

THE PRACTICE OF TEACHING READING SKILLS: PREPARATORY SCHOOL IN FOCUS

Alebel Adeg Abebe

*MA/Lecturer in Teaching English as a Foreign Language,
Department of English Language and Literature, University of Gondar, Ethiopia*

DOI: 10.37648/ijrssh.v10i02.004

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted to assess the practice of teaching reading skill of grade twelve at Fasiledes Preparatory School. Out of 910 students and 10 English teachers, six teachers and three hundred fourteen students were selected using simple random sampling technique, lottery method in particular. The head of the department who worked as a supervisor was chosen purposively. The data were collected through questionnaire, interview and classroom observations. Fourteen closed ended questions consisting of Likert Scale type were administered to students and these items were again used for observation checklist. Each teacher was observed four times with a total of twenty four observations and triangulated with students' response and interview result of the supervisor. The data were discussed quantitatively and qualitatively. The data obtained from questionnaire of students was analyzed using percentages and mean values with the integration of observation results which was analyzed using percentages. The finding in the pre-reading stage with grand mean 2.2 which is less than the expected mean 3 indicated that teachers rarely implemented this stage. The mean values 2.9 and 2.3 of respondents showed that teachers practiced sometimes and rarely to while and post-reading stages respectively. These results are also supported by the findings gained from interview and classroom observations. Generally, most teachers do not teach the three reading stages properly. Therefore, teachers should be given on job training about teaching reading skill. School supervisors should observe the practice of reading in the classroom and assist teachers so that there will be a better teaching learning process.

Keywords: *practice, pre-reading, while-reading, post-reading*

INTRODUCTION

English is given as a subject beginning from grade one and a medium of instruction in high schools and higher institutions of learning in the Ethiopian curriculum. It also serves as the language of science, technology and the media in many parts of the world. Moreover, it helps learners to communicate in the classroom and in a wide variety of everyday life situations.

Wendy and Scoths (1994) explained that a very important way of helping students to work responsibly and independently is to give them the necessary tools. One of the tools is classroom language. When we learn a language, there are four language skills that we need

for complete communication. We usually learn to listen first, then to speak, then to read, and finally to write.

Therefore, in order to teach these four language skills effectively, teachers need to apply clearly designed teaching methods to assist students use the target language. However, there are teachers who do not teach and follow the suggested teaching techniques and procedures. For example, Nunan (1988) showed that there is a mismatch between the planned activities and the actual implementation in the classroom. Likewise, Breen (1989) indicated that designing teaching materials alone does not mean the achievement of the objectives unless it is implemented in the classroom using suitable

methodology. From this, we can understand that applying effective classroom methodology in teaching a language has a positive impact on the students' performance. Thus, like other skills, teaching reading needs carefully selected teaching methodology at all grade levels.

Therefore, this study focuses on investigating the practices of teaching reading at preparatory school level on grade 12 at Fasiledes Preparatory School in Gondar city administration.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The ultimate goal of teaching the English language is to enable the learners to use the target language and communicate their opinions, thoughts and feelings (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). For a communication to take place successfully, it is important that the learner listen, speak, read and write in the language. Reading is one of the most important skills to be practiced from the primary to the university levels. Related to this Khan (2004) showed that reading is one of the most important language skill in receiving information from the written materials. It is also used to understand the subject matter in every field of study. Reading is the most important skill in Ethiopia where English is used as a foreign language.

Devine (1981) shows that in spite of the availability of audiovisual devices, reading continues to be the major way of learning today to get information, enhance concepts, and motivating ideas. Getachew (1996) shows that reading is the most important among the four language skills. Related to this Atkins, J. Hailom & Nuru (1996:39) states that "almost all the examinations which test their knowledge and abilities are based on their reading and comprehending abilities in English. In addition to the need for efficient reading for academic purposes, acquiring this skill is increasingly important for practical purposes in the real world after school."

However, according to Atkins et al. (1996) many high school students are weak in their

reading ability in English Language. This weakness affects their studies and academic performance. The major factors affecting students reading are ineffective teaching of reading and inappropriate tasks to help students enhance their reading abilities. Therefore, for the advantage of next generation, it is important to enhance the teaching of reading in the Ethiopian high schools.

Kukukoglu (2012) conducted action research on how to improve the reading comprehension of students in Turkey. The study aimed on the effective reading strategies so as to improve the reading skill of students in the classroom. Students had a very low awareness about reading strategies at the beginning of the study. The researcher finally found that teaching reading strategies is most important in order to improve the students comprehension. Therefore, the research showed that if teachers implement the appropriate strategies or methods, the comprehension of students will be enhanced. Similarly, Albdour (2015) conducted a research on the difficulties affecting the grade seven students reading comprehension. The study showed that students had a high degree of reading comprehension problems and recommended that trainings on teaching reading skill should be given.

There are related local studies in this area. For example, Paulos (2015) conducted a research on the reading activities of grade eleven. The study focused on how the reading activities or tasks are designed, and how these activities are distributed in the text book. The finding of the study revealed that reading for details, main ideas, word-attack skills, information transfer skills and predicting skill were included below average. Other activities like skimming, references and relating to their own idea, designed in moderate ways. On the other hand, scanning activities and inferences appeared more than average. Dereje (2008) also made a research on identifying tasks that require considerations in preparing and applying motivational techniques in reading

lessons. The research focused on assessing students perception on the frequency of teachers motivational techniques, students opinion on reading materials and teachers pedagogical presentation related to reading skill. The research showed that most students perceived additional materials as essential to them. Nevertheless, teachers sometimes use these materials. More than half percent of the students believed that participating in classroom discussions encourages them in reading lessons. Mesfin (2008) did a research on how grade four students and teachers practice reading skill. The researcher also investigated the students reading ability in the aforementioned grade level. The result depicted that students practiced inappropriate reading techniques and procedures. Likewise, teachers used traditional method of teaching reading, and practiced almost no silent reading. This study is different from the aforementioned researches in many ways. For example, Paulos (2015) focuses on how the reading activities or tasks are designed and distributed in the text book and Dereje (2008) studied in preparing and applying motivational techniques in reading lessons. In order to teach reading skill effectively, there are important stages that the teacher should follow. These procedures include pre, while and post readings (Atkins et al., 1996). To the best of my knowledge, I can't get a research done on how the teachers implement reading stages. i.e how teachers practice the pre-reading, the while-reading and post reading stages have not yet been touched.

I have been teaching the communicative English skills to the first year students at the University of Gondar for six years. From classroom observations and assessments I have carried out as part of my professional activity, the majority of the students' reading skill result is below the standard or expected. In addition, informal and formal departmental discussions indicated that many first year students are weak in their reading comprehension. These students, even, are unable to answer very simple comprehension questions. On top of this, there are complaints from the students themselves that teachers do not teach reading skill properly in the preparatory schools.

Therefore, the researcher is inspired to assess on how the reading skill is taught in grade twelve of Fasiledes Preparatory School. Therefore, the researcher formulated the following research questions.

1. How do teachers teach the pre-reading skill in the classroom?
2. How do teachers teach the while-reading skill in the classroom?
3. How do teachers teach the post-reading skill in the classroom?

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Design of the Study

This study employed descriptive design using quantitative and qualitative data analysis method to assess how teachers teach reading skill.

Population, Sample and Sampling Methods

The study was conducted in Gondarcity Fasiledes preparatory School which was selected randomly among five schools has two grade levels: grades eleven and twelve. The researcher again randomly selected grade twelve. This was because all of the teachers teach both grade eleven and twelve. There were fourteen sections of grade twelve with a total number of 910 students, on average, 65 students in each section and 314 (34.5%) of the students were taken as a sample. These students were selected using simple random sampling, specifically, the lottery method. This method was used because the population has similar characteristics and has an equal chance to be selected. The reason why the researcher included samples from each section was that there was a possibility that students in each section were taught by different teachers with different teaching experience. There were ten English language teachers in the school. Six (66.7%) of the teachers were selected for the study using lottery method. The head of the English language department was selected purposely for interview because the head was worked as a supervisor in the school and could provide information about the reading practices in the classroom.

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

In this study questionnaire, interview and classroom observations were used as data collecting tools.

Questionnaire

To collect data from students close ended questions were prepared. Fourteen close ended questions with five scoring of Likert Scale ranging from always to never were prepared to assess how teachers teach the pre, while and post reading stages. In scoring a point 5 was assigned for "always" 4 represented "usually", 3 stood for "sometimes" 2 represented for "rarely" and 1 assigned for "never". The questionnaire was prepared based on literature adapted from Atkins et al .(1996) &Debritu etal.(2015) and given to three of my colleagues specialized in teaching English as a foreign language for comment ,and I modified the questions based on the given comments.The pilot test was carried out in Azezo preparatory school by distributing the items to 30 grade twelve students and the reliability was calculated using cronbach alpha and found 0.82 which is greater than the minimum compromise value 0.75(Hinton, McMurray, &Brownlow, 2014).

Observation

DATA ANALYSIS AND THE FINDINGS

Responses on Pre-reading Stage Practices

To assess what actually happens in the classroom during the teaching of reading skill, the researcher conducted observations. Inorder to triangulateand integrate data, students' questionnaire was again used as observation check list. This was intended to receive data about how teachers practice the three stages of reading. Six English teachers were selected and each of them was observed four times. Hence, the researcher carried out a total of twenty four observation sessions when the teaching of reading skill was going on.

Interview

Structured and semi structured questions were prepared and asked to the head of the English language department. He was selected purposely because the head worked as a supervisorin the school and could provide information about the reading practices in the classroom.

Method of Data Analysis

Once the data was collected, both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods were used. Thus the data gathered through close ended questionnaire of students was analyzed using percentages and mean values with the integration of observation results which was analyzed using percentages. The data collected from interview was analyzed qualitatively.

Table 1 : Students’ Response on Pre reading Items&Classroom Observation Results

No	Item	Number of respondents												Mean	Expected mean=3		
		Pre reading Practices		Never(1)		Rarely(2)		Sometimes(3)		Usually(4)		Always(5)				Total	
		The English teacher:		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			No	%
1	asks some general questions about the students back ground knowledge related to the reading text before they read it	45	14.3	151	48.1	106	33.8	8	2.5	4	1.3	314	100	2.2			
2	teaches some key or difficult vocabulary words before reading	37	11.8	141	44.9	120	38.2	10	3.2	6	1.9	314	100	2.4			
3	motivates or relaxes students to arouse interest and curiosity	73	23.2	176	56.1	60	19.1	3	1	2	0.6	314	100	2.0			
4	makes students to look at the topic and visual supports like pictures, charts and predict what the text is about	67	21.3	81	25.8	143	45.5	18	5.7	5	1.6	314	100	2.4			
5	engages students in pair or group discussion on pre reading questions	120	38.2	107	34	35	11.1	38	12.1	14	4.5	314	100	2.11			
6	gives clear instruction and purpose to students	137	43.6	69	22	86	27.4	18	5.7	4	1.3	314	100	2.0			
	Grand Total	80	25.5	121	38.5	92	29.3	16	5.1	5	1.6	314	100	2.2			

Classroom Observation Results

No	Item	Classroom Observation Sessions													Total	
		Pre reading Practices		CO1		CO2		CO3		CO4		Total Frequency				
		The English teacher:		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	%	No		%
1	asks some general questions about the students back ground knowledge related to the reading text before they read it	2	4	1	5	3	3	2	4	8	33.3	16	66.7	24		
2	teaches some key or difficult vocabulary words before reading	1	5	3	3	0	6	2	4	6	25	18	75	24		
3	motivates or relaxes students to arouse interest and curiosity	0	6	1	5	2	4	1	5	4	16.6	20	83.3	24		
4	makes students to look at the topic and visual supports like pictures, charts and predict what the text is about	0	6	0	6	1	5	1	5	2	8.3	22	91.7	24		
5	engages students in pair or group discussion on pre reading questions	1	5	2	4	3	3	2	4	8	33.3	16	66.7	24		
6	gives clear instruction and purpose to students	2	4	2	4	2	4	1	5	7	29.2	17	70.8	24		
	frequency total									6	25	18	75			

Key: CO1=Classroom Observation one, CO2=Classroom Observation two CO3=Classroom Observation three, CO4=Classroom Observation four

As indicated in item 1 of table one above, 45 (14.3%) students responded that teachers never ask some questions about the students' background knowledge. Whereas 151(48.1%) replied that teachers rarely ask about their background knowledge related to the reading passage and 106(33.8%) teachers sometimes ask questions about students background knowledge in relation to the reading text. The mean value of this item is (2.2) showing that most teachers ask rarely about the background knowledge of students.

The class room observation also indicated that 66.7% of the teachers did not ask back ground knowledge questions related to the passage. Atkins et al. (1996) underlined the need to ask some questions to understand students' background knowledge in teaching reading skill. In addition ,Debritu,et al. (2015)showed the importance of activating students prior knowledge to relate the new information to what students already know.

Regarding item 2 of table one, 37 (11.8%) students replied that teachers never teach some key or unfamiliar vocabulary words before students read the passage and 141 (44.9%) responses showed that teachers teach key or unfamiliar vocabulary rarely. However, 10 (3.2%) and 6 (1.9%) respondents portrayed that teachers teach some key or unfamiliar vocabulary 'usually' and 'always' respectively. The mean value (2.3) of the respondents portrayed that teachers teach key or unfamiliar vocabulary rarely. The classroom observation above showed that 18 (75%) of the teachers never teach some key or unfamiliar vocabulary before students read the passage. Thus, it is possible to deduce from the above argument that most teachers never teach unfamiliar words before teaching reading .However,Atkins et,al .(1996)indicated the importance of teaching few key vocabularies which are central to the understanding of the whole passage in the pre-reading stage.

As it has been observed in item 3 of table one, 73 (23.2%) of the students agreed that teachers are not in a tendency to motivate or relax students to arose interest and curiosity and 56.1% of the respondents replied that teachers motivate students to arise interest . In relation to this 0.6% respondents replied that teachers always

motivate students in teaching reading lessons. However, the mean value of the respondents (1.9) and observation check list (83.3%) results depicted that most teachers did not motivate students to arise interest of students reading skill.Ur (1984) described the activity of motivation contribute to the interest and enjoyment of learning. Similarly, Abdu et, al.(2006:17) showed "motivation,that is wanting to read, is crucial."

As indicated in table one of item four, 67 (21.7%)students response revealed that teachers never help students to look at the title and visual supports like pictures and charts before they read the text and 81 (25.8%) of the respondents assured that teachers make students to look at visual supports rarely before reading the passage. While 45.5% respondents said teachers sometimes make students to look at visual supports and 5.7% and 1.6% of the respondents replied that teachers help students to look at visual supports 'usually' and 'always' respectively. The mean value (2.4) of the respondents inclined to the idea that teachers rarely make students to look at visual materials. The observation results of the researcher also revealed the questionnaire of students in that 91.7% of the teachers did not make students to look at visual materials before students read thepassage.Nevertheless, Debritu, et al. (2015)indicated that teachers should stimulate students' thinking by scanning the title,chapter headings, and other materials before reading a passage.

Item 5 of students response in table one, 120(38.2%) indicated that teachers never form pair or group discussions on pre-reading questions. Besides,. 34% of them responded 'rarely' and 11.1% answered 'sometimes'. The remaining respondents (12.1% usually and 4.5% always) replied that their teachers form pair or group discussions and make them discuss on pre reading questions. The mean value (2.1) shows teachers rarely make students discuss the pre reading questions. The observation results of the researcher confirmed that 33% of the teachers ordered their students to discuss on the pre reading questions whereas 66.7% of them never form groups to share ideas on pre reading questions.

In item 6 of table one, 43.6 % of students reported that teachers never tell students clear instructions and purpose before reading is carried out. 22% respondents

answered that teachers tell students clear instructions and purpose in rare cases and 27.4 said sometimes before reading the text. 5.7% of the respondents reported that teachers tell clear instructions and procedures usually while 1.3% assured that teachers always give clear instructions and procedures before they are allowed to read. Hence based on the mean value (2.0) and the frequency of the respondents, it is possible to deduce that teachers rarely tell clear instructions and procedures before reading the passage. The findings of class room observation revealed that

70.8% of the teachers never tell clear instructions and procedures for students before they read the text. Contrary to this, Almaz, et al. (2012) emphasized that it is essential that students read with a purpose. The head of the department was also asked if teachers teach the pre-reading skill properly. He replied that most teachers never teach this stage based on the procedures stated on the text book and teachers' guide. Generally, the cumulative observation results of the pre reading practices of teachers indicated that 75% of the teachers could not implement the pre reading stage.

Responses on While-reading Stage Practices

Table 2 : Students’ Response on While- reading Items & Classroom Observation Results

No	Item	Number of respondents												Mean	Expected mean=3		
		While Reading Practices		Never(1)		Rarely(2)		Sometimes(3)		Usually(4)		Always(5)				Total	
		The English teacher:		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			No	%
7	trains students to vary their reading speed according to their purpose e.g how to skim, scan etc	162	51.6	143	45.5	9	2.9	0	0	0	0	314	100	1.5			
8	instructs students to read silently and individually	3	1	4	1.3	65	21	174	55.4	68	21.7	314	100	4.0			
9	shows the students how to guess the meaning of new words using contextual clues, word-building ,antonym, synonym etc	63	20.1	198	63.1	45	14.3	8	2.5	0	0	314	100	1.9			
10	makes students compare their answers in pairs or in groups	24	7.7	52	16.6	153	48.7	83	26.4	2	0.6	314	100	2.9			
11	moves from group to group and support students	36	11.5	78	24.8	135	43	41	13.1	24	7.6	314	100	2.8			
12	asks students to report their answers for a whole class discussion	2	0.6	5	1.6	29	9.3	260	82.8	18	5.7	314	100	3.9			
	Grand Total	48	15.4	80	25.5	73	23.1	94	30	19	6	314	100	2.9			

Classroom Observation Results

No	Items	Classroom Observation Sessions												Total
		CO1		CO2		CO3		CO4		Total Frequency				
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	%	No	%	
7	teaches students to vary their reading speed according to their purpose e.g how to skim, scan etc	1	5	2	4	1	5	0	6	4	16.7	20	83.3	24
8	instructs students to read silently and individually	5	1	4	2	3	3	5	1	17	70.8	7	29.1	24
9	shows the students to guess the meaning of new words using contextual clues, word-building, antonyms, synonyms etc	2	4	3	3	1	5	2	4	8	33.3	16	66.7	24
10	makes students compare their answers in pairs or groups	3	3	2	4	2	4	2	4	9	37.5	15	62.5	24
11	moves from group to group and support students	0	6	2	4	3	3	2	4	7	29.2	17	70.8	24
12	asks students to report their answers for a whole class discussion	4	2	3	3	4	2	2	4	13	54.2	11	45.8	24
	frequency total									10	40.3	14	59.7	

Key: CO1=Classroom Observation one, CO2=Classroom Observation two CO3=Classroom Observation three, CO4=Classroom Observation four

As pointed out in item 7 of table two, 51.6% of the students reported that teachers never train or assist them to vary their reading speed according to their purpose using different reading techniques like scanning and skimming. Related to this, 143 (45.5%) of the students replied that their teachers rarely train them how to differ their reading speed based on their purpose. Very few of them (2.9%) showed that teachers sometimes help them how to apply reading techniques e.g scanning, skimming. Moreover, the mean value (1.5) approached between the rating of never and rarely which implies that teachers almost do not train their students how to scan and skim during reading. The classroom observation also showed that most teachers didn't assist students how to apply different reading strategies. From these, we can understand that teachers do not provide emphasis about reading techniques that students use differently based on their purpose. According to Abdu, Andargachew and Abiy (2006) effective readers should be able to skim and scan the text.

As it has been observed in item 8 of table two, 1% of the respondents replied that teachers never tell them to read the passage individually and silently and 1.3 % said that teachers rarely order to read the text silently and individually. 21% of the respondents said sometimes and 55.4 % of the respondents depicted that teachers usually inform students to read the reading text silently and individually. Additionally, 21.7 % of them replied that they are always told. The mean value(4) and the observation findings of the researcher revealed that most teachers (55.4% usually, 21.7 % always and 70.8 % observation results) make students to read silently and individually. Regarding to this Atkins et al,(1996) indicated that students should read the text silently and individually for a detail understanding of a text and able to answer the questions.

According to table two of item nine, 20.1% of the respondents replied that teachers did not teach the students to guess the meaning of new words using guessing methods like context, word building, antonym, synonym etc. Besides, 63.1% said that teachers rarely show them word guessing methods, and 14.3% and 2.5% said sometimes and usually

respectively. More than half (63.1%) respondents and mean value of (1.9) respondents confirmed that teachers rarely teach them how to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words. Similarly, the class room observation results of the researcher indicated that more (66.7%) of the teachers never show them how to guess the meanings of words in the passage. Similar to the above finding, the observation results of the researcher revealed that 66.7% of the teachers never encourage students to guess the vocabulary words . However, Aebersold and Field,(1997) stated that readers should know how to use techniques to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words when they read. Therefore, teachers ought to have the knowledge of the techniques of guessing so as to assist students.

Students were asked whether teachers encourage students to compare their answer in pairs or in groups. Based on this, item 10 of table two with 7.7% response showed that teachers never encourage students to compare their answer in group or pairs to correct their mistake and/or learning each other and 16.6% respondents reported that teachers assist students rarely in comparing or checking their answer one another after they did the questions related to the passage. Nevertheless, 153 (48.7%) of the respondents claimed that teachers sometimes encourage students to compare and contrast their work in pair or in group and, 26.4% and 0.6% said usually and always respectively with regard to encouragement of comparing their answers among groups. The mean value (2.9) indicated that teachers sometimes encourage students to evaluate each other's work and about half (48.7%) of the teachers applied this strategy. The observation result also portrayed that more than half (62.5%) teachers never encourage students to compare their answers in pairs or in groups. According to Dubinand Bycina(1991)&Nuttall (1996)showed that students should be in pairs or in small groups to discuss and compare their answers.

Responding to item eleven, 11.5% of the students answered that teachers did not move from group to group and support students in reading activities and 24.8% said teachers rarely round to groups to support their difficulties. However, 43% of the students said

that teachers sometimes move from group to group to assist the problems students face. 13.1% and 7.6% of them replied usually and always respectively in response to teachers' support by moving from group to group in reading activities. The mean value (2.8) showed that teachers sometimes move from group to group and support the difficulties and the observation result depicted that more (70.8%) of the teachers never round the class room to help students. This shows that most teachers spend their time by sitting till students finish their pair or group work.

Students were asked whether teachers ordered students to report their answers for a whole class discussion and 82.8% of them replied that teachers usually ask students to report their answers for a whole class discussion. 0.6% of the students said that teachers never give opportunities for students to present their answers in the class discussion. The class room observation investigated by the researcher also supported the above situation that more than half (54.2%) of the teachers gave chances for students to present their answers for the whole class discussion. Regarding to this Atkinset al.(1996) stated that discussing the answers with the whole class helps students to enhance their understanding of the text. The supervisor responded about the teachers practice of the while reading stage was that the text book is very bulky having twelve units with forty eight passages. Therefore, teachers focus on the coverage of the text book and on the grammar topics. Due to this, teachers do not teach this and other reading stages thoroughly. Generally, the cumulative observation results of the while reading practices of teachers indicated that 59.7% of the teachers could not implement the while reading skill.

Responses on Post-reading Stage Activities

Table 3 : Students’ Response on Post- reading Items & Classroom Observation Results

No	Item	Number of respondents													Mean	Expected mean=3
		Never(1)		Rarely(2)		Sometimes(3)		Usually(4)		Always(5)		Total				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
13	extends the reading activities and integrates with other language skillseg. Writing, speaking	153	48.7	13	4.1	132	42.0	12	3.8	4	1.3	314	100	2.0		
14	gives appropriate and immediate feedback	35	11.2	103	32.8	151	48.1	18	5.7	7	2.2	314	100	2.6		
	Grand Total	94	29.9	58	18.4	142	45.2	15	4.8	6	1.8	314	100	2.3		

Classroom Observation Results

No	Item	Classroom Observation Sessions												Total
		CO1		CO2		CO3		CO4		Total Frequency				
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	%	No	%	
13	extends the reading activities and integrates with other language skills eg. writing, speaking	1	5	0	6	0	6	1	5	2	8.3	22	91.7	24
14	gives appropriate and immediate feedback	3	3	2	4	1	5	2	4	8	33.3	16	66.7	24
	frequency total									5	20.8	19	79.2	

Key: CO1=Classroom Observation one CO2=Classroom Observation two CO3=Classroom Observation threeCO4=Classroom Observation four

According to Turner (1995) one language skill may not take place independently. It is usually integrated with the other or others. Throughout our daily lives we read and make comments; we listen and write. The language learning we do through listening should be connected with the language learning we do through speaking, reading and writing. Regarding to this in item 13, students were asked whether the teachers extend reading and integrate with other language skills. Thus, (48.7%) of the respondents replied that teachers never extend the reading activities and integrates with other language skills and (4.1%) replied rarely. The 2%) respondents said that teachers sometimes integrate the reading activities with other language skills. The mean value (2.0) confirmed that teachers rarely extends the reading tasks and integrated with other skills even though 3.8% and 1.3% respondents reported usually and always respectively. Most of the teachers (91.7%) never integrate reading activities with other skills as displayed in the above table of the researcher's observation check list. Yinager et al. (2005) states that it is advantageous to introduce all the four skills together because practicing one can support the development of the other. Therefore, it is worthy for English teachers to integrate one language skill with others when teaching reading.

As it has been observed in item 14 of table three, 11.2% of the respondents reported that teachers never give appropriate feedback when teaching reading and 32.8% said that teachers rarely give appropriate feedback. The 48.1%, 5.7% and 2.2% respondents said that teachers give appropriate feedback sometimes, usually and always respectively. More (48.1%) of the respondents and the mean value (2.6) of the study indicated that teachers sometimes give appropriate feedback when teaching reading skill. The finding of the observation check list confirmed the above finding in that 66.7% of the teachers do not give immediate and appropriate feedback. The interview result of the supervisor showed that teachers don't give much emphasis in teaching this stage. Generally, the cumulative results of the post reading practices of teachers indicated that 79.2% of the teachers could not implement this reading skill.

With regard to this Underwood (1989) states whatever activities you choose to use, it is important to provide immediate feedback and Harmer (2001) states that teachers should have feedback session to see how students completed effectively. The teacher may ask students to compare their answers in pairs and then the class in general.

CONCLUSION

This study was conducted on the practice of teaching reading skill of grade twelve at Fasiledes Preparatory School. Based on the findings, it is possible to conclude that the degree of implementation of the three stages of reading skill in the classroom is relatively different. The mean value indicates that the pre reading stage is implemented rarely. The observation result also indicates that most teachers could not implement the pre reading activities in the classroom. The while reading skill is sometimes practiced. It is better implemented Compared to the pre and post reading stages. When we see the practice of the post reading stage, the mean value portrays that teachers rarely implement the post reading activities in the classroom. The observation result is also the witness that most teachers don't properly teach the post reading stage.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Teaching reading skill is the important instrument to augment the academic performance of students. However, the results of this study showed that teachers are less likely in implementing the three stages of the reading skills. Therefore the teaching methodology of the teachers should be improved. The concerned stakeholders like the government and non-governmental organizations should give greater attention in boosting the skill, knowledge and attitude of the teachers. The government should devise the professional development strategies to enhance the performance of the teachers. The supervisors and education experts of Gondar city administration should provide need based trainings, rethinking mentoring and coaching schemes that facilitate better teaching- learning process is imperative to mitigate the problem.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The present study is not without limitations. First, it is limited to only grade twelve preparatory school students in Fasiledes Preparatory school. Consequently, it is less likely to generalize these results to other populations. In this study the practice of the implementation of the three stages of teaching reading skill is assessed. However, other variables like the challenges teachers face during teaching reading skill and their influence on the development of the reading skill of students are not studied. Hence, I encourage further studies on a large and comprehensive setting of primary and secondary schools to see the implementation of the three stages of reading skills. I also encourage future researchers to find variables that hamper the development of reading skill of students and the challenges teachers face in teaching the three stages of reading skills.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to English Language teachers and grade twelve students of Fasiledes Preparatory School for their cooperation in the process of data collection. Besides, my greatest indebtedness goes to Dr. Yoseph Mezgebu and Prof. Alexander Raju for their encouragement and support from the beginning to the end of the study.

REFERENCE

Abdu Mohammed, Andargachew Moges, Abiy Yigzaw. (2006). *ELT methodology II: Distance program of Bahir Dar University English Department*: Bahir Dar University.

Aebersold, J., & Field, M. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Albdour, W.M. (2015).

The difficulties that seventh grade students face in comprehensive reading skill for English curricula. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6 (27).

Almaz Baraki, Keedwell, A., Fenech, D., Vermeulen, E., Ferguson, J., Hare, P., Jones, S., & Adaye, Y. (2012). *Reading secondary teachers' booklet (module four)*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ministry of Education.

Atkins, J., Hailom Banteyerga & Nuru Mohammed. (1996). *Skills development methodology (part II)*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.

Breen, M. (1989). *The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks: The second language curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Debitu Minayehu, Mengesha Bogale, Assefa Demis, Yechale Akalu. (2015). *Reading skill: College of teachers education training module*. Bahirdar: Amhara National Regional State Education Bureau.

Dereje Wondimeneh. (2008). *An investigation of students' perception of motivational techniques teachers use for reading lesson* (Unpublished master's thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Devine, L. (1981). *Reading in high schools*. New York: Collier Educational Corporation.

Dubin, F., & Bycina, D. (1991). *Academic reading and ESL/EFL teacher in Celce Maurciateaching English as foreign and second language (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle publishers.

Getachew Asrat. (1996). *The Teaching of reading in government high schools in Addis Ababa: A descriptive Study (Unpublished master's thesis)*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English Language teaching*. London: Long man.

Hinton, P.R., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS explained (2nd ed.)*. New York: Routledge.

Khand, Z. (2004). *Teaching reading skills: problems and suggestions*. Retrieved

from <http://bzu-edu.pk/jrlanguages/vol-5%20-2004/ziauddin%20khand-4-pdf>

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach in the class room*. Hayward: CA Alemany press.

Kucukoglu, H. (.2013). Improving reading skillsthrough effective reading strategies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70; 709 – 714.

Mesfin Derash. (2008). The practice of teaching reading in English at First Cycle Primary Schools:Grade Four in focus (Unpublishedmaster's thesis). Addis Ababa:AddisAbabaUniversity.

Nunan, D.(1988). *The learner-centeredcurriculum*. Cambridge:CambridgeUniversitypress.

Nuttall, C.(1996).*Teachingreadingskillsinaforeignlanguage*.Oxford:Heinemann.

Paulos Gadebo. (2015).*Analysisofreadingactivities:ThecaseofGrade 11TextBook* (Unpublishedmaster's thesis). Addis Ababa:AddisAbabaUniversity.

Scotts, & windy. (1994). *Teaching English to children*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Turner, K. (1995). *Listening in a foreign language*. Great Britain: Oakdale Printing co LTD.

Underwood, M. (1989). *Teaching listening*. London: Longman.

Ur, P. (1984) .*Teaching listening comprehension*.Cambridge: Cambridge UniversityPress

Yinager TekleSillassie, Asres Nigus, & Kassie Shifere. (2005). *Listening skills module (flee 105): Distance Education Program*. Bahirdar: Bahirdar University.