

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SQ3R STRATEGY IN PROMOTING IRAQI EFL STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION

Zinah Mahdi Habeeb, Salam Hamid Abbas

University of Baghdad

College of Education/IbnRushd for Human Sciences

INTRODUCTION

As Iraqi EFL students are reported by many studies to have poor reading comprehension abilities, an experiment is conducted to investigate the effect of SQ3R strategy (Survey – Question – Read – Recite – Review) in improving Iraqi students' ability of reading comprehension. To achieve this, two groups of preparatory school students are randomly selected and equalized in terms of several important variables. The experiment lasts for 15 weeks during which the experimental group is taught reading comprehension according to the SQ3R strategy while the control group is taught conventionally. A post – test is given at the end of the experiment to students in both groups to assess their reading comprehension.

The results of the study reveal that there is a statistically significance difference in EFL students' reading comprehension in favor of the experimental group. Based on the results achieved, a set of conclusions and pedagogical recommendations are put forward.

Key Words: reading comprehension, reading strategies, cognitive and metacognitive strategies, levels of reading

THE PROBLEM

Reading is not only a source of getting information and an enjoyable activity, but also a high effective means of fostering and improving learner's knowledge of language. (Akbar and Farid, 2012: 128). Yet, comprehension is the ultimate goal of reading. The students usually attempt to accurately comprehend well the written material that the writer wants to convey. Through the process of comprehension that combines information from text with the reader's previous knowledge, the formation of an internally consistent mental representation of text will be built (Pressley, 2000: 545).

Many academic studies indicate that Iraqi EFL students have difficulties to fully understand the reading materials they study, that's why they are reported to be uninterested in the reading activities. Generally speaking, they seem to be unable to interact with the text they read and its general idea. Accordingly, they find difficulty in answering the questions about a reading passage in a test or discuss a reading topic in the classroom (Abdul-Majeed, 2015: 93). However, Iraqi students' poor mastery of reading skills might be attributed to different

covers, yet, Iraqi EFL teachers applying traditional procedures in teaching reading is one of the repeatedly stated reasons Al-Azawi (2009: 2).

Accordingly, more effective teaching techniques can be employed in teaching reading comprehension and this study is an attempt to utilize the SQ3R strategy in teaching reading comprehension to Iraqi EFL students as it is stated to involve classroom activities and procedures that may activate students' thinking about the text to construct meaning without depending fully on teacher's guidance but on their ability to grasp the information from the text.

AIM

This study aims at finding out the effect of SQ3R strategy on Iraqi EFL preparatory school students' reading comprehension.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group students who are taught reading comprehension by the SQ3R strategy and that of the control group students who are taught conventionally in the reading comprehension post – test.

Limits

The current study is limited to;

- 1- Iraqi EFL fourth preparatory school female students, the literary branch in Baghdad Governorate during the academic year 2017 – 2018.
- 2- the reading passages in the first four units of the textbook (English for Iraq – Fourth Preparatory).

Value

It is hoped that this study may be found useful by Iraqi EFL preparatory school teachers who are interested in improving their students' reading comprehension to become more independent and to build up confidence in their abilities to understand reading texts. The study may also attract the attention of EFL classroom teachers to the importance of utilizing effective and suitable strategies in teaching reading comprehension.

The findings of the current study may be beneficial to curriculum designers in making decisions about more effective reading activities and practices to be included in the Iraqi EFL textbooks. Finally, the study may also be of value to the researchers interested in EFL reading comprehension.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Reading Comprehension

Reading is considered one of the basic English skills which has an essential role in the classroom where language learning is the central purpose. It is considered a high effective means to improve the commands of language (Nuttal, 1996:30). It is an important process of joying the activation of relevant knowledge and related language skills in order to complete the task of exchanging information from writer to readers. In other words, the goal of reading is to attract thoughts, facts, opinions, etc., which are put together on the page by the writer to arrive at the best personal meanings. This reinforces the idea that reading is interactivity triangular: between the reader, the text, and the message. (Akbar and Farid, 2012:128).

Day (1980: 194) asserts that the reading process demands conscious strategies that lead to understanding as a process of interpretation, recognition and perception of the printed material. At the same time he asserts the concept of comprehension which is based on an understanding of the meaning of written texts. Therefore, the reading process deals with the form of language, while comprehension deals with language content (the end product).

McNamara and Magliano (2009: 185) state that this process of negotiating understanding between the reader and the author includes all linguistic factors, such as phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic. It can also include emotional and psychological factors that are studied in the field of pragmatics such as the expected speech acts performed by the addresser in the text. In this respect, Goodman (1988: 11) argues that the reading process is a receptive language process that begins with a linguistic symbol presented by an author who is the producer of the written material and ends with meaning which is the final and intended outcome of this process. The readers construct meaning through guessing or other reading strategies; therefore, reading is considered as a psycholinguistic process. This fact reflects a fundamental and essential interaction between language and thought in reading. The writer encodes thoughts as language by using suitable writing strategies to achieve the purpose behind the writing process, and the reader decodes language to thought so as to understand such a purpose

However, Habush (2010: 38) shows that reading process must contain visual decoding, mental processing of what has been decoded, and connecting it to reader's experience to extract meaning. The readers should not focus on memorizing patterns and practicing fluency when they read because this gives the indicator that the reading process in a passive process or a mere decoding of letters or words and this is a false view. Chastain (1988: 47), on the other hand, concludes that reading process is a complex cognitive system operating on written material to understand the text. The background and linguistic knowledge is activated during the writing process by the author. Then the students' task is to activate this knowledge to recreate the author's intended meaning. In fact, it is an interaction between thought and

language (between readers' ideas, beliefs and attitudes which is coupled with the ability to form linguistic predictions).

Proficient and successful readers comprehend the purposes involved in reading and consciously control them. Controlling of the reading process is known metacognition (knowing about knowing). They are using metacognitive skills to understand the essence of meanings in the printed materials (Akbar and Farid, 2012: 129).

READING STRATEGIES

Reading strategies are classified into two major categories; cognitive and metacognitive strategies. Cognitive strategies are employed to aid the reader at getting meaning from the text by practicing, analyzing, and creating structure for input and output. While metacognitive strategies enable students to reflect on and monitor their cognitive processes while reading (Davis and Bistodeau (1993: 462).

COGNITIVE STRATEGIES IN READING

Cognitive strategies in reading are typically found to be the most common strategies with language students. The significance of these strategies grows with the age of EFL students. An appropriate way of developing them is by enabling students to use these strategies as efficiently as possible. However, cognitive strategies practice may develop the thinking skills that will make students strategic and flexible learners (Nikolov, 1990: 33).

Chamot and O'Malley (1994:112) define cognitive strategies in reading as "mental or internal processes directly related to individual learning tasks and entail direct manipulation or transformation of the learning material". These strategies refer to the stages or operations used in understanding or problem solving that demand direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of the reading materials (Brown, 1994: 115).

By utilizing cognitive strategies, students are able to master their attention in comprehending a reading passage in which cognitive strategies refer to what the students require to comprehend what they read, how to make the reading meaningful, and what to do if they encounter difficulties or problems. In practice, although this strategy can uphold or aid the students in comprehending the reading text they read, it may also hinder or undermine the comprehension of text (Pressely and Afflerbach, 1995: 52) .

Some students must be explicitly taught so as to be able to consciously think. So, these strategies can be explicitly instructed by the teachers to help students be able to convey texts ideas reflexively and analytically. If the students master the internal process well, they will be able to self-learn (self-instruction) and can be independent learners (Chen, 2002: 133).

To sum up, cognitive reading strategies include direct interaction with the written passage, assist to facilitate understanding, and act directly in manipulating the coming

information in ways that improve reading comprehension. However, these strategies demand higher – order thinking process from the students to be effective readers as they recognize, use topic guessing from the context, use a dictionary, summarize, write down, use linguistic clues, use text markers, skip the difficult parts and repeat words or phrases (Williams and Burden, 1997:184).

METACOGNITIVE STRATEGIES IN READING

In reading comprehension, the metacognitive strategies are “strategies that increase the ability to monitor or regulate one’s current level of RC and decide when it is not adequate”. They reflect the notions of thinking about thinking, self-evaluation and self-regulatory of RC. So, they are planned, intentional, goal oriented, and future – oriented mental processing that can be used to accomplish the RC tasks (Skehan, 1989: 87).

Kuda (2005: 184) supports the position that “metacognitive strategies are strategies for thinking about one’s own learning”. If poor readers are aware of these strategies, they would be able to work on those they do not possess to promote understanding of a written material (Alderson and Bachman, 2000: 41). The readers’ lack of metacognitive awareness does not permit them to use reading strategies that could increase their ability to comprehend a written text. In this case, the teacher primarily has to guide, especially poor readers, and teach them strategies explicitly, so they become aware and go beyond recognizing isolated words to start constructing meaning (Anderson, 2008: 85).

Alderson and Bachman (2000: 60) report that the metacognitive skills that good readers employ efficiently for improving reading comprehension may include recognizing what is significant in a passage, adjusting reading rate, skimming, previewing, using context to solve misunderstanding, formulating question about information, and monitoring cognition, including recognizing problems with information presented in text or an inability to understand text.

Nunan (2015: 64) claims that metacognition in reading “does not only build facility in the language, but it also fosters independent learning”. In other words, self-regulated students who monitor their own learning process are likely to develop self-determination to plan how to achieve RC. Students should be encouraged to be independent readers. Thus, teachers need to provide them with tools that empower their choices to be autonomous. Autonomy in reading permits students to go through their RC process and to take responsibility for it, and the metacognitive strategies represent a powerful tool that may help them achieve this.

Good readers know how and when they should use a reading strategy. Diversity in reading strategies and approaches follows diversity in texts because these strategies make reading an active and observable process and be very useful for making struggling readers to interact with the text to develop and enhance understanding of the data. Predicting, inferring, connecting, summarizing, guessing, paraphrasing are the most important strategies for good

readers. However, a combination of strategies can be effective for learners to comprehend a text (Paran, 2003: 117).

SQ3R STRATEGY

Orlando (1980:71) states that SQ3R is a reading strategy in which EFL students visualize what is taking part in the text, activate background knowledge by making connections, ask mental questions to self – check understanding, learn how to make inferences about what is read, determine the importance of information in a text, and synthesize information that is learned. Students' ability to use this strategy varies from one student to the other due to individual difference. Some students may find it easy to visualize what they read but others may not.

Artis (2008: 133-134) states that in SQ3R strategy, students are able to be more active and hands – on in their reading. He points out that SQ3R enables students to change their negative thoughts on reading textbooks and tasks. He also argues that “SQ3R introduces a diverse set of metacognitive reading techniques in a way students can easily understand and implement”. According to him, SQ3R is a valuable source for students when they work independently without depending on the teacher for guidance, as it is a step – by – step process allowing students to be self – sufficient and self – managing.

Although there are individual difference among students, Phakiti (2006:35) states that using SQ3R strategy increases students engagement with the text, as students subjectively consume information in an effort to answer self – generated key questions regarding the text content. Reading becomes an evolving interaction between the text and the background of the students. This is accomplished through the use of a set of procedures which are both cognitive and metacognitive.

This strategy may aid students to create a good mental framework of a subject, in to which they can fit facts correctly. On other hand, it helps students to fix information in their minds and get the maximum benefit from their reading time (Cohen and Cowen, 2008: 216).

Steps of SQ3R Strategy

The acronym of SQ3R stands for the steps in the process: Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review. As a preliminary phase for these steps, students' prior knowledge should be activated.

Although activating prior knowledge is not part of the SQ3R strategy, yet this is an important warm up phase for students that can help them be prepared to digest new information in the text. (Yuksel, 2012: 12). Through This procedure, students are likely to be able to generate their ideas about the text as it stimulates the students to be ready to connect their previous information to the new information in the reading text. The prior knowledge

activation may be done by asking them several questions related to the text topic (Brandao and Oakhill, 2005: 687).

The five steps that are supposed to be implemented by students in this strategy are as follows:

1. Surveying

In the first step of the strategy, the students beings to survey the title and the heading of the text to get general ideas of what the text is going to talk about by “surveying” or browsing the text or to get an overview of the contents of the text and how the text is structured. The information acquired can be in the form of key words and main ideas to understand the whole text (Agudelo et al., 2007: 17). Carlston (2011: 142) sees that the students' mental processing system will be prepared through this step to receive information to be learned as it provides the main knowledge required to organize and assimilate incoming information from reading text. If students' thinking processing system knows what to expect in advance, it can comprehend and store information in a much more efficient way than if the new information is injected into the system with no forewarning.

2. Questioning

In the second step, that is, questioning, the students generate question based on the information acquired during the “surveying” step and their prior knowledge. They organize new information and starts attaching it to already existing knowledge. This attachment is an important component of learning. Self – generated questions assist increase concentration, reduce the phenomenon of forgetting what was just read, and increase reading speed and recall (Kemmis and, Taggart, 1988: 126). This process of asking questions leads to discover knowledge, which is the essence of comprehension as the students formulate some questions and then discover the answers in the text. (Gongos, 2012: 32).

Generating questions can be considered almost as one of the important study goals. It may facilitate students' comprehension in a way that they can have expectation and make predictions of the text, and search for the answers to the questions when they later read the text. This is likely to arouse students' curiosity and so increase their comprehension of the reading text (Baier, 2011: 21).

3. Reading

In the next step, that is, reading, the students have in depth reading session, allowing them to read the text carefully in order to understand it. In this step, they are supposed to focus only on the main ideas and important information which support the main idea. They are allowed to take notes during the implementation of this step as they have to focus on getting the detailed information. Without focusing on the important information, the students could easily be distracted by unimportant details on the text (Soedarsono, 2001: 47).

4. Reciting

In the reciting step, the students answer their own questions made earlier without looking back at the text. In other words, they respond to the questions by using their own words after they finish reading. The students might be asked to write down the answers and underline the important points and then they are asked to recall or recite them, taking into consideration that ,in this step, students should not be allowed to go back to the reading text(Gongos, 2012: 33).

Students' recitation is very important in this orientation of RC. If recitation is skipped, the system of this strategy will not work effectively. If students know that they are going to have to recite answers from memory, they will be more likely to read actively. As they read and study notes, they evaluate and choose what it is to be recited (Clark and Graves 2004: 53).

Gongos (2012: 33) states that memory of a human contains a short – term memory, and a long – term memory. When students find answers to their questions, these are likely to be stored in the short-term memory. When students recite the new information, it moves from short – term memory toward long – term memory and this what makes SQ3R works.

5. Reviewing

In the last step of the strategy, i.e., reviewing, the students review the text by re – reading and checking their own notes for important information (Soedarsono, 2001: 49). McDaniel and Fisher (1991: 20) states that during “review” step of SQ3R strategy, the students should try to find information that they may have missed at “reading” step, re – reading activity provides immediate feedback which has been shown to bolster the testing effect.

According to Gongos (2012: 34), “memory research indicates that it is normal for most forgetting to take place shortly after the learning task is completed”. Immediate review interferes with the normal forgetting process and the result is more complete retention. Repeated reviews may support the effect of reciting (moving information from short – term memory toward long – term memory) that is why it is essential to the reading process. So, without repeated reviews, information fades from short – term memory rather quickly.

However, the implementation of this strategy may help students become good readers by enabling them to practice several things that good readers do. Taking this strategy as an attempt to generalize the information, it enables students to practice how to separate relevant information from irrelevant one and affords them the opportunity to summarize what they read when they put the information in their own words. This is likely to enable them better understand what they know and what they do not know. In addition to that, they practice how to concentrate while they read as they actively monitor their own comprehension (Soedarsono, 2001: 53).

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample Selection

In this study, the population includes preparatory school female student in the city of Baghdad during the academic year 2017 – 2018. The fourth preparatory stage is randomly chosen by the researchers to extract the study sample from. Two sections are randomly selected from the fourth stage in a preparatory school in Baghdad to represent the control (39 students) and experimental (36 students) groups. The equalization of these two groups is checked in terms of participants' intelligence, academic motivation, and scores in a reading comprehension pre – test. See table 1.

Table1: The equalization of the experimental and control groups in Intelligence, Academic Motivation, and Reading Comprehension Pre-test

Variable	Groups	No.	M	SD	t- value		d.f	Sig.
					computed	critical		
Intelligence	Experimental	36	28.805	9.288	1.479	2.0	73	No
	Control	39	31.923	8.957				
Academic Motivation	Experimental	36	57.923	8.925	1.553			
	Control	39	53.923	11.915				
Reading Comprehension Pre-test	Experimental	36	6.888	3.114	1.601			
	Control	39	8.205	3.921				

The Teaching Material

Eight reading texts were selected from the prescribed textbook entitled (English for Iraq/ Students' Book) in 2017 by Caroline de Messieres Published by Garent for the fourth preparatory classes to be the material for the present study.

Instrument of the Study

The data collection tool used in this study is a reading comprehension post-test. It consists of four questions. Each question encompasses a text for reading. The four texts in this test are unseen passages selected by the researchers from different internet sources according to the cognitive and language level of students. The reading comprehension post-test consists of different test items such as short answers questions, true/false, matching, multiple-choice, and completion items. The test is to be scored out of 100.

Face Validity of the Post-test

To ensure its face validity and appropriateness to the fourth preparatory students, the post – test with its scoring rubric are displayed to a jury of experts in the English language teaching field from different Iraqi colleges. The jury also includes English teaching supervisors from the Ministry of Education. Generally speaking, the test and its scoring scheme are found valid by the jury members. However, few modifications are made according to the suggestions of the jurors.

Pilot Administration of the Post-test

It is a common practice that data collection instruments should be tried out before they are finally administered. Therefore, the test has been administered to a sample of 30 students who are randomly drawn from the population. The aims of this application are to determine whether the instructions of the test are clear or not, and to estimate the time required for the testees to answer the items of the test. However, the time needed by the pilot sample students to respond to the test is found to range between 40 to 50 minutes. The average time, then, for tackling the test is 45 minutes. Moreover, no ambiguity in the test instructions is noticed or reported by students.

Item Analysis

To ensure conducting a good test, it is not enough to choose appropriate language items, but to be sure also that each item functions properly in the test. This can be checked through conducting item analysis of the test which is a basic procedure to secure a reliable test through the analysis of its items to judge their level of difficulty and discrimination power (Mehrens and Lehmann, 1991: 161).

To achieve this procedure, a sample of 150 students are randomly selected from the population and given the test.

However, after scoring the test papers of the statistical analysis sample, the final scores are arranged from the highest to the lowest. Then, two groups of these scores are separated: an upper group consisting of the highest 27% of the scores and a lower group consisting of the lowest 27% of the scores. The number of scores in each group is 41. This is done to ;

- 1- determine the difficulty level and discriminating power of the test items.
- 2- finding out the reliability of the test.

Difficulty Level

Measuring the difficulty level of a test items helps to find out whether these items are too easy or too hard. Madesen (1983: 180) indicates that the accepted difficulty level ranges from 0.20 to 0.80. However, the difficulty level of the post-test items are found to range between 0.378 - 0.670.

Discriminating Power

Discriminating power refers to the efficiency of a test item to discriminate between the high and low achievers in the test.

According to Ebel (1972: 202), the item is considered acceptable if its discriminating power is 0.30 and above. The discriminating power of the post-test items is found to range between 0.341 and 0.585. Therefore, all the test items are acceptable in this respect.

Reliability of the Post-Test

Mehrens and Lehman (1991:249) state that reliability means the degree of consistency between two measures of the same test. It is the consistency with which a set of test scores measures what they are supposed to measure.

The method used to estimate the test reliability in the present study is Alpha – Cornbach formula. One hundred and fifty students have randomly been selected to take the test as a reliability sample. The reliability coefficient has been found out to be 0.846 which is considered acceptable and high.

THE EXPERIMENT

The experiment started on the 2nd of October, 2017 and ended on the 15th of January, 2018. This means that it lasted for fifteen weeks, five days per week.

Conducting the present experiment needs designing a set of lesson plans which contains detailed information about the teaching techniques and procedures that are followed in teaching the two groups. As far as the experimental group is concerned, the first lesson has been devoted to introduce SQ3R strategy to the students. The role of the students, the role of the teacher and the procedures for conducting this strategy are also introduced. The teaching of reading comprehension is done according to the five steps of SQ3R strategy discussed earlier. On the other hand, the conventional technique in teaching reading comprehension is adopted in teaching the control group with applying the instructions stated in the Teacher's Book for the fourth preparatory classes.

Final Administration of the Post-Test

The reading comprehension post-test is administered at the end of the experiment to both groups, the experimental group and the control group at the same time on 15th of January 2018. The allotted time for answering the test is 45 minutes. The testees are instructed to read carefully the four reading passages, and then answer the questions attached with each of them.

RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As shown in table 2, the statistical manipulation of the data collected through the application of the post-test reveals that the mean scores of the control and experimental groups in the post test are found to be 35.948 and 60.194 respectively.

Using t-test formula for two independent samples shows a computed t-value 8.162 which is higher than the critical value 2.000 at 0.05 level of significance and 73 degree of freedom.

Table2: The Mean Scores, Standard Deviation and T-test Value for Both Groups in the Post-test

Group	n	M	SD	Computed t - value	Critical t - value	d.f.	Level of significance
CG	39	35.948	11.948	8.162	2.000	73	0.05
EC	36	60.194	14.163				

This result indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups. The difference is in favor of the experimental group students who are taught reading comprehension by SQ3R strategy. Accordingly, the stated null hypothesis is rejected.

To determine the size of the investigated strategy statistical significant effect on students reading comprehension, ETA-Square formula is used. It yields a value of 0.47 which indicates a great effectsize.

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The positive effects of the investigated strategy revealed in this study can be attributed to the following:

- 1- Implementing this strategy facilitates students understanding of the text and this is the purpose of reading.
- 2- Extracts students' previous knowledge of the text topic assists them to recall, consider, and connect different ideas which may support their comprehension of the text.
- 3- It enables students to be aware of what they need to complete the reading comprehension task.
- 4- It encourages students to practice the tasks in different procedures and authentic contexts.
- 5- In applying this strategy, students are aided to develop the ability to expand ideas beyond the text.
- 6- It creates a supportive, safe, and welcoming learning environment. This environment encourages learners to take risks and try alternatives (without fear of negative responses, the learners will feel more comfortable expressing their thoughts).

- 7- It allows students to be aware of the behavioral objectives (instructional objectives) and ultimately work to achieve them. This supports the students to have a higher motivation and commitment to the RC task.
- 8- It requires group work which may play a vital role in reinforcing learning process through making interaction and cooperation among students to complete the reading comprehension task, and this is the fundamental goal of communicative classroom.
- 9- The suggested strategy is noticed to help students to separate necessary and relevant information from irrelevant information to achieve reading comprehension objectives.
- 10- Through the implementation of this strategy, the students are given an active role in participating in classroom activities so that the students become the focus of the educational process.
- 11- This strategy gives the students more opportunities to memorize and retain vocabulary items. That is why students in the experimental group are noticed to increase their vocabulary knowledge.
- 12- It is noticed that the implementation of this strategy eliminates monotony, boredom, anxiety, and shyness in the classroom because it is enjoyable, and purposeful in its application.

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the results obtained, it is concluded that;

- 1- applying SQ3R strategy helps Iraqi EFL preparatory school students to improve their level of reading comprehension of various reading text types.
- 2- The experimental groups' subjects of the current study show high interest and engagement with the new strategy (SQ3R). This leads them to be more active and enthusiastic to use activities than the control groups' students.
- 3- SQ3R is more effective, and appropriate in teaching reading comprehension to Iraqi EFL students than the conventional technique prescribed in the teacher's book.
- 4- The effect of SQ3R strategy on Iraqi students is not only statistically significant but also great.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the results and conclusions, the following recommendations are put forward:

- 1- EFL teachers should be aware of the importance of promoting students' ability of comprehending reading texts and its effect on students' performance in other language fields.
- 2- EFL teachers should consider students' individual differences and use reading comprehension teaching strategy that enables them to do different practices.

- 3- EFL teachers should do their best to create safe, comfortable, and positive environment in their classrooms to facilitate their students' reading comprehension ability.
- 4- Teachers are recommended to provide students with extra, interesting, and familiar reading comprehension texts on diverse topics to be supplementary materials and view themselves as facilitators of learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom.
- 5- This strategy reduces the teacher's guidance as it gives EFL students the opportunity to participate in continuing and improving the learning process. Accordingly, classroom teachers should be wise enough to know when to allow students work on their own, and when to work with them.
- 6- This strategy lessens learners' shyness by encouraging them to interact with their classmates and express their opinions. So, teachers should make use of this point and encourage shy and hesitant students to take active part in the reading comprehension task.

REFERENCES

- Abdul-Majeed, M. (2015) The Effect of using Scaffolding Strategies on EFL students Reading Comprehension Achievement. *Arts Journal* Vol.111 , 91 – 113.
- Aguedelo, S.C.; Avila, L.M.C. and Lopez, A.Y.C. (2007) How to Improve Sixth Graders' Reading Comprehension through the Skimming Method. Retrieved [http://www.aep-arts.org/files/publications/critical%20Evidence](http://www.aep-arts.org/files/publications/critical%20Evidence.pdf) , pdf.
- Akbar, M. and Farid, G. (2012) Language Teaching Theories Approaches Methods and Skills. Azad University.
- Al-Azzawi, N.J. (2009) A Study of Teaching Techniques Used by Instructors of the Novel in the Department of English. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Baghdad.
- Alderson, J.C. and Bachman, L.F. (2000) Assessing Reading. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, N.J. (2008) The Practical English Language Teaching: Reading. New York, NY: McGraw – Hill Companies.
- Artis, A.B. (2008) Improving marketing students reading comprehension with the SQ3R method. *Journal of Marketing Education*. Vol. 30, 130 – 137.
- Baier, K. (2011) The Effect of SQ3R on Fifth Grade Students' Comprehension Levels. Master Thesis. Ohio: Bowling Green State University.
- Brandao, A. and Oakhill, J. (2005) "How do you know this answer?" – Children's use of text data and general knowledge in story comprehension. Reading and Writing . Boston: Bedford.

- Brown, D.S. (1994) Books for a Small Planet: A Multicultural – Intercultural Bibliography from Young English Learners. Alexandria: VA.
- Carlston, D. (2011) Benefits of Students Generated Note Packets: A preliminary Investigation of SQ3R Implementation. M. Midwestern State University. www.Top.sagepub.
- Chamot, A.U. and O'Malley, J.M. (1994) The CALL Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach. Addison:Wesley.
- Chastain, K. (1988) Developing Second – language Skills Theory and Practice. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chen, H.C. (2002) A preliminary study of Chinese EFL learner's difficulties in vocabulary learning and remedial learning strategies. Papers selected from the 17th conference of TVES Education. Taipei: Grane.
- Clark, K.F., and Graves, M.F. (2004) Scaffolding Students' Comprehension of text. London: University of London press.
- Cohen, V.L. and Cowen, J., E. (2008) Literacy for Children in an Information Age: Teaching Reading, Writing and Thinking. Canada: Thomson Wordsworth Learning Academic Resource Center.
- Davies, J.N. and Bistodeau, L. (1993) How do L1 and L2 reading differ? Evidence from think aloud protocols. *The Modern Language Journal*. Vol. 77, 459 – 471.
- Day, J.D. (1980) Training Summarization Skills: A Comparison of Teaching Methods. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois, Urbana .
- Ebel, R.L. (1972) Essentials of Education Measurement. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gongos, D.H. (2012) Why SQ3R Works. University of Central Florida. [http://sarc.sdes.ucf.edu/docs/learning-skills/textbooks/ why – sq3r – works.pdf](http://sarc.sdes.ucf.edu/docs/learning-skills/textbooks/why-sq3r-works.pdf).
- Goodman, K.S. (1988).The Reading Process. In P.L. Carrell; J. Devine and D.E., Eskey (Eds.). Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Haboush, Z. (2010) the Effectiveness of Using a Programme Based on Multiple Intelligences Theory on English Grader's English Reading Comprehension Skills. Unpublished M.A Dissertation. Islamic University .Ghaza.
- Kemmis, S. and Taggart, R. (1988) The Action Research Reader (3rd ed.). Victoria: Deakin University Press.

- Kuda, K. (2005) *Insights into Second Language Reading: Across – Linguistic Approach*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Madsen, Harold. (1983) *Techniques in Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDaniel, M.A. and Fisher, R.P. (1991) *Test and Test Feedback as Learning Sources*.<http://www.sciencedirect.com/article/pii/0361476X9190037L>.
- McNamara, D.S. and Magliano, J.P. (2009) *Towards a Comprehension Model of Comprehension*. In B. Rose (Ed). *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mehrens, W.A. and I.J. Lehmann (1991) *Measurement and Evaluation* (4thed.). New York: Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Nikolov, M. (1990) *Why Do You Learn English? Because the Teacher is Shore. A Study of Hungarian Children's Foreign Language Learning Motivation*. *Language Teaching Research*. Vol. 3, 33 – 56.
- Nunan, D. (2015) *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. New York: Routledge.
- Nuttal, C.(1996) *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. (2nded.). Oxford: Heinemann English Language Teaching.
- Orlando, V.P.(1980) *Training Students to Use a Modified Version of SQ3R: An Instructional Strategy*. *Reading World Journal*. Vol. 20, 65-90.
- Paran, A. (2003) *Intensive Reading English Teaching Professional*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Phakiti, A. (2006) *Theoretical and Pedagogical Issues in ESL / EFL Teaching of Strategic Reading*. *TESOL*. Vol.1, 19 – 50.
- Pressley, M. and Afflerbach, P. (1995) *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Skehan, P. (1989) *Individual differences in second language learning*. Rout ledge: Chapman and Hall.
- Soedarsono, I. (2001) *Sistem Membaca Cepat dan Efeektif*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Williams, M. and R.L., Burden. (1997) *Psychology for language teacher: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yuksel, I. (2012) *Activating students' prior knowledge*. IDOSI Publication. [www.idosi.org/wasj/wasj20\(8\)12/2.pdf](http://www.idosi.org/wasj/wasj20(8)12/2.pdf).