

The Effectiveness of Guided Reading and Reciprocal Teaching Techniques to Teach English for Information Technology Purposes to Differently Motivated Students

Andreas Heri Kurniawan
Program Studi Teknik Elektronika
Sekolah Tinggi Elektronika dan Komputer Pat. Semarang, Indonesia
Email: andrew_helix@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study intends to explain the effectiveness of Guided Reading Technique (GRT) and Reciprocal Teaching Technique (RTT) as a means of teaching English for IT purposes to differently motivated students. Based on the question, this research intends to show the effectiveness of GRT to teach highly motivated students, the effectiveness of RTT to teach lowly motivated students, and the difference between the groups of students before and after being taught using GRT and RTT. This quasi-experimental study uses 2X2 factorial design. Two groups of students are located in their regular setting, taught by relatively similar quality teachers, using similar teaching-learning facilities except teaching techniques which are made different. The first group was taught using GRT, while the second was taught using RTT. Prior to the experiment proper, pre-test was administered to the two groups. The purpose on this test was to make sure that their competence in English for IT purposes was equal. The students were also asked to fill in a questionnaire to measure their levels of motivation. The results of the experiment show that (1) both techniques provide the same results when applied to highly motivated students; (2) both techniques provide similar results when applied to lowly motivated students; (3) there is a significant difference among the groups of students before and after being taught using GRT compared to RTT.

Key words: Guided Reading technique, Reciprocal Teaching technique, English for Information Technology

INTRODUCTION

Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) in this country has been conducted for a long time. Curriculums which are used as the basis for the teaching-learning processes have been changed over time. Syllabus, lesson plans, learning materials, and teaching media have also been continually renewed. In addition, teachers have also been introduced and familiarized with a lot number of approaches, methods, and techniques. Nevertheless, TEFL activities have not given satisfactory results. There are always people complaining about the competence that the students have after

learning the foreign language for a long time. It is said that the students' mastery of the foreign language remains low even after being taught by strict teachers using innovative methods in completely facilitated classrooms over long period of time that is by spending up the students' time which should have been allocated for other purposes.

A question may arise: Why does the students' mastery of the foreign language remain low? A number of tentative answers to such a question can be put forward here. Such condition may be caused by the students' internal factors. It may also be caused by their

external ones. The internal factors can be in such form as anxiety, self confidence, expectation, intelligence, or motivation. Meanwhile, the external factors may be in such form as the students' disadvantageous environment, lack of facilities, low quality of family care, school atmosphere, teaching techniques, and so on.

Taking two of such internal as well as external factors, i.e. motivation and teaching technique into consideration, this study intends to look into the effectiveness of two innovative teaching techniques to teach English for IT purposes to differently motivated students of junior high school. The techniques to be applied are called Guided Reading Technique (GRT) and Reciprocal Teaching Technique (RTT). Henceforth, the two techniques are each called experimental group and control group respectively. Meanwhile, the students' levels of motivation are categorized into high, mid, and low. This quasi-experimental study intends to compare the achievement on English for IT purposes of students taught using GRT and the achievement of the same major skill in a class taught using RTT. The categorization of students' motivation into high, mid, and low is intended to see whether students with different levels of motivation achieve differently both in the experimental and the control group of students.

Research on GRT, among other things, have been conducted by Brown & Palincsar (1989); Burkins & Croft (2010); Burkins (2012); Clay (1994); Chris, et al. N.d.; Fountas & Pinnell (1996); Government of South Australia, N.d.; Heston, N.d. Iaquina (2006); Schmitt & Phillips (2008). Meanwhile, studies on RTT were conducted by Dyer, N.d.; Howard (2004); Palincsar & Brown (1984); Seymour & Osana (2003). Studies on the influence of cognitive aspects on language learning were conducted by Collins, et al. (1989); Dörnyei (1998); Hui-ju Liu (2012); Tharp & Gallimore (1988).

There have been a lot of studies which are focused on the role of motivation in language learning as well as the relations between the students' different levels of motivation and their achievement in mastering certain skills in learning English. Such studies may be qualitative, quantitative, or mixed in nature.

Conttia (2007) adopts both quantitative and qualitative approaches to identify factors which motivate and hinder the science majors to take charge of their language learning in a course-based SALL program. Hernández & Cañado (2001) found that motivation of the students in the English class – understood as the integration of (a) degree of interest, (b) attention in class, (c) effort to learn, (d) constancy, (e) satisfaction in class – is high. The female students exhibit a higher degree of motivation than their male counterpart. The inclusion of gender as a variable shows that different sexes takes part in determining the levels of motivation. As generally expected, females learners are highly motivated than their counterpart in learning English. Lasagabaster (2011) pointed out that motivation is a complex psychological construct regarded as one of the determinant factors in successful foreign language learning. Like Conttia's as well as Hernandez and Canado's findings, Lagabaster's research as mentioned above also stresses the importance of motivation in pursuing better achievement in learning English as a second language. While contrasting CLIL and EFL from the perspective of different levels of motivation, Lagabaster points out that motivation really plays an important role in enhancing the learners' achievement in any EFL skill in that the higher a student's motivation is the better his/her achievement. Therefore, this has confirmed the common belief that it is necessary for educators in general to enhance the learners' motivation so as to increase their achievement in learning EFL.

Lim (2012) investigated instrumental and integrative motivation of a group of EFL students and possible correlations between motivational orientation and English proficiency. He comes to a conclusion that both types of motivation play a significant role at the beginning of efforts to improve the learners proficiency. This has initiated researchers to consider whether different levels of motivation identified prior to a treatment significantly influence the learners to struggle for better achievement. Molavi & Biria (2013) claimed that de-motivation is a relatively new issue in the field of second/foreign Recognizing and removing barriers can have a marked effect on motivation and attention to learning in general and ESL/EFL learning in particular. Interestingly, Molavi and Biria's research as extracted above deals with the effect of de-motivation to the students' achievement in learning EFL claiming that de-motivated students tend to achieve worse compared to motivated students. This implies that motivation, be it positive or negative, still plays significant roles in determining the success or failure for students achievement. However, it is still questionable due to the research design implemented in the study.

Such types of motivation as internal, external, instrumental, integrated, and intrinsic one play a very important role in the success or failure of students in learning English as the students' second or foreign language. The studies clearly show that the higher the students' motivation is the better their achievement will be in mastering the foreign language skills. Nevertheless, as far as the writer knows, there have not been comprehensive studies about the influence of different levels of motivation to the achievement in learning such major skill in English as a foreign language particularly reading comprehension. This has inspired the writer to propose this research.

Based on an assumption that the achievement in learning an English major skill, particularly English for IT purposes is determined by a number of phases. The first phase to consider is the students input which is very much influenced by external factors. The second is the influence from the students' internal drive, specifically various types of motivation. The two phases will certainly influence the way the students perceive and master the skills exposed to them. Such perception and mastery may be identified through the classes which are taught using different techniques (in this case GRT and RTT). Based on the different treatment, it is likely that this study will show that the use of GRT to teach English for IT purposes will be beneficial to the students with different levels of motivation. To summarize the theoretical reviews stated above, the figure can be understood as follows. In this study, **Input** is the Junior High School (SMP) students who are obliged to sit for all subjects matters offered to the students at the school, particularly English. Their readiness to sit for such class includes levels of several types of motivation available in their mind. These types of **motivation** include their level of (1) determination, (2) anxiety, (3) internal motivation, (4) sociability, (5) attitude toward culture, (6) attitude towards foreign residence, (7) intrinsic motivation, (8) belief about failure, and (9) enjoyment.

These types of motivation are among variables which may influence the students' achievement in learning English. This motivation is then considered as moderator variable in this study. Besides, there are of course a number of other different variables such as school facilities, students environment, teachers quality, students psychological traits beyond motivation, and so on. However, they considered as controlled variables, meaning that their existence are considered similar to both groups of students in this study; their presence were not taken into account here.

GRT and RTT are two techniques that can be implemented to teach English for IT purposes specifically to beginners. As teaching techniques, they are relatively new both for students as well as teachers. Therefore, it is reasonable to study their effectiveness when applied in English classes, particularly those of reading comprehension. Theoretically, highly motivated students achieve better than lowly motivated students when they are taught using certain teaching techniques. Therefore, by categorizing the students' levels of motivation into High and Low, it is possible to prove whether such theory is true or not.

The objectives of this research are to show (1) the interaction among the motivation-based groups of students, reading comprehension, and GRT or RTT techniques; (2) the effectiveness of GRT compared to RTT to teach highly motivated students; (3) the effectiveness of RTT GRT compared to RTT to teach lowly motivated students; (4) the difference among the groups of students before and after being taught using GRT compared to RTT,

METHODOLOGY

This is a quasi-experimental study using 2X2 factorial design. Two groups of students are located in their regular setting, taught by relatively similar quality teachers, using similar teaching-learning facilities except teaching techniques which are made different. The first group was taught using GRT, while the second group was taught using RTT. Prior to the experiment proper, pre-test was administered to the two groups. The purpose on this test was to make sure that their competence in English for IT purposes was relatively equal. The students were also asked to fill in a questionnaire to measure their levels of motivation. The students' answers to the questionnaire were used as the basis to determine which students belong to highly motivated students (HIGH) and lowly

motivated ones (LOW). Then, the two groups of students were taught reading comprehension, GRT was implemented in the experimental group, while RTT was implemented in the control group.

This study was carried out at SMP Tri Tunggal Semarang. Two out of six classes consisting of the eighth year students were randomly drawn as the samples, one being the experimental group and the other being the control group. In line with the syllabus design at school, intensive reading under this study involved Descriptive, Report, Recount, and Narrative Texts. These were all reflected in the materials which were presented to the students in the classroom. Because each of the four types of materials were scheduled to be taught in 4 meeting sessions (each consisting of 40 minutes), this research was then designed to consist of (1) One session for Pre-Test, (2) 16 sessions or four weeks for teaching-learning processes, and (3) One session for Post-Test. Table 3.2 represents the activities which were designed to present the materials which include the pre-test, the four text-types, and the post-test according to the allocated time.

There are three major instruments which were used to draw data from the subject of the study in this research: (a) test including pre-test and post-test, (b) observation sheet, and (c) questionnaire. Each of the three instruments can be elaborated as follows.

Questionnaire on the students' levels of motivation was provided for the students to complete before all of the steps of the experiment were carried out. The students' responds to the questionnaire were scored quantitatively in order to see how high/low their level of motivation was. Based on the rank scale of the scores the students in both groups (i.e. the experimental and the control groups) were categorized into three: One half of the students scoring highest in each group were considered to be the highly motivated students

(HIGH), and the rest were considered to be lowly motivated students (LOW).

Pretest was administered prior to the experiment proper in order to see that there was no significant difference in the students' average or mean scores reflecting similar competence of the two groups in English for IT purposes before treatment. In order to convince this, the students' scores of the pretest were compared statistically using t-test.

After treatment, post-test was administered in order to measure the students gain in reading comprehension. Then, all of the students' scores were listed in the matrix of the students' scores, ready for analysis.

The data which were gathered through the questionnaire on the students motivation were analyzed using the ANOVA program available at Excel. This program was used to distinguish the students as highly, averagely, and lowly motivated ones. According to the research design, this study was focused only on HIGH and LOW, excluding MID (averagely motivated students). The results of this data analysis had been reported and could be seen somewhere on the previous pages.

The data which were gathered through the **try-out** were analyzed for their reliability, validity and practicality. The statistical program for identifying the reliability of the test was Regression. This analysis had to be done long before the pre-test was administered. As it can be seen somewhere on the previous pages, it was found that the test was statistically reliable to test the students competence as well as achievement in reading comprehension.

The scores which were obtained through pre-test and post-test for the experimental and control groups were put into the matrix that had been provided. Then, in order to show the effectiveness of GRT two statistical techniques were used. The comparison of mean averages of each pair of the groups was carried out using t-Test. Meanwhile, in order to see the interaction among the groups as shown in the matrix, ANOVA was employed. For the sake of convenience and accuracy, all statistical computations were carried out by means of Statistical Programs available at Excel. By using the two statistical procedures, it was all the research questions presented on the previous pages were answered properly. The results of applying such statistical programs were reported in the following section..

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

A pre-test was administered to all of the 40 students involved in this study. The main purpose was to make sure that the students in the four groups were equal. This is to convince that changes in their competence after treatment could theoretically be referred to the different use of teaching learning techniques, i.e. GRT and RTT. Analysis of variance was used to determine whether the average means of the pre-test in the four groups were similar. Based on the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the pre-test among the four groups, the computation resulted in figures that can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 Results of the Pre-Test Implementing ANOVA: Two-Factor with Replication

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
---------------------	----	----	----	---	---------	--------

Sample	42.025	1	42.025	1.277032	0.265925	4.113165
Columns	0.025	1	0.025	0.00076	0.978163	4.113165
Interaction	0.225	1	0.225	0.006837	0.934558	4.113165
Within	1184.7	36	32.90833			
Total	1226.975	39				

Based on the output of ANOVA for Sample (Levels of motivation), it was found that the value of F Stat was **1.277032**, while the F Critical with df (0.05, 1, 36) was **4.113165**. Because the value of F Stat (**1.277032**) < F Critical (**4.113165**) or p value (**0.265925**) > alpha (0.05), there is no significant difference of the highly and lowly motivated groups of students before being taught using GRT and RTT.

Based on the output of ANOVA, it was found out that the value of F Stat was only 0.00076, while the F Critical with df (0.05, 1, 36) was 4.113165. Because the value of F Stat

(0.00076) < F Critical (4.113165) or p value (0.978163) > alpha (0.05), there is no significant difference between the groups of GRT and RTT students prior to treatment.

Based on the results of the statistical computation, it can be stated that prior to the treatment, the basic competence of the four groups of students in English for IT purposes was similar to each other. This implies that differences in the students' competence after treatment can be referred to the types of treatment provided to them during classes.

Table 2 Results of the Post-Test Implementing ANOVA: Two-Factor with Replication

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Sample	235.225	1	235.225	7.74545	0.008523	4.113165
Columns	13.225	1	13.225	0.435471	0.513517	4.113165
Interaction	7.225	1	7.225	0.237904	0.628682	4.113165
Within	1093.3	36	30.36944			
Total	1348.975	39				

After treatment, a post-test was administered to all of the 60 students involved in this study. The main purpose of this post-test was to measure the students' achievement after treatment. Analysis of variance was used to determine whether the average means of the post-test in the four groups were similar. Based on the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the pre-test among the four groups, the results of the can be seen in Table 2.

Based on the output of ANOVA for Sample (Levels of motivation), it was found out

that the value of F Stat was 7.74545, while the F Critical with df (0.05, 3, 36) was 0.435471 (see Table 4.2). Because the value of F Stat (7.74545) > F Critical (0.435471) or p value (0.008523) < alpha (0.05), it could be concluded that there is a significant difference between the highly and lowly motivated groups of students after being taught using GRT and RTT.

Based on the output of ANOVA as presented in Table 2, for Columns (post-test of GRT and RTT groups of students), it was found out that the value of F Stat was only 0.435471, while the F Critical with df (0.05, 3, 36) was

0.513517. Because the value of F Stat (**0.435471**) < F Critical (**4.113165**) or p value (**0.513517**) > alpha (0.05), it could be concluded that there is no significant difference between the groups of GRT and RTT students after treatment.

Based on the results of the statistical computation, it can be stated that after treatment, the basic competence of the four groups of students in English for IT purposes was similar to each other. This implies that differences in the students' competence after treatment cannot be referred to the types of treatment provided to them during classes.

Results of the Hypotheses Testing

This research intends to show whether GRT and RTT are effective as means of teaching

English for IT purposes to students with two different levels of motivation. It intends to accept or refuse three hypotheses.

Ho1: There is no difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach highly motivated students.

In order to accept or refuse the Hypothesis (the scores of post-test among the highly motivated GRT students) and O4 (the scores of post-test among the highly motivated RTT students) were compared. The use of T-Test-Statistical Analysis available in Microsoft Excel resulted in figures which are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 t-Test: Paired Post-Test of GRT and RTT for Highly Motivated Students

	GRT	RTT
Mean		77.8
Variance	28.844444	33.166667
Observations	10	10
Pearson Correlation	0.819050	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	9	
t-Stat	0.281663	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.392286	
t Critical one-tail	1.833113	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.784571	
t Critical two-tail	2.262157	

It can be seen in Table 3 that the t-Stat value was **0.281663** while the t Critical one tail with the degree of freedom (df) 9 was **1.833113**. Because the t-Stat value (**0.281663**) < t Critical (**1.833113**), it can be inferred that the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted while the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is refused. It means that there is no significant difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach

English for IT purposes to highly motivated students. In other words, both techniques provide the same results when applied to highly motivated students.

The question which follows is whether the two techniques are effective or not when applied to teach English for IT purposes to the students with low level of motivation. This question was proved by means of comparing

the results of Pre-Test and Post-Test which were administered to them. The comparison was based on Hypothesis (2)

Ho2: There is no difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach lowly motivated students.

Table 3 t-Test: Paired Post-Test of GRT and RTT for Lowly Motivated Students

	<i>GRT</i>	<i>RTT</i>
Mean	73.8	71.8
Variance	38.177778	21.288889
Observations	10	10
Pearson Correlation	0.602539	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	9	
t-Stat	1.262109	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.119317	
t Critical one-tail	1.833113	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.238634	
t Critical two-tail	2.262157	

In order to accept or refuse Hypothesis 2 O2 (the scores of post-test among the highly motivated GRT students) and O4 (the scores of post-test among the highly motivated RTT students) were compared. The use of T-Test-Statistical Analysis available in Microsoft Excel resulted in figures which are presented in Table 4.6. It can be seen in the table that the t-Stat value was **1.262109** while the t Critical one tail with the degree of freedom (df) 9 was **1.833113**. Because the t-Stat value (**1.262109**) < t Critical (**1.833113**), it can be inferred that the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted while the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is refused. It means that there is no significant difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach English for IT purposes to lowly motivated students. In other words, both techniques provide similar results when applied to lowly motivated students.

The question which follows is whether the two techniques are effective or not when applied to teach English for IT purposes to the

students with low level of motivation. This question was answered by means of comparing the results of Pre-Test and Post-Test which were administered to them.

H3: There is no significant difference among the groups of students before and after being taught using GRT compared to RTT (X1 = X2 = X3 = X4).

Based on this hypothesis, the criteria of acceptance are as follows. Ho is accepted if the value of F Stat < F Critical or p value > alpha (α); Ha is accepted if the value of F Stat > F Critical or p value < alpha (α).

Discussion

All of the findings which are presented in section 4.1 of this chapter can be discussed from two different perspectives. The first is the discussion of the t-Test results, while the second is the discussion of the ANOVA results. Before discussing the two points it is necessary to present the rules which were used as the basis to interpret the statistical analyses.

In order to discuss the results of the statistical computation presented in Section 4.1 of this chapter, it is necessary to understand the following rules. The paired t test compares the means of two paired groups in order to see the difference between the two means. It also displays the confidence interval for that difference. If the assumptions of the analysis are true, it can be said that the 95% confidence interval contains the true difference between means.

The P value is used to ask whether the difference between the mean of two groups is likely to be due to chance. It answers this question: If the two populations really had the same mean, what is the chance that random sampling would result in means as far apart (or more so) than observed in this experiment? It is traditional, but not necessary and often not useful, to use the P value to make a simple statement about whether or not the difference is “statistically significant”. The results can be interpreted differently depending on whether the P value is small or large.

The paired t test compares two paired groups. It calculates the difference between each set of pairs and analyzes that list of differences based on the assumption that the differences in the entire population follow the following distribution. First, t-Test calculates the difference between each set of pairs, keeping track of sign. The t ratio for a paired t test is the mean of these differences divided by the standard error of the differences. If the t ratio is large (or is a large negative number) the P value will be small. The direction of the differences (Column A minus B, or B minus A) is set in the Options tab of the t test dialog. The number of degrees of freedom equals the number of pairs minus 1. T-Test calculates the P value from the t ratio and the number of degrees of freedom. The whole point of using a paired experimental design and a paired test is to control for experimental variability. Some factors you don't control in the experiment will

affect the before and the after measurements equally, so they will not affect the difference between before and after. By analyzing only the differences, a paired test corrects for those sources of scatter.

If the two groups really are not correlated at all, what is the chance that randomly selected subjects would have a correlation coefficient as large (or larger) as observed in your experiment? The P value has one-tail, as you are not interested in the possibility of observing a strong negative correlation.

If the pairing was effective, r will be positive and the P value will be small. This means that the two groups are significantly correlated, so it made sense to choose a paired test. If the P value is large (say larger than 0.05), it may be questioned whether it made sense to use a paired test. The choice of whether to use a paired test or not should not be based on this one P value, but also on the experimental design and the results you have seen in other similar experiments. If r is negative, it means that the pairing was counterproductive! You expect the values of the pairs to move together – if one is higher, so is the other. Here, the opposite is true – if one has a higher value, the other has a lower value. Most likely this is just a matter of chance. If r is close to -1, you should review your experimental design, as this is a very unusual result.

Based on the rules of interpretation, it can be stated that when comparing the GRT and RTT post-tests for overall students (as hypothesized in Hypothesis 1), it was found that there is no significant difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach reading comprehension. In other words, both techniques provide the same results when applied in different classrooms. It implies that when applying such innovative techniques as GRT and RTT in reading classrooms, it is found that the results are equal no matter whether the students have high or low motivation.

When comparing the results of the pre-tests and the post-tests of the GRT and RTT groups (as hypothesized in Hypothesis 2), it was found that both GRT and RTT are significantly effective when used to teach English for IT purposes to students with different levels of motivation. This also means that the two techniques, i.e. GRT and RTT are similarly effective when used to teach English for IT purposes to students with different levels of motivation. It implies that no matter whether the students are highly or lowly motivated, they will achieve significantly better when they are taught English for IT purposes by means of GRT or RTT techniques.

When the results of post-tests for GRT and RTT highly motivated students were compared (as hypothesized in Hypothesis 3), it was found that there is no significant difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach English for IT purposes to highly motivated students. In other words, both techniques provide the same results when applied to highly motivated students. This implied that no matter what technique is used, highly motivated students will show similar results, meaning that both techniques are equally effective when adopted to teach English for IT purposes to highly motivated students of Junior High School, specifically that of SMP Tri Tunggal Semarang.

The results stated in the above paragraph is also true with the results for lowly motivated students (as hypothesized in Hypothesis 4), stating that there is no significant difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach English for IT purposes to lowly motivated students. In other words, both techniques provide similar results when applied to lowly motivated students.

CONCLUSION

After examining Hypothesis 1 the scores of post-test among the highly motivated GRT students were compared with the scores of post-test among the highly motivated RTT students. Because the Statistical value is below the Critical value, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis (H1) is accepted, meaning that there is no significant difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach English for IT purposes to highly motivated students. In other words, both techniques provide the same results when applied to highly motivated students.

When examining Hypothesis 2 by comparing the scores of post-test among the highly motivated GRT students with the scores of post-test among the highly motivated RTT students, it was found that the Statistical value is below the Critical value, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis H2 is accepted. It implies that there is no significant difference in effectiveness between GRT and RTT to teach English for IT purposes to lowly motivated students. In other words, both techniques provide similar results when applied to lowly motivated students.

Hypothesis 3 was examined by looking at the output of ANOVA for Columns (pre-test and post-test of different techniques: GRT and RTT). It was found out that the Statistical value was above the F Critical value. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference among the groups of students before and after being taught using GRT compared to RTT.

REFERENCES

- Brown, A. L., & Palincsar, A. S. (1989). Guided, cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, Learning, and Instruction: Essays in Honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 393–451). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). *Preventing misguided reading: New strategies for guided reading teachers*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Burkins, Jan Miller. (2012). *Using Guided Reading to Develop Student Reading Independence*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Clay, M. (1994). *Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chris, Lunagirl, BR, Korra and 6 others (Eds). N.d. *How to Teach Guided Reading*. <http://www.wikihow.com/Teach-Guided-Reading>. Accessed 20 November 2013
- Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 453–494). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conttia, Lai Man Wai. (2007). The Influence of Learner Motivation on Developing Autonomous Learning in an English-for-Specific-Purposes Course submitted by for the degree of Master of Arts (Applied Linguistics) at the University of Hong Kong
- Dörnyei, Zolt' n. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31, pp 117-1 35 doi:10.1017/S026144480001315X
- Dyer, D. Nd. Available at www.readingrockets.org/.../reciprocal_teaching. Retrieved on 30 April 2014.
- Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Government of South Australia. Nd. Engaging in and Exploring Guided Reading in the early years. Available at http://www.decd.sa.gov.au/literacy/ files/links/link_157_530.pdf. accessed 20 Nov 2013
- Hernandez, D.M., & Cañado, M. L. P. (2001). Exploring the student's motivation in the EFL class, en E. García Sánchez (ed.): *Present and Future Trends in TEFL*, pp. 321-364. Universidad de Almería: Secretariado de publicaciones.
- Heston, K.. N.d. *Guided Reading, Fluency, Accuracy, and Comprehension*. <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/rs/2011/Guided%20Reading.pdf>. Accessed 20 Nov 2013
- Howard, J.B. (2004). Definion of Reciprocal Teaching. Available at http://org.elon.edu/t2project/pdf_docs/sp_reciprocalteach.pdf.
- Hui-ju Liu. (2012). Understanding EFL Undergraduate Anxiety in Relation to Motivation, Autonomy, and Language Proficiency. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching National University of Singapore* 9(1), 123–139.
- Iaquinta, A. (2006). Guided Reading: A Research-Based Response to the Challenges of Early Reading Instruction. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33(6).

- Schmitt, K.. Preventing Misguided Reading: *New Strategies for Guided Reading Teachers. Workshop Paper*. <http://www.cesa6.org/rsn/PreventingMisguidedReading.pdf>
- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL settings. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1).
- Lim, S. (2012). EFL Motivational Orientation and Proficiency: A Survey of Cambodian University Students in Phnom Penh. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 8.
- Molavi, A., & Biria, R. (2013). EFL learning among motivated and demotivated Iranian seminary students. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 6(1), 55-66.
- Palincsar, A.S., & Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension-Fostering and Comprehension-Monitoring Activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117-175.
- Phillips, D.K. (2008). *Guided Reading: Constructivism in Action*. Institute for Learning Centered Education Niagara University. Available at <http://www.jpacte.org/uploads/9/0/0/6/9006355/2008-1-phillips.pdf>. Accessed 21 Nov 2013
- Seymour, J.R, & Osana, H.P. (2003). Reciprocal Teaching procedures and principles: two teachers' developing understanding. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 19. 325-344 Available at <http://www.speakeasydesigns.com/SDSU/student/640/science.pdf>
- Tharp, R.G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing Minds to Life: Teaching, Learning, and Schooling in Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.