LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow

Volume 7 : 11 November 2007

Strategic Reading in L1 and L2 – One System or Two Systems?

Seyed Hassan Talebi, Ph.D. Candidate

STRATEGIC READING IN L1 AND L2: ONE SYSTEM OR TWO SYSTEMS?

Seyed Hassan Talebi, Ph.D. Candidate

ABSTRACT

This study intends to determine whether strategic reading in L1 differs from that of L2 or not. In other words, whether there are two systems for strategic reading in L1 and L2 or one system for both L1 and L2.

To this end, a test of English language proficiency was distributed among students to have two groups of intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. The subjects were put into control and experimental groups. Then reading comprehension tests in Persian and English as pretests were given to the students followed by a reading comprehension strategy questionnaire to determine what strategies students employed while reading in L1 and L2.

The experimental group received strategy instruction in L1 and after the treatment the posttest was given to the students. The obtained results showed that the reading strategy awareness can be the same in L1 and L2 at two proficiency levels of intermediate and advanced. However, the reading ability of students in L1 and L2 was differently affected by the L1 reading strategy instruction. In other words, the same improvements in L1 reading performance were not observed in L2 reading as a result of L1 reading strategy instruction. Therefore, the reading strategy awareness in L1 and L2 can be one system but the reading performance is not necessarily the same in L1 and L2. Pedagogically, through reading strategy instruction in L1 our students can benefit from an increase in the reading strategy awareness in L1 and L2 without receiving any instruction in L2. However, in order to improve the L2 reading ability students need to be familiarized with the effective use of reading strategies in L2 classes with the L2 code.

Since reading is a problem-solving activity, the idea of strategic learning of reading became the matter of investigation in recent years. As Grabe (1991) mentions a description of reading accounts for the notion that fluent reading is flexible, that is the reader in order to read efficiently, employs a range of strategies including skimming ahead, considering titles, headings, pictures and text information, anticipating information to come, and so on. Urquhart & Weir (1998, p. 95) define strategies as "ways of getting around difficulties encountered while reading". In recent years, a great deal of research in L1 and L2 fields has been conducted on reading strategy training. Strategy training comes from the assumption that success in learning mainly depends on appropriate strategy use and that unsuccessful learners can improve their learning by being trained to use effective strategies (Dansereau, 1985; Weinstein & Underwood, 1985). Many studies have shown that reading strategies can be taught to students, and when taught, strategies help improve student performance on tests of comprehension and recall (Carrell, 1985; Brown & Palincsar, 1989; Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto, 1989; Pearson & Fielding, 1991).

It is commonly asserted by many teachers that the reason why their students cannot read adequately in English is that they cannot read adequately in the native language (Alderson, 1984). In second language acquisition, theorists have argued whether bilingual individuals have two separate stores of information in long-term memory, one for each language, or a single information store accompanied by selection mechanisms for using the L1 or L2. If individuals have a separate store of information maintained in each language, then transfer of information acquired in the L1 to L2 applications would be difficult because of the independence of the two memory systems.

In other words, intriguing questions involve whether there are two parallel cognitive processes at work, or whether there are processing strategies that accommodate both the first and the second language (Singhal, 1998).

Two hypotheses, the common underlying proficiency hypothesis and the reading universal hypothesis, claim that reading is a skill interdependent or universal across languages (Tang, 1996).

The common underlying proficiency hypothesis suggests that adult L2 readers who are already literate in L1 may have two channels available to them as they develop literacy skills in L2. Educated L2 readers can draw on their literacy skills and knowledge of literacy practices from L1 and they can also draw on input from the second language.

Cummins (1983) believes that all written languages have an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency or interdependence in common. Therefore, educated L2 readers can draw on their literacy skills and knowledge of literacy practices from L1 and can also draw on input from the second language. In the reading universal hypothesis, as has been addressed by Goodman (1970,1973) in his psycholinguistic point of view, the primary goal of reading is comprehension.

Goodman argues that the reading process will be much the same for all languages and the key question is how much background knowledge the reader brings to the specific reading task. Bosser (1991) believes that if students are strategic in their first language, there is a strong possibility that the strategies they use with their mother tongue, when brought to their attention, may transfer from one language to another. This view is shared by Coady (1979) who asserted that foreign language reading is a reading problem that readers have in their L1and not a language problem.

Yorio (1971) takes an opposite view. He puts that the reading problems of foreign language learners are mainly because of imperfect knowledge of the language, and the native language interference in the reading process. He mentions “the readers’ knowledge of foreign language is not like that of the native speaker, the guessing or predicating ability necessary to pick up the correct cues is hindered by the imperfect knowledge of the language (p.108). However, in his studies, Alderson (1984; Cited in Ridgway, 1997, p. 154) concluded “[L2 reading] appears to be both a language problem and a reading problem, but with firmer evidence that it is a language problem for low levels of foreign language competence, than a reading problem” (p. 24). Cziko (1978, Cited in Nunan, 1999, p. 258) mentions that limited linguistic proficiency would appear to ‘short-circuit’ the transfer of reading skills from one language to another.

In a study aimed at describing and understanding the metacognitive knowledge and strategic reading processes of proficient and less proficient bilingual readers, Jimenez et al. (1995) reported that proficient English and Spanish biliterate readers, like expert monolingual readers, demonstrated

remarkable strategic abilities when reading. They also found that bilingual readers tended to have a unitary view of reading and conceive many similarities between reading in Spanish (L1) and English (L2). Finally, they found that the successful bilingual readers were aware of the transfer of knowledge across languages. On the other hand, the less successful readers were found to not have a unitary view of reading.

This study, however, is going to investigate how Iranian EFL students come to read in L1 and L2. It is going to find out whether they have a unitary view of reading in L1 and L2. It is going to find out whether the reading strategy awareness of students in L1 will transfer to L2 reading and whether this transfer will have the same effects on L1 and L2 reading ability.

However the following questions are suggested:

1) Is there any relationship between the language variable and Reading Comprehension performance?
2) Does reading strategy training have any effects on students' reading comprehension **in Persian**?
3) Does reading strategy training have any effects on students' reading comprehension **in English**?
4) Does reading strategy training have any effects on increasing the reading strategy awareness of students **in Persian**?
5) Does reading strategy training have any effects on increasing the reading strategy awareness of students **in English**?

A null hypothesis was suggested for all the above questions.

METHOD

SUBJECTS

The subjects of this study were Iranian students. Through administering the NELSON English Language tests, series 300B, to 310 students, 160 students were chosen for the purpose of this study. The subjects were classified into control and experimental groups. Each group was again classified into intermediate and advanced subgroups of language proficiency. Forty students took part in each subgroup.

INSTRUMENTATION

A) Language proficiency test

In order to make sure of the homogeneity of control and experimental groups in terms of English language proficiency, a test of NELSON, series 300B, after being piloted on a similar group of ten students, was administered. It consisted of four parts: cloze tests, structure, vocabulary, and pronunciation and the time allotted was 35 minutes.

B) Test of reading comprehension in English

The English reading comprehension test was selected from the reading section of the TOEFL TESTS OF ARCO (1997). It was in three passages containing thirty items. The time allowed was 20 minutes. To ensure that this test is an appropriate one in terms of text difficulty level to be given to the both

groups of proficiency, first from the course books of the two proficiency groups, the Reading Section, some passages were randomly selected. The readability formula was run afterward to obtain an index of readability for them. The mean index turned out to be 22.83.

Then the readability formula, after studying many texts, was run for the above-mentioned test of TOEFL, ARCO, which turned out to be 23.7and seemed quite suitable for the purpose of this study. To estimate the reliability of the test of reading in English a pilot study was conducted. The test was administered to a similar group of ten students.

The reliability of the test was estimated through the KR-21 formula. The same procedure was run for the NELSON proficiency test in the piloting stage in order to see whether the test is reliable for the above-mentioned group or not. To have the most appropriate test, item characteristics, that is item facility and item discrimination, were also studied. In order to determine the concurrent validity of the test of reading in English, it was validated against the aforesaid NELSON standard test of proficiency, which was given to the same group of ten students. The correlation coefficient between the test of NELSON and Reading was calculated which turned out to be suitable for this study at 0.1 level of significance. (See table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the results of pilot study

TEST	MEAN	Std .Dev	Reliability	DF	Correlation Coefficient	P.Value
READINGin ENGLISH	58.00	14.58	o.63	9	0.95875	0.1
NELSON	73.20	6.54	0.71			

C) Tests of reading comprehension in Persian language

In order to neutralize the test-wise effects of Persian language reading test on the students in the pretest and posttest phases, two parallel tests of reading comprehension were made in Persian, one for the purpose of the pretest and the other for the purpose of the posttest. For each test of reading comprehension in Persian, two passages, each containing fifteen items, and in all 30 items were used. Each item carried two points.

The nature of the items in terms of recognizing main ideas, vocabulary knowledge, and inferring was the same for all passages and, by implication, for the two sets of tests of reading comprehension in Persian.

The time allotted for each reading test in Persian was 20 minutes. This time limit was determined in the piloting stage. Too much time allowed changes rapid expeditious reading into slow careful reading. Therefore the time factor was carefully controlled.

The two sets of teacher-made tests of reading comprehension in L1 were piloted on a similar group of ten students. In order to have reliable tests, their scores underwent the KR-21 formula. The reliability

indices as calculated were good enough for this study. (See table.2) For determining the strength of the relationship between the scores of these two sets of tests in L1, the Pearson correlation coefficient formula was also run. The result turned out to be 0.963 which was promising for this study. (See table.2) Item characteristics were also taken care of at the piloting stage.

Table **2.** *Descriptive statistics for the results of pilot study*

L1 Reading tests	*MEAN*	Std .Dev	Reliability	DF	Correlation Coefficient	P.Value
TEST ONE	20	4.06	0.62	9	0.963	.0001
TEST TWO	19	4.29	0.64			

D) Questionnaire

The process of comprehension was measured by means of a five-point likert scale questionnaire (**Never/ Seldom/ Sometimes/ Usually/** and **Always** *true of me*). As Janzen & Stoller (1998, p. 251) state "the strategies used may range from local actions, such as guessing the meaning of a word in context to more global behaviors such as evaluating the text according to the reader's purpose". The questionnaire contained two groups of **General reading strategies** and **Local reading strategies**. General reading strategies show how the reader perceives of the task, uses textual content, responses intellectually to the information in the text, and uses concrete techniques to understand the text. General strategies are divided into four sub-categories of:

- ***Textual content***, Qs 1-5; (Questioning whether students linked pieces of information together, guessed what was coming, corrected ideas formerly shaped in the mind, and differentiated important parts from details.)

- ***Reader response***, Qs 6-7; (Questioning whether students reacted intellectually to the text or whether they tried to interpret the text.)

-***Concrete techniques***, Qs 8-12; (Questioning whether students tried to push ahead when blocked during reading, consciously used punctuation and capital, tried to remember parts of the text, noticed titles, and finally reread parts of the text.)

-***Task perception***, Qs 13-14; (Questioning whether students felt it had been necessary to understand every word, and aimed first at general understanding.)

Local reading strategies *or* ***local problem solving techniques***, Q 15-20; (Questioning whether, when blocked, students tried to guess the meaning of unknown words, skipped some difficult / unimportant parts, looked for clues in the context, analyzed a word in itself (prefix, suffix, root), grammatically analyzed a difficult word within the sentence, and finally wanted to use a dictionary as a last resort or not.).

This instrument was adapted from the questionnaire by Taillefer & Pugh (1998) and offered an

immediate retrospective picture of reading behavior. Twenty items out of the thirty-seven items in the original questionnaire were selected for the purpose of this study, and then translated into Persian.

The reason why these 20 items were selected was the ease of use by students, ease of training to 80 students in the experimental group as far as time limit was concerned, and finally being of great importance in reading both in L1 and L2. It was reviewed by four experienced professors in order to give their comments on the translated version of the questionnaire both in terms of the clarity of the translation and the selection of the items in the instrument. In order to make sure of the internal consistency reliability coefficient of the instrument at the piloting stage it was given to 20 students of the similar proficiency levels taking part in the study. Based on the data gathered, the reliability coefficient alpha was calculated to be 0.89, which seemed promising for the purpose of this study.

Procedure

Through administering NELSON English language tests, series 300B, two groups of Intermediate and Advanced language proficiency were identified and randomly put into control and experimental groups.

For the purpose of determining the subjects' current abilities in L1 and L2 reading comprehension, the first 30 item L1 reading test and the L2 reading test were administered as a pretest to the students which were immediately followed by the general reading strategy questionnaire that would determine what strategies students would apply during reading in their L1 and L2.

After the pretest, the experimental group received reading strategy treatment in Persian language with Persian language texts. In order to teach students how to read strategically, the five elements proposed by Winograde & Hare (1988,cited in Carrell , 1998.p.5) were used including: What the strategy is; Why a strategy should be learnt; How to use the strategy; When and where the strategies should be used; How to evaluate use of strategy. The texts used in treatment, were similar to texts in Persian reading tests in length, genre, and general content. The course consisted of eight 35/40 minute sessions. After the treatment was over, both the Experimental and Control groups were given the posttests as has been done in the abovementioned pretest stage.

RESULTS

Analysis of reading tests in English using ***MANOVA***:

A multivariate analysis of variances(MANOVA) was run to compare the mean scores of the experimental(Exp) and control(Con) groups, from two different proficiency levels, advanced(Adv) and intermediate(Inter) on pretest and posttest English and Persian tests. The following table depicts a schematic representation of this study. The figures in table 1 are the mean scores.

Table 1:The schematic representation of this study

	Pretest		**Posttest**	
	Eng	**Persian**	**Eng**	**Persian**

Exp	Adv	44.55	47.5	46.6	53.05
	Int	34.6	46.3	35.55	52.55
Cont	Adv	45.8	48.8	46.15	49.05
	Int	35.25	45.7	35.75	45.7

Here again the eight research questions would be presented one by one followed by the statistical analysis for each.

1) Is there any relationship between the language variable and Reading comprehension performance?

With regard to the first research question, the F-observed value for the effect of language variable,976.85 at 1 and 156 degrees of freedom is much greater than the critical F-value ,3.92(table

2) Based on these results, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the mean scores for English tests, X= 40.53, and the Persian tests mean scores, X=48.58. The students performed better on the Persian tests.

The null-hypothesis suggesting that there is no relationship between the language variable and performance on the tests is rejected; hence it can be concluded that the subjects performed much better on the tests administered in their mother tongue.

Table 2: Tests involving "Language" within subject-effect

Source of variation	**Sum of squares**	**D.F**	**Mean squares**	**F.observed**	**F.critical**
Language	10368	1	10368.40	976.85	3.92

3) Does reading strategy training have any effects on students' reading comprehension **in Persian**?

To answer this question, the mean scores of each group at two phases of pretest and posttest are subtracted. Wherever the mean difference observed is equal to or greater than the T-critical, the difference would be significant. Mean differences are displayed in table 3. As presented in this table the mean differences of the control groups are not greater than the critical value. So, the difference is not significant in L1 for the control group. But in the experimental groups both mean differences are greater than the critical value, that is, the difference is significant at .05 level.

Table 3: Mean differences

Group	***Phase***	**Mean**	**Means difference**	**Critical value**
Con.Adv.Farsi	Pretest	48.8	0.25	3.01
	Posttest	49.05		
Con.Inter.Farsi	Pretest	45.7	0	
	Posttest	45.7		
Exp.Adv.Farsi	Pretest	47.5	5.55	
	Posttest	53.03		
Exp.Inter.Farsi	Pretest	46.3	6.25	
	Posttest	52.55		

Con.Adv.Eng	Pretest	45.8	0.35	
	Posttest	46.15		
Con.Inter.Eng	Pretest	35.25	0.5	
	Posttest	35.75		
Exp.Adv.Eng	Pretest	44.55	2.05	
	Posttest	46.6		
Exp.Inter.Eng	Pretest	34.6	0.95	
	Posttest	35.55		

4) Does reading strategy training have any effects on students' reading comprehension **in English**?

To answer this question, the same procedure is followed like the previous question. Wherever the mean difference observed is equal to or greater than the T-critical, the difference would be significant. Mean differences are displayed in table 3. As presented in this table, neither the control group's nor the experimental group's mean difference observed is greater than the critical value 3.01, that is no significant difference was observed. So the null-hypothesis for question number two was not rejected at .05 level of significance.

Analysis of reading strategy questionnaire in Persian and English

This phase is related to the analysis of the students' answers to a 20-item, five-point scale reading strategy questionnaire. The Chi-square statistical procedure is run to test the remaining research hypotheses.

5) Does reading strategy training have any effects on increasing the students' reading strategy awareness in Persian?

As shown in table 4, the Chi-square observed values for the two control groups (Intermediate & Advanced) do not exceed the Chi-square critical value at 4 degrees of freedom, i.e, there are no significant differences between the choice of strategies on pretest and posttest, but it does for the experimental group.

Table 4*:* Chi-square in Persian

Group	Level	D.F	Chi-square observed	Chi-square critical
Exp	Adv	4	344.91	9.48
	Inter	4	339.48	
Con	Adv	4	0.49	
	Inter	4	1.13	

As presented in tables 5 & 6, both control groups at the pretest and posttest phases preferred to choose "Never" and "Seldom" choices more than other choices.

Table 5: **CONTROL-ADVANCED-FARSI**

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	187	189	222	141	64	803

	11.5	*11.6*	*13.7*	*8.7*	*3.9*	*49.5*
Posttest	184	196	23.7	141	62	820
	11.3	*12.1*	*14.6*	*8.7*	*3.8*	*50.5*
TOTAL	371	385	459	282	126	**-**
	22.5	*23.7*	*28.3*	*17.4*	*7.8*	-

Chi-square observed= 0.49 D.F=4 Sig= 0.97 Chi-square critical=9.48

Table 6: CONTROL-INTERMEDIATE-FARSI

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	**204**	**190**	**224**	**132**	**63**	**813**
	12.6	*11.8*	*13.9*	*8.2*	*3.6*	*50.4*
Posttest	**183**	**195**	**226**	**133**	**64**	**801**
	11.3	*12.1*	*14*	*8.2*	*4*	*49.4*
TOTAL	***387***	***385***	***450***	***265***	***127***	-
	24	*23.9*	*27.9*	*16.4*	*7.9*	-

Chi-square observed= 1.13 D.F= 4 Sig= 0.888 Chi-square critical= 9.48

More details are given in tables 7& 8 regarding the experimental groups (Intermediate & Advanced). For the Advanced, experimental group the Chi-square observed value 344.91 at 4 degrees of freedom is greater than the critical value of Chi-square, i.e, 9.48, indicating that there is a significant difference between the choice of strategies on pretest and posttest. While the subjects chose "Never" and "Seldom" more on the pretest they chose "Usually" and "Always" on the posttest.

Table 7*:* EXPERIMENTAL-ADVANCED-FARSI

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	**186**	**176**	**191**	**155**	**91**	**799**
	11.6	*11*	*11.9*	*9.7*	*5.7*	*49.9*
Posttest	**21**	**43**	**184**	**261**	**292**	**801**
	1.3	*2.7*	*11.5*	*16.3*	*18.3*	*50.1*
TOTAL	**207**	**219**	**375**	**416**	**383**	-
	12.9	*13.7*	*23.4*	*26*	*23.9*	-

Chi-square observed= 344.91 D.F= 4 Sig= .0000 Chi-square critical= 9.48

For the Intermediate, Experimental group, the observed Chi-square, 338.40 is greater than the critical Chi-square,9.48 at 4 degrees of freedom. The difference between the choices of strategies on pretest and posttest is significant. The students chose "Never" and "Seldom" more on the pretest, while they shifted to "Usually" and "Always" on the posttest.

Table 8*:*EXPERIMENTAL-INTERMEDIATE-FARSI

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	**202**	**171**	**194**	**146**	**86**	**799**
	12.5	*10.6*	*12*	*9*	*5.3*	*49.5*

Posttest	**33**	**50**	**171**	**266**	**296**	**816**
	2	*3.1*	*10.6*	*16.5*	*18.3*	*50.5*
TOTAL	**23.5**	**221**	**365**	**412**	**382**	**-**
	14.6	*13.7*	*22.6*	*25.5*	*23.7*	**-**

Chi-square observed= 339.48 D.F= 4 Sig= .0000 Chi-square critical= 9.48

6) Does reading strategy training have any effects on increasing the students' reading strategy awareness in English?

The Chi-square observed for each control group, as shown in table 9, does not exceed the Chi-square critical value, meaning that the control groups did not show any significant differences between their pretest and posttests, but the experimental groups did.

Table 9*:* Chi-square observed in English

Group	Level	D.F	Chi-square observed	Chi-square critical
Exp	Adv	4	370.19	9.48
	Inter	4	354.31	
Con	Adv	4	0.051	
	Inter	4	0.48	

Tables 10 & 11 show more exactly how the two control groups performed on strategy questionnaire in English.

Table 10*:*CONTROL-ADVANCED-ENGLISH

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	**258**	**227**	**192**	**91**	**33**	**801**
	16.1	*14.2*	*12*	*5.7*	*2.1*	*50*
Posttest	**257**	**226**	**194**	**89**	**34**	**800**
	16.1	*14.1*	*12.2*	*5.6*	*2.1*	*50*
TOTAL	**515**	**453**	**386**	**180**	**67**	**-**
	32.2	*28.3*	*24.1*	*11.2*	*4.2*	*-*

Chi-square observed= 0.051 D.F= 4 Sig= 0.99 Chi-square critical= 9.48

Table 11:CONTROL-INTERMEDIATE-ENGLISH

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	**261**	**221**	**197**	**89**	**32**	**800**
	16.3	*13.8*	*12.3*	*5.6*	*2*	*50*
Posttest	**249**	**230**	**200**	**89**	**32**	**796**
	15.6	*14.4*	*12.5*	*5.6*	*2*	*40.1*
TOTAL	**510**	**451**	**397**	**178**	**-**	1536
	31.9	*28.2*	*24.8*	*11.1*	*-*	96

Chi-square observed= 0.48 D.F= 4 Sig= 0.97 Chi-square critical= 9.48

As presented in table 12, for the Adv experimental group the Chi-square observed value 370.15 at 4 degrees of freedom is greater than the chi-square critical value of 9.48. There is a significant difference between the strategies chosen on pretest and posttest.

Table 12*:* EXPERIMENTAL-ADVANCED-ENGLISH

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	**256**	**201**	**182**	**106**	**57**	**802**
	16.1	*12.6*	*11.4*	*6.6*	*3.6*	*50.3*
Posttest	**43**	**76**	**203**	**224**	**247**	**793**
	2.7	*4.6*	*12.7*	*14*	*15.5*	*49.7*
TOTAL	**299**	**277**	**385**	**330**	**304**	**-**
	18.7	*17.4*	*24.1*	*20.7*	*19.1*	*-*

Chi-square observed= 370.19 , D.F= 4 , Sig= .0000 , Chi-square critical= 9.48

On the pretests, the subjects preferred to choose "Never" and "Seldom" choices, while on the posttests they chose "Usually" and "Seldom" more.

For the Intermediate experimental group the Chi-square observed value 354.31 is greater than the Chi-square critical value of the 9.48 at 4 degrees of freedom. Here once again, while they chose "Never" and "Seldom" more frequently on the pretest, they chose "Usually" and "Always" on the posttest (table 13).

Table 13*:* EXPERIMENTAL-INTERMEDIATE-ENGLISH

Phase	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	USUALLY	ALWAYS	TOTAL
Pretest	**279**	**205**	**185**	**99**	**40**	**808**
	17.2	*12.7*	*11.4*	*6.1*	*2.5*	*49.9*
Posttest	**74**	**90**	**183**	**230**	**235**	**812**
	4.6	*5.6*	*11.3*	*14.2*	*14.5*	*50.1*
TOTAL	**353**	**295**	**368**	**329**	**275**	**-**
	21.8	*18.2*	*22.7*	*20.3*	*17*	*-*

Chi-square observed= 354.31 D.F= 4 Sig= .0000 Chi-square critical= 9.48

Discussion and conclusion

The first finding of this study is that reading strategy training in L1 would have significant effects on students' reading strategy awareness in L1 and L2. The second finding is that the students' L1 reading performance increased significantly through explicit reading strategy training but there was no significant improvement in their reading ability in English (L2).

In literature there are two contradictory views regarding the idea of transfer of strategies from L1 to L2.

The first view is that strategic approach is different in different situations (Hosenfeld, 1984; Mc Load and Mc Laughlin,1986).

The second view is that reading is reading and that L1 reading strategies transfer to the L2 context (Cziko, 1980; Sarig, 1987; Cummins, 1980).

The first finding of this study regarding the transfer of reading strategy awareness from L1 to L2 is in line with the latter view. It became clear that as far as reading strategy awareness in doing reading tasks is concerned, there is one processing system that can be applied for both L1 and L2 reading tasks. However in this study we saw the effect of reading strategy instruction in L1 on increasing the L1 reading ability of students but the L2 reading ability was not affected by the transfer of these strategies from L1 to L2.
In other words, although reading strategy awareness transferred to L2 reading task this transfer did not lead to significant improvements in L2 reading score. Anderson (1991) mentions that successful second language reading comprehension is not simply a matter of knowing what strategies to use, but the reader must also know how to use them successfully. In fact, it is not sufficient to know about strategies; a reader must also be able to apply them strategically.

Through the findings of this study it can be concluded that there is one processing system for L1 and L2 as far as reading strategy awareness is concerned. However, the manifestation of L1 and L2 reading ability is diffeent in L1 and L2 reading performance. It seems that students need to receive strategy instruction in L2 in order to get familiarised with strategic reading with the L2 code. Since students know the concepts of strategies and strategic reading in L1, it may take less time to implement reading strategy instruction in L2 and only modelling the strategic reading by the teachert and giving students some strategic reading tasks with scaffoloding from the teacher seems to be enough to see the L2 improvement in reading.

========== ==========

References

Alderson, C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A language problem or a reading problem? In J. C.Alderson, & A. A. Urquhart (Eds.). *Reading in a foreign language, pp. 1-27.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman Publishing.

Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in Strategy use in Second Language reading and testing - ***Modern Language Journal.*** 75/5, pp. 460-472.

Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 163-494.

Bossers, B. (1991*). On thresholds, ceilings and short - circuits: The relations between L1 reading, L2reading and l2 knowledge*. In Hulstijn & Matter (Eds).

Brown, A., & Palincsar, A. (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: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Carrell, P. L. (1985). Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (4), 727 752.

Carrell, P. L. (l989). Metacognitive awareness and second language reading. The Modern Language Journal, 73, 121-134.

Carrell, P. L. (1998). *Can reading strategies be successfully taught?* Online - URL : Http : // Languejhyper. chubu. ac. jp. galt / pub/ tlt/ 98/ mar/ Carrall html.

Carrell, P. L., Pharis, B. G., & Liberto, J. G. (1989). Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 463-494.

Coady, J. (1979*).* Psycholinguistic model of the ESL readers. In R. Mackay, B.Barkran and R. Jordon (Eds.). *Reading in a second language: Hypothesis, organization and practice* (pp.5-12). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. ***TESOL Quarterly.*** 14/3, pp. 175- 187.

Cziko, G. A. (1980). Language competence and reading strategies: A comparison of first and second language oral reading errors, ***Language Learning***. *30/2, pp. 101-116.*

Dansereau, D. (1985). Learning strategy research. In J. Segal & S. Chipman (Eds.), Thinking and learning skills. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hosenfeld, C. (1977). A preliminary investigation of the reading strategies of successful and nonsuccessful second language learners*. System, 5, 110-123.*

Hosenfeld, C. (1984). Case studies of ninth grade readers. In J. C. Alderson and A. H. Urquhart (Eds.). *Reading in a foreign language.* pp. 231- 249.

Jimenez, R., Garcia, G., & Pearson, P. (1996).The reading strategies of bilingual Latina/o students who are successful English readers: opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly* 31, 90-112.

Knight, S. L., Padron, Y. N., & Waxman, H. G. (1985). The cognitive reading strategies of ESL students. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 789-792

Koda, K. (2005). Insights into Second Language Reading: A Cross-Linguistic Approach. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

McLeod, B., & McLaugLin, B. (1986). Restructuring or automatic reading in a foreign language. ***language learning*** *. 36/2, pp. 109-123*.

Pearson, P. D., & Fielding, L. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research (pp. 815-860).* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Ridgeway, T. (1997). Threshold of the background knowledge effect in Foreign language

reading. ***Reading in a Foreign Language***.11/1, pp.154.

Sarig, G. (1987). High-level reading in the first and in the foreign language: Some comparative processes data. In J. Devine, P. Carrell and D. E. Eskey (Eds), *Research In Reading in English as Second Language*. pp. 105-120. Washington, D.C. : TESOL.

Singhal, M. (1998). A comparison of L1 and L2 Reading: Cultural Differences and Schema. ***The internet TESOL Journal.*** *4/10, pp. 1-10*. Online. Http:// iteslj. org / Articles / singhal *Reading in L1 and L2* . html.

Singhal, Meena (2001). Reading proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness, and l2 readers. *The reading Matrix.* ***Vol. 1, No. 1, April 2001.*** ***Online:****http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/singhal/*

Tang, H. (1996). *A study on reading comprehension processes in Chinese and English: Interdependent or universal*. Online .http: itesli. org/ Articles/ lessard-Clouston-Strategy.html.

Taillefer, G. & Pugh, T. (1998). Strategies for professional reading in L1 and L2. ***Jornal Of Research in Reading***. *21/2, pp. 97-108.*

Weinstein, C., & Underwood, V. (1985). Learning strategies. In J. Segal & S. Chipman (Eds.), Thinking and learning skills. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Young, D. J., & Oxford, R. (1997). A gender-related analysis of strategies used to process written input in the native language and a foreign language. *Applied Language Learning,* 8, 43-73.

Seyed Hassan Talebi, Ph.D. Candidate
Department of studies in English
University of Mysore
Mysore 570006, India
talebi4@gmail.com