the secondary stage consisted of 30 questions . The aim of this inventory was to investigate EFL students' content reading strategies at the secondary stage. It was divided into two parts; the first part contained 22 yes or no questions and eight open-ended questions.

Concerning Attitudes Questionnaire, it was divided into two sections: one asking about students' L1 reading and the other about their FL reading. Each section contained two parts (A and B). Part A probed affective reactions to reading, and part B cognitive reactions. There were seven and 5 items in parts A and B respectively. The wording of each questionnaire item, written in Arabic, was identical in the L1 and FL sections, except that the word "English" was inserted into the FL section (e.g., "Reading is enjoyable." in the L1 section became "Reading in English is enjoyable." in the FL section).The aim of this questionnaire was to reveal EFL students' attitudes in L1 and FL reading .

As for EFL learners' Reading Interests and Passions Survey , the goal was to encourage young people to consider the value and fun of reading, and to educate ourselves about young people's views about reading. By hearing directly from teens, we can better understand their interests and habits and, thus, find and develop more effective strategies to raise and maintain their interest in reading.

The aim of the EFL Learners' Reading Preferences Survey was to reveal their reading preferences

Validity of the instruments:

The tools of the study were submitted to a group of EFL specialists, some items were modified till they took their final shape.

3 - EFL Students' Attitudes Questionnaire at the secondary stage in L1 and FL reading (see Appendix C)

4 - EFL Learners; Reading Interests and Passions Survey at the secondary stage (see Appendix D)

5 - EFL Learners' Reading Preferences Survey at the secondary stage (see Appendix E)

Description of the Instruments:

The main aim of EFL Teachers' Content Reading Area Questionnaire was to collect demographic data and information regarding content reading strategies. The questionnaire consists of two sections: (1) a request for demographic information related to group membership (i.e., years of teaching experience, grade level taught, years teaching the specific grade level, attendance at content reading workshops, and previous enrollment in content reading courses), and (2) a list of 40 reading strategies. The second section of the questionnaire requires the respondent to rate each of the 40 strategies three times: (1) if the strategy is familiar (yes/no);(2) how frequently the strategy is used (often, seldom, never) and (3) if the strategy is applicable to secondary grade classroom instruction (yes/no).

The list of items contained in the second section of the Content Reading Area Questionnaire was compiled after a review of literature which included a search of ERIC citations, textbooks, Dissertation Abstracts ,and the snowball method , which involves a follow –up search of pertinent references extracted from articles (Weitzel,1990). Forty reading –related strategies were identified from the review of literature and are included as items in the questionnaire with the specific sources of information supporting inclusion of each item.

The affective domain of reading has received much less attention than the cognitive domain, despite the great amount of research accumulated in the field of second language (L2) reading. According to Day and Bamford's (1998) model, one of the factors influencing L2 reading attitude is first language (L1) reading attitude. They remark, "Assuming that students are already literate in their first language, one source of attitudes toward second language reading is the attitude that students have toward reading in their native language" (Day and Bamford, 1998: 23). Indeed, this sounds plausible, but evidence is necessary. Results of these studies have generally supported the linguistic threshold hypothesis, and the importance of acquiring some basic level of L2 proficiency for L2 readers in order to read as well as they do in their L1 has been stressed.

Methodology:

Subjects:

The subjects were 75 EFL students at the first grade secondary and 80 EFL teachers at the secondary stage, Sharkia Governorate; 55 of those teachers completed the Content Reading Area Questionnaire (see Appendix A). The subjects included first grade (n=20), second grade(n=5) and third grade (n=30) EFL secondary stage teachers. Participants ranged from first year classroom teachers to teachers with more than 20 years of experience.

Instruments:

1 - EFL Teachers' Content Reading Area Questionnaire (see Appendix A).

2 - EFL Students' Content Reading Strategies Inventory at the secondary stage (see Appendix B)

Reading attitude

Several studies over the past three decades have demonstrated significant positive correlations between reading attitude and achievement (Bruns, 1992; Harris & Sipay, 1990; Henk & Melnick, 1995; Roth, Worrell & Gabelko, 2002). Contemporary models of reading motivation include both cognitive ability and affective stance toward reading at their foundations, the two factors linked together in a mutually reinforcing feedback loop (Baker & Wigfield, 1999; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2001; Moss, 1999; Smith & Wilhelm, 2002; Wilhelm, 2002). However, a teacher with a class of unmotivated, underachieving readers might find little instructional guidance in such models as they do not resolve the question of whether students would develop better attitudes toward reading if they were more skillful readers, or whether they would develop into better readers if they were to have better attitudes toward reading.

Reading attitude is a complex theoretical construct. It is defined in various ways, for example, "a system of feelings related to reading which causes the learner to approach or avoid a reading situation" (Alexander and Filler, 1976: 1) or "a state of mind, accompanied by feelings and emotions, that make reading more or less probable" (Smith, 1990: 215). According to an extensive and in-depth review of literature by Reeves (2002), there is considerable agreement among contemporary researchers that reading attitude is defined by three components: cognitive (personal, evaluative beliefs), affective (feelings and emotions), and cognitive (action readiness and behavioral intentions). This tri-component view is most explicitly stated by Mathewson (1994), and these components can also be identified in other major models dealing with reading attitude, such as those of McKenna (1994) and Ruddell and Unrau (1994).

allows the struggling reader to adapt and internalize strategic reading.

As struggling readers are learning strategic reading, they need frequent, sustained periods of reading connected prose (Hansen, 1987), such as opportunities to read uninterruptedly from a book, newspaper, magazine, or other whole piece of text for at least 15 to 20 minutes. But independent silent reading, conducted without guidance or feedback, is not sufficient to build reading improvement (National Reading Panel, 2000). This suggests that students also need the opportunity to talk about ideas in texts, in order to move comprehension beyond the word level (Pressley & Wharton-McDonald, 1997), that is, guided practice in building consensus.

Students who choose reading for a personally relevant purpose likely will be more motivated to accomplish that task. For adolescents, that purpose likely addresses their fundamental questions, "Who am I?" "Where and how do I fit?" and "What can or should I do with my life?" Practically, students should be helped to articulate their personal learning and reading goals at the outset of any instructional session (Block, 1999). This goal- directed reading provides purpose and direction, which is inherently motivational and engaging.

Reading success may not be enough to build self-efficacy, but it can be helped by these approaches: (a) allowing a choice of tasks and materials that are personally meaningful (Alexander, 1997; Taylor, 1999) and (b) changing student expectations or schema about what it means to engage in academic activities and use strategies to accomplish goals (Brophy, 1999).

particularly the skills of self-assessment and self-management, as the major difference between beginners and advanced language learners (e.g. Rivers, 2001; Wenden, 1999).

As shown from the discussion above, there is a strong correlation between a learner's second/foreign language proficiency and learning strategies. Reading strategies are effective tools for comprehending (Pressley, 1999); they represent procedural rather than declarative knowledge, stressing "how" as much or more than "what." Strategies help readers to engage with the text, to monitor their comprehension, and to fix it when it has failed. Rather than a single strategy applied in a reading class, Faculty of Specific Education students need to have a repertoire of strategies that they learn and apply in many reading contexts and not just in a reading class.

To learn a strategic approach to reading, struggling readers typically must be taught how, why, and when to use it. An effective way to teach a reading strategy is to follow the Pearson and Gallagher "Gradual Release of Responsibility" model (1983). Teachers model through a think-aloud (Davey, 1983; Wade, 1990), sharing their self-talk about how they strategically approach reading, making their expert thinking visible to struggling readers. Guided practice in the strategy follows the modeling as students attempt the reading strategy within a context of support from peers with the teacher evaluating its effectiveness, adapting it as needed, and generating a consensus as to its effectiveness. Most important is sufficient independent practice of the strategy in different texts and contexts as students take ownership of these strategies, adapting them to these different reading situations. The shifting of responsibility for learning from the teacher to the learner

1995). Advanced learners and beginners, regardless of their disciplines and fields, differ in encoding, organizing, memorising and using information for reasoning or problem-solving (Etringer & Hillerbrand, 1995; Hornik & Ruf, 1997).

Mislevy (1993) and Schenk and Vitalari (1998) compare differences between advanced learners and beginners in conceptual structures and procedural skills, and state that the organization of advanced learners' conceptual knowledge is more complex; advanced learners restructure the elements into abstract, underlying principles of the task, whereas beginners focus more on the surface elements of the task. Advanced learners also show more flexibility in reorganising their knowledge (McLaughlin,1990; Rayneri et al., 2003).

As for second language acquisition, Young and Perkins (1995) propose an architectural view of language proficiency in which the factors underlying the language performance of advanced learners are different from those of the beginners, and the ways those factors interact are different as well. Advanced learners control more facts and concepts than beginners, and have richer, qualitatively different interconnections among the facts and concepts than beginners do.

Furthermore, advanced learners use more language learning strategies appropriate to the nature of the task, as well as to the individual's goals and stage of learning (Wharton, 2000; Oxford, 2001). While some research states that advanced learners use substantially more verbalization and vocal practice, mnemonic devices, positive affect reinforcement, more sources of information, and more risk taking and less fear of errors (Rivers, 2001), many researchers suggest that the metacognitive strategies,

- A good language learner attends to meaning. S/he understands that in order to understand the message, it is not enough to focus on the grammar of the language.

Likewise, the "Toronto Study of the Good Language Learner" (Naiman et al., 1978) adopted Stern's and Rubin's concept as well. It was a famous large-scale survey study, which also used classroom observations, interviews, and testings on aptitude, attitude, and ability as the main methods. Conclusions were very much similar to Rubin's. In addition, it added many useful techniques such as watching and recording TV programs, asking for correction or explanations, mentally rehearsing phrases or sentences, making lists of vocabulary, orally practicing difficult sound combinations, and drawing graphs showing grammatical structures.

Willing (1988) summarizes the conclusions of Stern, Rubin, Naiman et al. and others, and outlines language learning strategies which help make language learning successful. The most important general language learning strategies are valuing (the culture, the language and its speakers), planning, evaluating, monitoring, internalising, hypothesizing, rehearsing, communicating, persisting, risk-taking, practicing, inferencing, attending to meaning, attending to form, and absorbing.

Although the search for the "good language learner" declined for more than a decade, in the nineties research on the performance of successful learners increased, and researchers carefully used "advanced learner" or "successful learner" instead of "good learner". More and more literature shows that the distinction between advanced learners and beginners does not lie on the fact that advanced learners accumulate more of what beginners lack (e.g. Laufer & Glick, 1996; Rivers, 2001; Young & Perkins,

increase their second language proficiency in the learning process.

Level of Proficiency and Language Learning Strategy Use

In the seventies, there was a trend towards research on good language learners. One of the most influential studies was done by Rubin (1975). She adopted the theoretical framework designed by Stern (1975), and conducted an empirical study of the "good language learner" (as defined by scores on tests of language aptitude, achievement, marks in classes, and remarks by teachers). The term the "good language learner" is misleading here, for a good language learner does not necessarily mean the same thing as an advanced language learner. Rubin's findings, however, help to identify some strategies that learners apply in order to achieve successful language learning. The methods she used were mainly interviews and observations. She identified the following general strategies as the most significant:

- A good language learner is willing to guess.
- A good language learner likes to communicate or learn from communication with others.
- A good language learner is often not inhibited. S/he does not mind appearing foolish for the cause of a reasonable communication. S/he does not fear to make mistakes, or live with a certain degree of ambiguity.
- Besides focusing on communication, a good language learner is also prepared to pay attention to form, constantly looking for patterns in the language.
- A good language learner practices.
- A good language learner monitors his/her own performance as well as others.

Strategies are generally classified into two categories: direct and indirect (Oxford, 1989; Rubin, 1981). They mutually support one another and work closely together. Direct strategies are made up of memory strategies for remembering and retrieving information, cognitive strategies for comprehending and producing the language, and compensation strategies for using the language despite limitations of knowledge. Oxford (1989) provides a useful analogy. Direct strategies can be compared as the performer in a stage play, dealing with the language itself under a variety of circumstances.

Indirect strategies are composed of metacognitive strategies for managing the learning process, affective strategies for managing emotions, and social strategies for learning language with others. Indirect strategies can be compared as the director of the play, serving to organize, coordinate, guide, correct, support and encourage the performer. The performer and the director have to work closely in order to obtain the best possible outcome (Oxford, 1989).

As researchers understand the significance of learning strategy research, its various research methods, and its classification, it is also important to note that most research on language learning strategies to date has been conducted in the United States either on native speakers of English learning a foreign language or on learners from linguistically diverse backgrounds studying English as a second language. As a result, the definition of good language learning strategies might be biased with an ethnocentric perspective (Gremmo & Riley, 1995; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995; Wharton, 2000). Researchers need to be aware of this possible bias as further research is conducted on language learning strategies as to how they help students

Steadman 1996), learning strategies are methods learners can use to improve their understanding, integration, and retention of new information. Learning strategies include a wide variety of cognitive processes and behavioural skills (Weinstein and Meyer, 1991). General learning strategy components include rehearsal, elaboration, organization, comprehension, metacognition, and resources management (Weinstein and Meyer, 1991;Cross and Steadman, 1996).

The importance of learning strategy use in second language acquisition has been recognized by many researchers (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Ellis, 1994 and Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). Research on language learning strategy is based on widely accepted premises that the learner is an active participant in the language learning process, that language learners use strategies regardless of their proficiency, that some learners do not take advantage of the full range of available strategies, and that it is possible and generally advisable to teach learners how and why to use, transfer and evaluate strategies when it is appropriate to do so in certain situations (Bull & Ma, 2001; Carson & Longhini, 2002; Oxford & Crookall, 1989).

There are several classification systems for language learning strategy (e.g. O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 2001; Rubin, 1981). Researchers debate about the definitions and classifications of certain strategies. For example, using gestures is classified by some researchers as merely a communication strategy which is not useful for learning, but is regarded by other researchers as learning strategies as well. Despite inconsistencies in defining and classifying strategies, research continues to show that strategies help learners enhance autonomy and proficiency (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 2001).

school year. Assessments of student reading development on multiple measures were not only statistically significant, but impressive overall, as students made gains of two years in reading proficiency in seven months of instruction. Follow-up studies indicated that students maintained their reading development and continued their growth as readers.

Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition

Motivational and learning strategies are crucial aspects of self regulated learning. Learning "strategies" are often discussed as an integral element of learning styles but must not be confused with the styles themselves. There is a basic difference between the concepts "style" and "strategy". Style has a psychological basis and is relatively permanent state for the individual. "Style" refers to the way in which a person thinks. It is a person's "...preferred and habitual approach to organising and representing information". Learning Strategies on the other hand are behaviours or methods that learners use to improve their understanding, integration and retention of new information in the learning process (Cross and Steadman, 1996). And self-regulated learning involves use of motivational and learning strategies to the degree that students are motivationally, meta-cognitively and behaviourally active participants in their own learning processes (Zimmerman, 1989 and Pintrich, 1995). Like the literature on learning styles, the literature on learning strategies explores different ways of learning. However, in assuming stability as well as lack of individual control, learning style literature suggests that it may be difficult for students to change their learning styles (Pintrich and Johnson, 1990) whereas learning strategy literature assumes that students' motivation and use of learning strategies can be controlled by learners and changed through teaching. According to (Cross and

Briefly summarized, Reading Apprenticeship involves teachers and their students as partners in a collaborative inquiry into reading and reading processes as they engage in subject-area texts. This instructional framework explicitly draws on students' strengths and abilities to provide crucial resources for the inquiry partnership... how we read and why we read in the ways we do become part of the curriculum, accompanying what, we read in subject-matter classes [emphasis in original] (Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001, p. 89).

The framework consists of four integrated dimensions of classroom life that teachers and students explore together: social, personal, cognitive, and knowledge-building. The social dimension centers on building a community of readers who use literacy to make connections between their interests, each other, and the larger social world they are engaged in learning about. The personal dimension of Reading Apprenticeship develops students' awareness of themselves as readers, of their purposes in reading, and of their goals for improvement. Adolescents' resources and the multiple literacies that are part of their daily lives are part of the teaching and learning that occurs. The cognitive dimension is the part of the framework that incorporates instruction in and the use of comprehension strategies, providing tools for monitoring comprehension, for problem-solving to assist comprehension, and for developing flexibility in reading. The knowledge-building dimension focuses on such areas as developing content knowledge (building schemata), knowledge of the discipline-specific vocabulary, and text and language structures.

Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, and Mueller (2001) report on the implementation of this framework in a course in academic literacy offered to ninth graders in one of the poorest neighborhoods in San Francisco for the 1996-1997

the class. After assembling sentence strips or paragraph strips, groups can check with other groups or scan the reading again to see if the assembled strips follow the same order as the reading. Students can use their personal dictionaries or index cards to test themselves on knowledge of vocabulary words. Teachers can ask students to discuss their answers to the cloze exercises to check for comprehension. Students could present a final product to the class, such as creating an informational poster or comic strip.

Finally, when the teacher and student are satisfied that the student understood the text material, it is time to expand on the knowledge learned. One idea that comes to mind is to have students choose an article from the newspaper and use any combination of the strategies for pre-reading , reading and post reading listed above. The student could then share the information either with another student or the teacher and check for comprehension. Students could work together to write a news-type article using text reading material and print it in a newspaper layout. A passage from a text could be role-played with students writing the script and creating props.

One model developed from the reconceptualization of content reading is Reading Apprenticeship (Schoenbach, Greenleaf, Cziko, & Hurwitz, 1999). This instructional framework is based on the dual notions of literacy as a complex cognitive and social process and of teaching as cognitive apprenticeship. In order for adolescents to move from being novices to experts in specific content area practices, an expert practitioner (the subject matter teacher) guides, models, makes explicit, and supports the novice in his or her development.

exercises consist of giving the student a handout with a paragraph printed on it that has blanks in place of some of the words.

After students have read the textbook passage, they need to practice the new material knowledge. By following the steps of SQ4R, students are already practicing what they have learned. Also when students use vocabulary words in their own sentences either in their personal dictionaries or on index cards they are practicing.

Teachers can also use sentence strips to help with basic reading comprehension. Each line of a paragraph is written on a strip of paper separately. Students work in small groups to decipher the meaning of each sentence strip. The group tapes the strips onto paper in a sequential order so that a logical paragraph is formed. Groups compare their paragraphs to other groups' and discuss the correct order for the strips. (Cantoni-Harvey 1987) This method is similar to Jigsaw Learning in that each member of the groups insures that all members understand each sentence. The pieces of the "puzzle" are assembled by each group and then discussed as a whole class.

Elina Raso uses the information gap activity for post reading practice. Students are paired up with each having an information chart about the reading. Each student's chart has information on it that the other student's chart is missing. Students have to ask their partner questions to complete their own chart. This encourages communication through questioning, reading a chart, and oral language skills. (Raso 1996)

After practicing with the material that has been read, it is time for both the student and the teacher to evaluate the students' level of understanding. If using the information grids, students can compare their information with others in

The next step would be the presentation of the reading passage. Richard-Amato and Snow recommend silent reading instead of reading aloud. ". . . children who worry about their ability to perform adequately often try to locate the lines they will have to read aloud and rehearse them surreptitiously. While they concentrate on them, they miss the cues provided by the preceding passages as well as the teacher's discussion of the words and concepts they contain." (Richard-Amato & Snow 1992) When reading silently, encourage students to focus on the context of unknown words instead of stopping to look up every word. Students should first finish reading the sentence to see if they can guess the meaning. Next they should try to recognize any parts of the word. Finally, the students should consult a dictionary.

SQ4R is another technique students can use to comprehend content reading. First, students survey the chapter by skimming it and looking at all visuals. Second, students question, writing down any questions they have about the first subheading. The third step is to read the body of the passage. The fourth step is reciting, where students answer their questions from what they learned in the reading. The fifth step is recording, when students write down their answers. Finally, the students review what they wrote. (Richard-Amato & Snow 1992)

Teachers may want to record passages from the textbook on tape for students to be able to access after their attempt to read the passages. This technique is designed as an addition to silent reading but should not be used for extended time periods because students may rely too heavily on it.This aide can be gradually removed as students' reading comprehension expands. (Richard-Amato & Snow 1992) The use of cloze exercises may help beginning level ESL students with basic reading comprehension. Cloze

Another method for pre-reading is to present new vocabulary depending on the knowledge base of the students. Students can create a personal dictionary that could be set up as follows:

Word Page Sentence from reading Definition (your words) Your sentence (Anderson 1999)

Each vocabulary word could be listed first, then the student could fill in the rest of the chart as he or she reads the passage. Snow and Brinton suggest having students make vocabulary study cards using index cards. The front side of the card contains the new word with its part of speech, pronunciation, and related word forms. A first language translation can be written here also. The back of the card is where the student writes where they first saw or heard the word, such as the example sentence. Next the student writes the dictionary definition, the dictionary example, and a sentence created by the student using the word. (Snow & Brinton 1997) Any portions of the index card method could be used. This example seems quite tedious.

Gina Cantoni-Harvey presents another pre-reading strategy that involves vocabulary. The teacher makes a handout with lists of words that pertain to the passage to be read along with words that do not pertain to the passage. The teacher briefly introduces the topic that the reading will present, then asks students to place a checkmark before each word that they expect to find in the reading. Students are told not to worry about incorrect answers; that this is not a test. They leave words they either do not recognize or that do not belong in the passage blank. The class discusses why each word should or should not have been checked and students explain why they checked the words. (Cantoni-Harvey 1987)

demonstrations. 3) Practice – The students employ strategies to acquire the new material. Some examples are, summarizing, making diagrams, inferring, asking questions, or working in groups. 4) Evaluation – The teachers and students assess students' level of understanding using self-check strategies, cooperation with peers, or clarifying questions. 5) Expansion – Students integrate new knowledge they have acquired into other applications.

How should the teacher prepare his students to read? There are several pre-reading strategies that may be used. Neil Anderson recommends activating a student's prior knowledge. He suggests pre-reading discussions on the topic because " . . . sometimes students may not realize that they have prior knowledge on a particular subject, but as they listen to other students share information, they come to realize that they indeed know something about the reading topic." (Anderson 1999). The teacher can lead a discussion at the beginning with a journal writing activity called the Daily Thought. The teacher reads the question aloud, (which is written on the chalkboard), and asks students to write their response in their journals. Next, Students' responses are discussed and elaborated with pictures drawn on the chalkboard. The Daily Thought pertains to the subject matter to be introduced or a topic that was taught previously. In this way the class can come up with some common information about the question and the teacher writes that on the chalkboard. Students who were not able to write an entry in their journal may copy the class feedback.

Semantic mapping is a good way to help students discern what they know, what they need to know, and what they learned. Maps can be used at any point of a unit, beginning, middle, or end. Creating a web or brainstorming a topic on the chalkboard helps students to connect ideas they know with the new concept in the reading.

students than EFL classes that focus on language only." (Richard-Amato & Snow 1992).

Research indicates that teaching students specific learning strategies increases understanding of content while they promote critical thinking skills. One model that was developed for ESL students is the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). CALLA utilizes instruction in learning strategies, grade-appropriate content, and the development of academic language as tools for students to comprehend and expand their content knowledge as well as their use of English. Richard-Amato and Snow list three main types of learning strategies that are activated through CALLA:

1. Metacognitive strategies – which involve executive processes in planning for learning, monitoring one's comprehension and production, and evaluating how well one has achieved a learning objective.

2. Cognitive strategies, in which the learner interacts with the material to be learned by manipulating it mentally (as in making mental images, or elaborating on previously acquired concepts or skills) or physically (as in grouping items to be learned in meaningful categories, or taking notes on important information to be remembered.)

3. Social-affective strategies, in which the learner either interacts with another person in order to assist learning, as in cooperation or asking questions for clarification,or uses some kind of affective control to assist a learning task. (Richard-Amato & Snow 1992) .

CALLA lessons have five stages: 1) Preparation – What do the students know already? What type of learning strategies are they now using? 2) Presentation – The new information is presented along with visual aides and /or

Vacca, 1999). Emphasis on the integrated nature of the language processes of listening, speaking, thinking, reading, and writing within the context of content-specific classrooms has emerged as a key element for training preservice and practicing secondary teachers (Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1998; Postman, 1979; Tierney &Shanahan, 1991).

Many teachers now accept the view that reading is the result of a two-way communication between the reader and the text, achieved through the simultaneous interaction of bottom-up information processing (which involves word recognition, sound/spelling correspondence, etc.,) and top-down processing (which involves skills like prediction, inference, etc.) Carrell (1983) distinguished between formal schemata (knowledge about the structural configuration of texts) and content schemata (knowledge about the subject matter of text). She found that a reader might fail to understand a text if it does not follow a formal schema (coherent organization) or if content schema was lacking. Carrell (1984);Alderson and Urquhart (1988) documented the discipline-specific effect of content schemata in their work with students who found it difficult to read texts which did not relate to their area of study.

Research on foreign language acquisition asserts that English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students need numerous rich opportunities to practice their language acquisition. One method of enriching language exposure is Content Based Instruction (CBI). Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are taught in content area classes with modifications to help them learn English in meaningful contexts. Patricia Richard-Amato and Marguerite Snow suggest that "Content based English language development is not only important for developing academic language skills, but it is also inherently more interesting to many

percentages of eighth and twelfth graders scoring above the proficient level have increased (33% and 40% respectively), these percentages still suggest that high levels of literacy are not being attained by most secondary students. Some research indicates that an emphasis on reading solely as a cognitive process has not adequately addressed the needs of adolescent readers as they face learning from texts in the various subject areas at the secondary level.

The work of sociolinguists, cultural anthropologists, and critical theorists has shown that it is not possible to separate classroom practices such as strategies for activating background knowledge from the larger social and cultural contexts in which the practices are enacted (e.g., Heath, 1983; Gee, 1996).

Drawing from some recent studies, Moje, Young, Readence, & Moore (2000) call for a conception of adolescent literacy that includes adolescents' literacy practices beyond the secondary classroom, their expanded notion of text (i.e., the Internet, television, and magazines), and the relationship between literacy and the development of identity. But they also caution that the issues of teaching and learning in the context of secondary school content areas are still critical areas for research. For example, what constitutes best practices depends on many factors: how students perceive themselves as readers, what their interests are at the time, the interactions of teacher and student, of student and student, the classroom environment in which the strategy is being used, and how institutional structures shape daily events that occur in classrooms and schools

More recently, content area literacy, rather than content area reading, has been the focus of teacher training resources (McKenna & Robinson, 1993; Alvermann & Phelps, 1994; Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1998; Vacca &

a reader's background knowledge (schema) of a topic and the reader's ability to make sense of a text addressing that topic. The term "schema" refers to a set of cognitive structures of interrelated ideas and concepts built from a person's experience (Alvarez & Risko,1989). According to some views of schema theory, a reader's existing knowledge of the subject matter is the single most influential factor in what he or she will learn from reading a text about that subject matter (Anderson, 1984; Steffensen, Joag-Dev, & Anderson, 1979). Thus, theorizing and research in cognitive psychology led to the development of many instructional strategies that secondary teachers could use to increase students' comprehension of course materials. For example, the use of a pre-reading strategy such as an anticipation guide can serve to activate students' prior knowledge to improve comprehension. It can also enable students to confront misconceptions about the topic at hand, or to arrive at new understandings by revising or constructing new schema (Dufflemeyer, 1994). Numerous content area vocabulary development strategies focus on activating students' existing word/concept knowledge so that they may build on the schemata they have, or develop new schemata for new concepts (Alvermann & Phelps, 1994; Lenski, Wham, M. A. & Johns, 1999; Ruddell, 2001).

While the focus on the cognitive dimension of reading has helped some students become more proficient readers of content area texts (Ruddell, 2001), some assessment data indicates the need to reconsider adolescent literacy and content area learning. Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, and Mueller, (2001) note that there are still persistent gaps in student achievement between students who are members of the dominant culture and those who are not. They also draw on data from the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress Reading Report Card. It indicates that although the