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ABSTRACT

This study introduces an English reading program in an effort to enrich Korean middle school English learners’ reading experiences in classroom and eventually nurture them to be independent, proficient L2 readers. The main task of the reading instruction is summarization. The task of summarizing is partly incorporated with collaborative learning and uses full-length news reports that have narrative features. The purpose of the study is to describe the participants’ learning experiences during the program in terms of their achievement in reading comprehension assessment and their reading experiences in terms of their reading behaviors during the summarization task and their perceptions on the reading passages used in the program.

The participants are thirteen middle school students at a local middle school. The English reading program was organized into 10 sessions. In the first and last session, the L1 free written recall test was given to measure the students’ reading ability. During the middle eight intervention sessions, the students read eight news reports and performed a series of classroom activities that constitute the summarization task. The information on the students’ reading experiences during the program was collected via survey and interview at the end of the program along with the teacher’s log during the program. The students’ recall protocols were descriptively and statistically analyzed in terms of the total number of the idea units and the degree of the importance of the recalled idea units. On the other hand, the data from the survey, interview and the teacher’s log were qualitatively analyzed.
The results on the pre- and post-recall test demonstrate that the achievement varies among the individuals in terms of the recall test score calculated by the total number of the recalled idea units. On the other hand, the reading program yielded a modest enhancement in the ability of distinguishing relative degrees of importance among textual information. This quantitative finding is discussed as the enhanced metacognitive reading behaviors based on the students’ accounts on their reading behaviors.

The qualitative inquiry on the students’ reading experiences provides response as to how the reading program contributed to the development of reading ability and why the program did not improve some students’ reading ability. The summarization task pushed the students into independent reading and made them focus on the main idea comprehension and read interactively with peers. With respect to the passages, the narrative discourse pertaining to the given passages was appreciated due to the easiness. Also, the relatively longer length was conducive to writing summaries. However, the incongruence between the readability of the passages and students’ reading ability was the main attributor to the low achievement shown by some students. The insight from this qualitative inquiry suggests some pedagogical implications. Limitations and future studies are suggested subsequently.
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CHAPTER 1.
INTRODUCTION

This study explores learning experiences of an English reading program specialized with summarization task. In this chapter, the background of the study is first discussed in Section 1.1. Then Section 1.2 raises the set of research questions for the study. Finally, the organization of the thesis is outlined in Section 1.3.

1.1. The Background of the Study

Many reading researchers have provided explanations on what are the constructs of reading comprehension ability (Alderson, 2000). One of the most cited L2 reading researcher, Grabe (2009), conceptualizes reading comprehension into ‘higher-’ and ‘lower-’ level processing that respectively consists of several component skills. To simply put, lower-level component skills draw information from a text while higher-level component skills build a complete picture of the textual meaning and combine it with the expectations that the reader already has.

Regardless of how reading comprehension is defined, what is obvious is that the development of reading ability demands consistent, effortful
practice (Hanlon 2013). Furthermore, developing L2 literacy in EFL contexts like Korea seems to require extra efforts and practices. This is because learners have to seek print exposure deliberately because EFL environment is likely to restrict the opportunities of L2 reading to the classroom unlike ESL contexts where the L2 readers cannot avoid reading English in their everyday life. As a result, students who learn English at classroom should maximize the opportunities of practicing L2 reading given that the learning hour in classroom is the critical factor in developing the L2 ability in EFL context (Lee, 2014).

L2 reading pedagogy suggests extensive reading as an optimal strategy to develop L2 reading ability (Day & Bamford, 1998; Grabe, 1991). However, novice L2 readers may not take advantage of the reading strategy that deemphasizes the role of instruction for many reasons. One is that novice L2 readers may need to develop basic reading comprehension strategies to read extended texts in L2 (Bamford, 1993). Another concern is that when the L2 readers are early adolescent students, instruction that gives guidance and support is needed because reading behavior during this developmental period is easily influenced by affective aspects such as self-efficacy or confidence (Lau, 2009; Wigfield, Eccles, & Pintrich, 1996). In this line of discussion, instruction given in classroom has a critical accountability in EFL context and the reading experiences given by the
instruction are substantially important in guiding the early adolescent students’ L2 reading ability development.

While the development of L2 reading ability requires time and effort and the instruction given in classroom plays an important role in the development in EFL context, many reports and studies point out that English classroom of Korean secondary school does not play an adequate role. According to the report released from Statistics Korea in 2017, English has been the subject that households spent most of the private education cost in terms of the total expense as well as expense per student since 2010 (Kostat, 2017). Also, the major reason that Korean secondary school students attend private English education is to practice reading and learn grammar (Jung & Cha, 2014). Though there are many socio-related reasons on this matter, the present researcher seeks a reason from the reading instruction in school that lacks ‘reading’ (e.g., Ahn, 2007; Heo, 2015; Joh & Choi, 2001; Lee, 2009). The studies conclude that English reading instructions are given in a lecture-centered way in which the teachers use reading passages to teach grammar and vocabulary. As a result, English classrooms give little opportunities for the students to engage in independent interaction with text.

Concerning this issue, the present study narrows the scope into instruction, particularly the instruction for middle school English learners in
Korea. The study suggests an English reading instruction through a task invoking a higher “standard of coherence” as the goal of reading, which is the level of comprehension that the researcher attempts to achieve during the reading of a text (Linderholm, Virtue, Tzeng & van den Broek, 2004, p. 168). The program uses summarization as the reading comprehension task and full-length news reports as the reading material. The instruction is programmed by the researcher, which will be named as ‘English reading program’ hereinafter.

Summarization shows the extent of how much and how precisely the reader has comprehended the text because summarization taps similar cognitive process involved in reading comprehension process (Brown & Day, 1980; Kintsch & Dijk, 1978; Winograd, 1984). Thus, the goal of summarization is to develop the ability to understand English texts to the extent that the readers trace a central thread of a text after reading.

The present reading program has some distinctive features that characterize the particular reading instruction. First, the task of writing summaries partly incorporates collaborative learning. Second, the program uses texts having narrative features although most classroom studies on summarization instruction in L1 and L2 used traditional expository texts. Third, the reading program uses a reading assessment method that has not commonly used in related studies in Korea. Joh and Seon (2007) criticized
that there is little variation in the assessment methods in Korean research on L2 reading and pointed out the predominance of one particular instrument, multiple-choice question test. Considering the washback effect of assessment, diversifying the instruments accessing reading comprehension is important because it affects learning (Alderson, 2000). Hence, this program attempts to use the free written recall test as the measurement.

The English reading program focusing on summarization is implemented to a group of Korean middle school students in a hope that it engages the L2 readers in more focused reading practices in classroom and eventually promotes the development of reading comprehension ability. In this regard, the present study has more interest in exploring the students’ learning experiences during the reading program although it provides some quantitative evidence to demonstrate the effect on the reading comprehension ability development.
1.2. The Research Questions

This study addresses the following research questions to explore the students’ learning experiences of English reading during the English reading program.

1. To what extent does the English reading program affect the development of the students’ reading comprehension ability in terms of their performance on the free written recall task as a reading comprehension assessment?

2. What are the students’ reading experiences during the program in terms of their reading behaviors and their perceptions on the reading passages and how do they differ in terms of the achievement on the recall test?

1.3. Organization of the Thesis

The present thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the study by introducing the background of the study, the
research questions and the organization of the thesis. Chapter 2 establishes a logical foundation through reviewing the relevant literature. Chapter 3 describes methodology employed in this study including research design, the participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations. Chapter 4 reports results and discusses implicational findings in relation to the findings from previous studies. Finally chapter 5 provides conclusion of the study with pedagogical implication, some limitations and suggestions for further studies.
CHAPTER 2.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews a body of extent literature relevant to the present study. Section 2.1 introduces literature on summarization in relation to its theoretical rationale on reading comprehension, empirical studies on its effect on L2 reading comprehension development and the use of L1 for L2 reading development. Section 2.2 briefly discusses collaboration in L2 reading instruction. Section 2.3 presents some text-driven factors that affect reading performance. Lastly, section 2.4 examines the free written recall task with respect to its validity as a reading comprehension ability measure and the administration.

2.1. Summarization

This section discusses summarization in relation to the reading comprehension process and the comprehension ability development. Also, it examines its instructional effects based on the empirical findings from L2 reading context. Lastly, the significance of summarizing in L1 for L2 reading comprehension is pointed out.
2.1.1. Theoretical Relation to Reading Comprehension

The model of text comprehension (Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983) provides the theoretical explanation of how summarizing of the text read is reflective or facilitative of comprehension process of the text. In their terms, readers and summarizers undergo similar mental processes although they are not same. Reading comprehension is a process of condensing a text into the gist, ‘macro structure,’ from the individual propositions and their relationship. This macro structure formation involves the application of four ‘macro rules’ including deletion, generalization, integration and construction. In this application process, the reader’s own schema including background knowledge, values or the purpose of reading influence the judgement of importance among the propositions. In short, this cognitive process is identified as an activity of mentally summarizing all of the propositions on the text into a coherent whole (Brown & Day, 1983).

The reader, who now turns to be the summarizer, engage in the comprehension process similarly (Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978). The theoretical significance of summarization is that summarizing is not just representing the stored ideas in the reader’s working memory but constructing the gist of the text with the readers’ own schema. Thus, when the summarizer attempts to weave a central thread encompassing the whole
story beyond the surface textual meaning, the higher order comprehension ability, inference generation, is necessarily added and the reader eventually creates the mental representation of the text’s meaning (Perfetti, 1989; MaNamara, Miller & Bransford, 1991).

The study of Day (1980, cited in Brown, Campione & Day, 1981) provided an empirical explanation on summarization process within the text comprehension framework by Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978). After analyzing the think aloud protocols produced by mature summarizers, they suggested six summarization rules, which resemble the ‘macro rules’ by Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978). They concluded that mature summarizers operate a similar cognitive mechanism involving the macro structure formation process. Moreover, they addressed the effectiveness of the explicit teaching of summarization rules on the reading comprehension development.

Later, the summarization rules were used as criteria to evaluate the qualitative difference of summarization in terms of the developmental cognitive maturity or different reading proficiency (Brown & Day, 1983; Winograd, 1984). Winograd (1984) compared the quality of summary protocols produced by a group of elementary, middle school, high school and college students. The results suggested that summarization is not a simply retrieval process of what the reader has just read but it is a metacognitive process that involves planning what to include, giving
selectional attention on the textual information, and operating several strategies such as self-questioning or rereading.

A lot of reading researchers made endeavors to investigate the instructional effect of the summarization rules on developing literacy skills of L1 readers. Major findings include its effect on the heightened sensitivity of importance (Hare & Borchardt, 1984; Rinehart, Stahl, & Erickson, 1986); the positive effect on the structural awareness (Taylor & Beach, 1984; Armbruster, Anderson & Ostertag, 1987).

2.1.2. Empirical Studies in L2 Context

Comparatively in recent years, L2 reading research shed light on the effect of summarization on L2 reading ability development and produced reflective research based on the accumulated findings in L1 contexts. The findings are generally parallel to those findings from L1 context including its relation to reading comprehension process and its effect on reading comprehension development. There is one study that documented the ineffectiveness of summarization on L2 readers’ reading comprehension (Yu, 1997). In his study, summarization was used as a comprehension task in repeated reading instruction for college students. The participants who performed summarization between the first and subsequent reading
demonstrated lower performance on the reading comprehension test than the other student groups who performed other tasks such as multiple-choice item tasks or short answer tasks. However, interpreting this result into the ineffectiveness of summarization is controversial because there was neither summarization instruction given nor its extensive practice, but the participants wrote a summary at a one-shot study design.

Apart from the study above, most findings are consistent with the results from the relevant L1 reading research. It was found that summarization abilities in L2 are good indicators of L2 reading comprehension (Oh, 2007; Hwang, 2010; Mokeddem & Houcine, 2016). Also, its facilitating effects on reading comprehension were demonstrated (Baleghizadeh & Babapour, 2011; Chiu, 2015; Fan, 2009; Hwang, 2015; Joh, 2000; Kim & Park, 2001; Lee, 2010; Ponce, 2000; Yang, 2014). Furthermore, the diverse L1 backgrounds of the participants (e.g., English, Korean, Chinese, or Iranian) in the above studies provide stronger supports on the instructional effect of summarization on the L2 readers’ reading ability development. The facilitating effects are summarized in two aspects: improving reading comprehension ability and enhancing metacognitive awareness and regulation on their comprehension process. The following paragraphs elaborate on the findings from the cited studies.

Studies suggest that summarization practices develop reading
comprehension ability (Baleghizadeh & Babapour, 2011; Chiu, 2015; Hwang, 2015; Joh, 2000; Kim & Park, 2001; Lee, 2010; Ponce, 2000; Yang, 2014). Among them, the studies (Baleghizadeh & Babapour, 2011; Hwang, 2015; Joh, 2000; Lee, 2010; Ponce, 2000; Yang, 2014) demonstrated general development in reading comprehension ability of high school and adult L2 readers after a series of practices. Some studies suggested that certain reading comprehension abilities are benefitted from summarization instruction and practice. The rest of two studies (Chiu, 2015; Kim & Park, 2001) concluded that their summarization instruction and practice improved the ability of comprehending main ideas, which they denoted as ‘top down’ and ‘macro level’ reading although the other comprehension components of understanding details, denoted as ‘bottom up’ and ‘micro level’ reading, was unaffected.

Besides the effects on reading comprehension ability, meaningful suggestions are found as additional implications in two of the studies. The study of Ponce (2000) utilized recall test as a reading measurement, which was not commonly used to L2 reading research at least in Korea (Joh, 2006). Also, the study of Chiu (2015) has some instructional implication in that the study shows the positive effect of the immediate and automatic feedback on the students’ summaries via the online summarization practice program called ‘WriteToLearn’.
Studies also show the enhanced the L2 readers’ metacognitive awareness and regulation on their reading comprehension process after the practice of summarization (Fan 2009; Joh, 2000; Kim & Park, 2001; Ponce, 2000; Yang, 2014). Several methods were used to demonstrate the invisible and cognitive changes. The study of Joh (2000) and Ponce (2000) explained the cognitive change by showing the inclusion of more important idea units on the students’ summary protocols. That is, students became more aware of and self-regulatory in identifying main ideas and distinguishing more important ideas from less important ones after practicing a series of summarization of reading L2 passages. The study of Yang (2014) used the students’ response on the checklist to capture the change of the high school participants’ metacognitive reading strategy after the English reading instruction employing summarization tasks. The study of Kim and Park (2001) used the improved scores on the particular types of questions to indicate the change of the middle school participants’ metacognitive reading strategy.

Based on the evidence accumulated by the previous studies from L1 and L2 context, many reading researchers suggested that summarization is one of the effective reading comprehension strategies regardless of L1 or L2 reading (Duke & Pearson, 2002; NRP, 2000; Pearson & Fielding, 1996; Pressley, Johnson, Symons, McGoldrick & Kurita, 1989).
2.1.3. Summarizing in L1 for L2 Comprehension

Bernhardt (2000, 2011) show that 20% of the performance of L2 reading can be explained by L1 literacy such as the knowledge of structure, beliefs about word and sentence configuration or comprehension strategies and conclude that L1 literacy should come into play in L2 reading class. This claim provides a rationale on the instructional practice of summarizing in L1 after reading L2 text. If it is given to students who have an adequate level of L1 literacy, the summarization skill that was developed as a general learning strategy may be transferred to the L2 reading performance.

2.2. Collaboration in Reading Instruction

The benefit of collaboration in language learning is theoretically grounded in sociocultural theories including Vygotsky’s scaffolding (1978), the notion of situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and the collaborative dialogue (Swain, 2000). This section briefly discusses the role and effect of collaboration in L2 reading classroom in the light of Swain’s collaborative dialogue.

The collaborative dialogue in language learning inevitably involves the
use of L1 when the learners share the same native language. The cognitive and social function of the collaborative dialogue via the use of L1 has been frequently discussed in studies investigating its effect on developing L2 writing ability (e.g., Donoto, 2012; Nishino & Atkinson, 2015; Young & Miller, 2004). And its effect in reading ability has been discussed in line with Collative Strategic Reading, a popular literacy practice (e.g., Klingner & Vaughn, 2010; Momtaz & Garner, 2010; Shim, 2009; Zoghi et al., 2010). The essence pertaining to the findings of these empirical studies is that the verbal peer interaction via L1 during language learning creates a social and cognitive space in which the L2 learners can give assistance each other and this leads to build a co-constructed knowledge and to achieve a mutual development of L2.

The effect of the collaborative dialogue in L2 reading has been investigated has been found to the language ability development and motivation enhancement (e.g., Klingner & Vaughn, 2010; Momtaz & Garner, 2010; Shim, 2009; Zoghi et al., 2010). Momtaz and Garner (2010) and Klingner and Vaughn (2010) showed the improvement of language ability including reading ability and vocabulary knowledge after the collaborative reading instruction, while Shim (2009) and Zoghi et al. (2010) failed to demonstrate. However, a common finding is that collaboration positively influenced the motivation to engage in classroom activities.
Furthermore, the students valued more on the explanation from their peers than their teachers (Klingner & Vaughn, 2010). However, the researchers remarked that the success of collaborative reading instruction depends on the quality of interaction and the active interaction is not automatically achieved (Klingner & Vaughn, 2010). Collaborative reading instruction can come into play appropriately when the teacher structures the environment to support learning.

2.3. Text Factors that Affect Reading Performance

There are many text-related factors that cause variance in the L2 readers’ reading performance, such as text genre, organization, topic familiarity, text readability, text input, etc. (Alderson, 2000). Valencia and Pearson (1988) suggests that three features characterizing texts (i.e., text genre, structure and length) should be taken into consideration when the assessment for reading comprehension is constructed and its results are interpreted. Following their explanation, this section discusses two textual features affecting reading comprehension performance: text genre and length. These two text features are necessary to be discussed because they are the major features characterizing the reading materials that are going to be used in the present reading program for not only instruction but also
assessment of reading comprehension.

### 2.3.1. Text Genre: narrative

The text genre is generally discussed on a continuum between expository (e.g., training manuals, textbooks) and narrative (e.g. literary stories, script, fables) (Weaver & Kintsch, 1991). Expository texts contain structured thoughts such as classification, comparison and contrast or procedural description. Most studies on summarization that were reviewed in the previous section used expository texts, because its revealing hierarchy among the textual information is more conducive to the summarization process (Pearson & Fielding, 1996). Nevertheless, the present study selected narrative texts for pedagogical reasons. In this regard, narrative text is discussed in relation to its benefits in reading comprehension process.

A study in discourse research provides a holistic definition of narrative (Graesser, Golding, & Long, 1996). Narratives are written as “expressions of event-based experiences that are either stored in memory or cognitively constructed, and are organized in knowledge structures that can be anticipated by the audience or reader” (p. 174). McNamara, Graesser, McCarthy and Cai explains that a text that is narrative “tells a story with characters, events, places and things that are familiar to the readers” (2014,
p. 85) and is closely affiliated with everyday conversation, word familiarity and world knowledge. Accordingly, comprehending narratives means the understanding of the storyline featured by characters, settings, actions, and events on the particular texts (Best, Floyd, & McNamara, 2008).

In recent years, a group of discourse researchers attempted to quantify such textual characteristics at a discourse level using Coh-metrix, which is a computational software that produces multiple indices on the linguistic and discourse characteristics of a text (McNamara et al., 2014). The text analyzer provides an index that shows the extent to which how much a text is narrative as opposed to informational, called ‘narrativity’ (Graesser, McNamara, & Kulikowich, 2011). The dimension of narrativity is calculated based on the features including characteristics of words, sentences and connections between sentences and also one of the components that constitute the ‘text easibility’ that shows how much the text is easier (Graesser et al., 2011).

From these accounts, news reports can be identified as the narrative genre if they deliver an event-based experience that is described with characters, settings, or actions in familiar words. In fact, there is a claim that literary texts and news reports are both narrative and they cannot not be distinguished at the textual level but only distinguished at the pragmatic level (Zwaan, 1994). Although news reports are not read for entertaining
purpose, which is a general practical purpose of narrative texts (Weaver & Kintsch, 1991), the news reports used in the present study are identified as narrative in term of the definitions made by Graesser et al. (1996) and McNamara et al. (2014).

Narrative discourse is generally easier to read, comprehend and recall than expository text for several reasons (Graesser et al., 2011). One is that the content of narrative discourse is generally familiar to readers than informational text (Graesser et al., 1991) even when the familiarity and vocabulary is controlled. (Graesser & Riha, 1984, cited in Graesser et al). Another aspect is related to the general organizational pattern, which is the sequences of causally-related events (William, Hall, & Lauer, 2004). The event sequences in narrative resemble the world knowledge that children develop from first hand and are the general experiences that people in a society experience at every day in contrast with other structures in expository (e.g., comparison and contrast in expository). William et al. (2004) suggests that reading instruction for slow readers should be started with narrative texts because most students have well-developed schemas on a sequence of causally-related events compared to the expository text, and thus they are simple to follow.

The advantage of narrative can play a role in L2 reading comprehension if the readers are mature enough to possess schema of narrative in their L1
system (Bernhardt, 2011). Based on her argument, narrative genre can come into play in classrooms for English reading in EFL context including Korea.

### 2.3.2. Text Length

The length of text is frequently discussed in the matter of improvement of reading comprehension in test-taking situations in both L1 and L2 reading (Alderson, 2000; Bachman, 1990). There are several empirical studies that investigate its effect in relation to the test-takers’ L2 reading comprehension (e.g., Cha, 1995; Choi, 2011; Yi, 2013, all cited from the study of Bae in 2017). Yi (2013) points out that there is no agreed criterion against which length of a text is judged as longer or shorter among researchers, but she mentions that any text with less than 400 words does not make statistically significant influence on the reading comprehension. However, Bae (2016) suggests that readers regardless of L1 and L2 reading perceive the text as longer when it is longer than twice the short counterpart. Accordingly, judging the length of the text longer or shorter is relative in nature and thus the matter of length should be discussed in comparison with what the readers have read in the past.

The length of the text has been identified as a mediating variable of affecting the effect of background knowledge on the readers’ comprehension.
performance (e.g., Alderson, 2000; Johnston, 1984; Valencia & Pearson, 1988). Findings on reading comprehension since the early 20th century acknowledged the influence of topical prior knowledge on reading comprehension process (Johnston, 1984). In most extant standardized tests, reading comprehension is assessed by using many short passages in order to increase the total number of test items and to deal with a variety of topics (Alderson, 2000; Ozuru, Dempsey & McNamara, 2009; Valencia & Pearson, 1988). They agree that this manipulation is to minimize the possible advantage of background knowledge on reading comprehension.

However, using such short passages on a deliberate way is criticized in terms of the perspective of “ecological validity” (Valencia & Pearson, 1988, p.29) of reading assessment. The shortcomings of deliberately using short segmental passages are documented in empirical studies in L1 and L2 reading (e.g., Armbruster, 1984; Swaffer et al, 1991; Cha, 1995). Valencia and Pearson (1988) warns that using the short segmental passages for assessment does not reflect what one reads in real world, which threatens the ecological validity of assessment. Comprehension theorists provide rationale on using longer text for comprehension instruction or assessment. Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978) suggests that the text should be long enough in order for the reader to apply the set of strategies called ‘macro structure rules’ in condensing the textual information into a coherent gist, which is the
text comprehension process theorized by them. They explain that the lengthiness is not necessarily in contrary to the ease of the text because long texts can provide enough information that can be available in the readers’ working memory when the reader must find clues for coherence building.

Johnston (1984) rather suggests to use longer texts as an attempt to reduce the biasing effect of background knowledge for reading assessment. Following the text comprehension model (Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978), he argues that if assessing reading comprehension is to see how well the reader develops a coherent representation of the text meaning, the influence of prior knowledge should be minimalized. The best way for this is to ask central questions not peripheral questions with no availability of the text to refer back. And he concludes that asking central questions can be valid tasks when the texts are long enough to provide redundant clues and contexts that the readers can utilize in their coherence building.

2.4. Free Written Recall Test

This study adopts a free written recall task to measure the change English reading comprehension ability as the outcome of the instruction centered on summarization. The task of summarization and recall are distinguished in terms of the availability of the text to refer back during
producing the protocols although the two tasks share a critical feature that they are the representation of the reader’s comprehension of the text (Riley & Lee, 1996). Since free written recall has not been frequently used as measurement in L2 reading research in Korea, its validity as a reading measurement is examined thoroughly focusing on its validity as assessment. Also, external factors that might threaten its validity are also discussed in order to administer in a more valid way.

### 2.4.1. Its Validity as Reading Assessment

Many studies on summarization in L1 and L2 used the multiple-choice questions task as measurement to see its instructional effect on the development of reading comprehension while some studies conducted in L1 and L2 contexts employed recall task or similar tasks such as an essay (e.g., Armbruster et al, 1987; King et al, 1984; Ponce, 2000; Taylor & Beach, 1984). In Korean L2 reading research, multiple-choice question task has been predominantly used in studies on summarization as well as other reading research (Joh & Seon, 2007). Free written recall task has been rarely employed to measure comprehension in Korean L2 studies (Joh, 2006).

Given that reading comprehension is to extract the central idea from textual information, assessing comprehension ability by multiple choice
question test can be questioned over its validity for a number of reasons. For instance, test takers can perform at above-chance levels on multiple choice questions without reading the passage corresponding with the question (Katz, Blackburn, and Lautenschlager, 1991). Also, the multiple choice test may yield test performances that may not accurately demonstrate the ability to construct meaning from text because multiple choice test items require the test takers to choose one answer from predetermined answer choices (Valencia & Pearson, 1988). Another concern is that the answer choices can unintentionally influence reader’s understanding of the text (Bachman, 1990).

On the other hand, recall task has strong support on its validity as a reading measurement because the recall protocols are the output of reader-directed processing and they provide richer evidence on not only what the readers understood but also how the information was stored in the readers’ working memory (Bernhardt, 1991; Johnston, 1983). Johnston (1983) mentions that recall protocol analysis is a measure of tracking a reader’s psychological processes during reading and thus it can reduce bias. Bernhardt (1991) mentions that the free written recall task is a ‘purer’ measure of comprehension possessing since it reveals “the organization of stored information and some of the retrieval strategies used by readers (p.200)” and argues for its use in second language reading assessment.
Alderson (2000) argued against the validity of recall test since it might measure reader’s memorizing ability rather than reading comprehension ability. However, discourse comprehension researchers provide the theoretical explanation on what the recall task measures (Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; Zwaan & Radvansky, 1998). Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978) made a claim that protocols are neither “simply a replica of a memory representation of the original discourse” (p. 374) nor simple representation of the stored information in the reader’s cognition. Rather, producing recall protocols is a process of constructing the coherent network among the textual propositions through the inverse application of the macro-structure rules. Thus, the retrieval in the recall task significantly depends on how well the reader has built the coherent, integrated mental representation of the essence of the text (Zwaan & Radvansky, 1998). Simply put, the better the reader comprehends, the more he/she recall on the text.

### 2.4.2. Administration

L2 reader’s recall performances can be influenced by the conditions under which the recall tasks are administered regardless of the L2 readers’ proficiency. Lee’s (1986) review identified some of these variables: whether the recalling is done in L1 or L2; whether it is an immediate or delayed task;
whether the test takers are oriented to read for the purpose of recalling the passages; whether they are informed of the scoring system of their recall protocols. Then he empirically proved that allowing the test takers to use L1 to recall and orienting them to the post-reading recall task facilitate producing more recalled idea units although giving pre-reading instruction only affected the performances of less proficient readers. In particular, recall in the first language is recommended as an integrative measure of reading comprehension in L2 reading (Bernhardt, 2000; 2010).

There are some studies that warn a possible weakness of free written recall task. Joh’s (2006) retrospective interview uncovered that most of her participants used the strategy of memorizing every pieces of propositions in the text. This behavior was interpreted as the result of the unique socio educational circumstance of Korea where cramming knowledge for test has been prevailing. This inefficient strategy use of L2 readers may be in line with the conclusion of Riley and Lee (1996). After comparing the protocols of summary and recall, they found that the L2 readers’ recall protocols contained significantly less percentage of main ideas and higher percentage of details than summary protocols. However, this possible weakness can be adjusted by giving pre-reading instruction to orient the test-takers to read for comprehension of the main idea as done in the study of S.-K. Lee (2009).

In sum, recall tasks offer more revealing window to see what the readers
comprehend. To achieve such validity, some factors should be taken into consideration when it is administered as a reading measurement.
CHAPTER 3.
METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methods employed in the present study. Section 3.1 introduces the research design. Section 3.2 gives information about the participants focusing on their past and present English learning experiences outside school and Section 3.3 gives a description on the English reading program. Sections 3.4 and 3.5 respectively explains the procedures of collecting and analyzing data. Section 3.6 reports ethical considerations.

3.1. Research Design

The present study was conducted based on a specialized English reading program designed by the researcher. It was aimed to improve students’ English reading ability and enrich their English reading experiences. The program was given as an after-school class in a girls’ middle school in Seoul. The researcher served as both a researcher and instructor. The main task of the reading program was to write summaries in L1 after reading the selected English news reports that are relatively longer and written in a narrative discourse.
This study takes a case study approach to explore the participants’ learning experiences of English reading in terms of the reading ability change and their reading experiences involving the summarization task and the reading material. Also, the case study employs quantitative and qualitative methods to answer the research questions. The most agreed defining characteristics of case study is that it aims on the in-depth understanding of the situation, and its interest is in process rather than outcomes in the real life context and in holistic interpretation rather than hypothesis testing (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2014). These characteristics pertain to the present study since the study aims to understand the developmental change of the L2 participants and their language learning experiences in a natural classroom setting where a lot of variables related to students’ and teachers’ behaviors cannot be manipulated as in a traditional experimental study.

The entire research lasted for one year and four months, from February, 2016 to May 2017. Data was collected for 10 weeks from the last week of March (March, 30) to the fourth week of June in 2016 (June, 22).

3.2. Participants

The participants of this study are thirteen middle school students ranging
from first year to third year. Students from all year levels were allowed to participate in the study due to a realistic issue regarding the recruitment of the students. They all completed a reading measurement, which was a free written recall test, and participated in answering the survey and interview although some of them missed a few sessions in the program.

The instructional input given to them during the regular English class at school is assumed to be compatible because the learning experiences of regular English classroom are similar among the thirteen participants. Although they were taught by four different teachers, the learning objectives and materials were generally unified because the school uses a government-authorized English textbook published in 2009 under the revised National Curriculum of 2009. The reading passages predominantly used by the four different teachers are the materials in their textbook *Middle School English* (by Kim, S-G et al.). The classroom activities for reading instruction focused on analyzing sentences of the passages in terms of the grammatical structures and vocabulary, although they had some variations among the four teachers. In addition to the regular English classes, the thirteen participants in this program involved in the present reading instruction after school.

The participants’ extracurricular learning experiences of English\(^1\) were

\(^1\) Extracurricular learning experiences of English is defined as any English learning
examined at the beginning and end of the program by a hands-on activity called ‘My English learning History’ and informal interview. This investigation was done in order to see if there would be critical influences on their reading performance change besides this program and to obtain meaningful information that could contribute to comprehensive understanding on the participants’ reading performance in this reading program. The participants were given a handout and asked to jot down on any English learning experiences they have had chronologically. Subsequently, the researcher conducted informal interview based on the individual students’ accounts in order to elaborate on their past experiences. The questions include ‘what did you mostly do there?’, ‘what kind of material did the teacher use?’ etc. The collected information revealed that most students only took the after-school English reading program when the study started, while two students currently engaged in extra learning of English outside school. This engagement in extra learning did not change during the course of the study.

Considering the learning content and intensity of reading done during the regular class and the students’ current engagement in extra learning of English, the learning experiences from this after-school English reading program are presumably the priming determinant in terms of affecting the experiences that were given outside the regular school curriculum.
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participants’ possible reading ability differences from the beginning of the program to the end.

Regarding their previous involvement in extracurricular language learning experiences, most of the students had some experiences although the intensity of the instruction varies. None of the participants were involved in immersion type of English education such as study abroad or English-medium kindergarten except one, who had a three-month-residency in the Philippines five years ago when she was 5th grade in elementary school. Three students attended language academies that are known as giving intensive reading and writing instruction. On the other extreme, one student had none of the instructional experiences besides school. The rest of the nine participants had some modest level of English learning experiences in several forms including attending after-school class at elementary school, going to local private institutes covering school textbook or grammar, practicing speaking via phone-call with native speakers. Table 3.1 summarizes the information on the students’ extra-curricular learning

2 ‘The intensity’ was judged by the name of the institutes. The ‘intensive’ institutes were those popular franchised- English language academies having their own curriculum and giving intensive reading and writing instructions with high tuition fee. On the other hand, those institutes whose instruction focuses on grammar or covering school textbooks were assumed as the institutes giving modest instructions. Although the criterion to judge the intensity of private education is rather subjective, the judgment was made clear because there were not many variables regarding the private institutes in this small group.
experiences of English. The students’ names are presented in the alphabetic order of their Korean names and coded into alphabet.

After the program, the researcher selected six as focal students to look into the learning experiences that were made in this reading program. Thus, their narrative data were included in the qualitative inquiry. The focal students were selected with those who showed high class engagement in class. Also, the focal students included not only those who recorded some growths on the assessment, but also those who did not show any or little growths in order to provide comprehensive interpretation on this reading program. Among the students who showed growths, those who had limited experiences of private education for English were only selected. As a result, Student E, D, F, L, K and L were selected as focal students for qualitative inquiry.
### Table 3.1
A Summary of the Students’ Extra Learning Experiences of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Past(years)</th>
<th>Present^4</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MDRT^1</td>
<td>INTSV^2</td>
<td>S.A^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*

1. MDRT refers to ‘moderate’ instruction (e.g., after-school class given at school, local institutes, phone-talks with native speakers).
2. INTSV refers to ‘intensive’ instruction (e.g., some popular English language academies and private tutoring)
3. S.A. stands for study abroad.
4. The involvement of private education during the program was indicated by O if she is currently involved and X if she is not currently involved.
5. The students who will be designated as focal students for the qualitative inquiry are.
3.3. The Reading Program

This section describes the English reading program with respect to its overall procedures focusing students’ involvement with summarization activities after reading English passages and the selected reading passages for the program.

3.3.1. Overall Procedures

The program had 10 sessions and each session ran approximately 90 minutes without recess. The program has three phases: orientation, intervention and completion.

In the orientation (i.e., the first session) and completion phase (i.e., the last session), recall tests were given to obtain information on the participants’ reading ability change after the program. Also, a survey was given at the last session to obtain information on the students’ reading experiences during the program. Also, in the first session of the program, the reading passages for the intervention phase were selected among many sample news reports that had been selected by the researcher primarily
based on the readability and the topic interest. The researcher showed the headlines and pictures of the twelve news reports (see Figure 3.1) on a power-point slide and the participants chose the eight reading passages that they will read together in this program through discussion.

**Figure 3.1**

**A Power-point Slide on the Sample Passages for Choice**

Also, the online class on the web was introduced and its access was set. The main purpose of the online class was to give complementary video lessons for some difficult grammatical structures on the passage read in class (see Figure 3.2).
Figure 3.2
A Screenshot of the Online Class

Each of the 8 sessions in the intervention phase deals with different news reports to read. The participants learned new vocabulary on the assigned passage, spent time reading the passage on their own paces and engaged in a series of reading tasks including making a list of important ideas from the reading passage, writing a summary in L1, and creating a headline representing the news report. Table 3.2 summarizes the program according to the three phases and Table 3.3 outlines the instructional procedures according to the time allotment in the intervention phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATION</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>▪ Measuring reading ability: free written recall in L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Conducting a survey on extra learning of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Introducing the program: the aim and main activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Registering online class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Selecting the 8 reading passages that will be used in the program through discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVENTION</td>
<td>2nd-9th</td>
<td>▪ The Summarization Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETION</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>▪ Measuring reading ability: free written recall in L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Conducting a survey on their reading experiences during the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3
Instructional Procedures of the Summarization Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Time (90minits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before-reading</td>
<td>• Review previous vocabulary through quiz</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn new vocabulary from the reading passage</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Reading</td>
<td>• Read the passage silently on their own pace</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Choose seven important information from the passage</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compare it with group members and discuss</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Summarize the reading passage into a paragraph in L1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review teacher’s sample summary in English</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher’s explanation on some grammar</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-reading</td>
<td>• Create a headline through discussion and share it with other students in the class</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wrap up</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2. Summarization Task

The present reading program centers on writing summaries in L1 after reading. Garan (2008) mentions, “although teaching methods may be defined at their inception and in the literature, they seldom remain pure as
teachers adjust them to fit their own beliefs and teaching style” (p. 337). Summarization as a teaching method in this study is implemented with other instructional practices including sustained silent reading and collaboration and hereinafter it is named as the summarization task.

After learning new vocabulary in advance of reading, students were given time to explore the selected passage own their own pace for about ten minutes while the researcher monitored the students. Allotting time for independent reading during the class hour resembles an instructional practice for literacy class, Sustained Silent Reading (i.e., SSR). According to Garan and DeVoogd (2008), the defining characteristic of SSR is that every day a fixed period of time in class is given for the students to read material of their own choice. Although the reading passages used in this program were not completely out of the students’ own choice, they were selected by the participants through discussion among many other passages extracted from the same resource. The time for independent reading was kept without the interruptions including the teacher’s explanation. Nevertheless, the researcher involved in a few students’ reading process who were frequently observed having difficulty in reading on their own.

As a preparatory activity for writing a summary, an activity was given to make a list of seven important ideas from the reading passage. This
The preparatory activity was to follow the guidelines for summarization\(^3\). The guidelines combined the summary rules suggested by Hare and Borchardt (1984) and Rinehart et al. (1986). Six summarization guidelines are follows:

1. Select important information
2. Delete redundant or trivial information
3. Relating main ideas and important supporting details
4. Make a topic sentence representing the theme of the news report
5. Rewrite if necessary
6. Polish the summary

In this preparatory activity, the rule 1 and 2 were demonstrated by the researcher via the verbalization of the thinking process. Considering the characteristics of the present text, the important information was defined as the characters, settings and events that establish the story line of the news report.

While reading the passages repetitively, the students independently selected seven important ideas from the text by separating more important

\(^3\) The researcher is ensured that students learned general summarization rules in Korean class from the Korean teachers of the school. They said that how to summarize is learned in year 1 from the textbook. Therefore, the students are assumed to know what summarization is and how to do it.
from less important ideas in relation to the gist of the text and organized them into a list on their worksheet. After involving the independent interaction with the text, the peer learning was initiated. The students were asked to compare their own list with the peers. In order to motivate the students to discuss interactively, the researcher asked the students to make an agreed list of important information within the group by explaining why the particular sentences were important to the story line. Then the students were told that they could use the agreed list of important information that was made during the group discussion as a guide to compose a summary of the passage, although it was not necessary.

The next activity was to write a summary in L1 of the text they read. The researcher modeled how to follow the guidelines by verbalizing the thinking process. Next, she modeled the entire summary process while checking their summaries based on the checklist. At the end, the researcher showed a sample summary for the passage to raise students’ awareness of how the passage they read could be summarized with good quality. Then, students independently wrote their own summaries. Students independently wrote a 50-word-long summary of the given texts on blank sheets. The length of summaries was limited to less than 50 words, which was around 10 percent of the reading materials. The constraint was applied to make the students be aware of important ideas in their summaries. Since the main
goal of writing a summary in this program was to facilitate students’ reading comprehension, not practice writing in English, the students were allowed to write in Korean. Students completed summary assignment during the class hours and they submitted their summaries the researcher. The worksheet for the summarization task is presented (see Appendix 1).

3.3.3. Reading Passages Selected for the Program

The selected eleven news reports were from a non-profitable online English news outlets: one was used for recall practice; two for pre-and post-tests; and eight for the intervention. In order to examine the characteristics of the text, the researcher utilized Coh-metrix, which is a computational software that produces multiple indices on the linguistic and discourse characteristics of a text based on theories on discourse comprehension (McNamara et al., 2014).

The selected reading passages share two features in common. First, the genre of the passages falls into narrative according to the definition of narrativity by Coh-metrix. Each of the passages tells a story with characters, events, places and things that are relatively familiar to the participants. And the theme of the stories are relatively congruent to the world knowledge that general middle school students may have and the stories were written in
relatively familiar words. Also, the stories are structured in a sequence of causally related events, which is a characteristic of narratives. In fact, such narrative features of texts can be quantified by Coh-metrix in terms of the index of narrativity.

Second, the passages are full-length complete news reports, which are relatively longer than the average textbook passages commonly read by the students during the regular class. The average number of words in the selected passages is 378, ranging from 343 to 417. The average number of words in the reading passages of the year 1 textbook is about 160; the year 2 textbook is about 270; the year 3 textbook is 350.

With respect to the language level, the selected news reports were shown as readable to the English native speakers of elementary school level in terms of the two readability measures from Coh-metrix. Flesch-Kincaid’s Grade Level ranges from 2.6 to 6.8. The Lexile index ranges from 400 to 710. Considering the readability level by the Flesch-Kincaid’s Grade Level and Lexile index and the length by the number of words, the news reports were expected not to be too challenging for the general Korean middle school English readers although they may not necessarily easy to read. Table 3.4 summarizes the information of the passages used in the program in terms of narrativity, the number of words, and readability by two measures including the Flesch-Kincaid’s Grade Level and the Lexile index. A sample of the
reading passages used in the program is presented (see Appendix 2).

### Table 3.4

Information of the Reading Passages Used in the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>NRTVT</th>
<th>WN</th>
<th>FKGL</th>
<th>LXI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muslim girl likes boxing and wants to wear her headscarf</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A boy gets a special new arm in the United States *</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More women are becoming sushi chefs in Japan</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ten Malala shooters are arrested</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A lot of plastic is floating in the ocean and sea turtles are eating it</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Black ballerina is the first to become an lead dancer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teens with autism go to the prom</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Drones causing trouble for firefighting planes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>People argue over how to take care of homeless cats</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Children who lost parents in Japan's tsunami are healing slowly</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dogs find new homes and are happy again*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* NRTVT = narrativity; WN = word number FKGL = Flesh Kincaid’s Grade Level; LXI = Lexile Index

The passages used for the pre- and post-recall tests are marked by asterisk "*".
3.4. Data Collection

The procedures of collecting data are presented in terms of the instruments. Quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were used to collect the students’ English learning experiences of the after-school reading program.

3.4.1. The Free Written Recall Test in L1

The researcher administered a reading ability test at the first (hereinafter pre-test) and last session of the program (hereinafter post-test) in order to see if the English reading program benefits the students in terms of improving their English reading ability. The task of free written recall in L1 was used as a measurement. After the students read the passage, they wrote down in Korean everything they remembered without referring back to the passage (See Appendix 3). The students’ recall protocols were analyzed quantitatively to examine students’ reading ability development and any change in the ability to distinguish the relative degrees of importance among ideas. As reviewed in the literature, some external factors that can affect L2 readers’ performance on recall test including the text genre and length were
taken into consideration in the process of selecting testing passages. Also, the development procedures of scoring criteria is described.

3.4.1.1. Testing Passages

Two different news reports were used for pre and post recall tests (see Appendix 4 and 5). The headline and the picture were deleted to avoid the possible influence on the test-takers’ reading comprehension. Both news reports for pre- and post-recall testing respectively deal with events centered on two entities, who had difficulty but overcame thanks to other’s assistance.

Since the passages have not been used for reading assessment in any previous studies, the text analysis from Coh-metrix was utilized to verify if the set of passages are compatibly easy or difficult both at language and discourse level. Among many indices, the present study adopts three indices (i.e., narrativity, word concreteness, and deep cohesion) that could reflect the key features of the passages, which is a real story having causally-related sequences on a familiar topic. The three indices in order indicate how much a text is narrative and the content words are concrete and meaningful and how strongly the clauses and sentences are linked with causal and intentional connectives when they have causal relationships (McNamara et al., 2014). These three indices constitutes the dimension of
showing how much the text is easier to read. Besides these indices, the indices of showing readability (i.e., Flesch-Kincaid’s Grade level, Lexile) and the number of total words of showing the length of the passages were used. The six indicators are summarized in Table 3.5. Since new vocabulary were taught in advance of reading and dictionary was also allowed to use while reading, the vocabulary knowledge of the participants were assumed to be same.

Table 3.5.

Information of the Testing Passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passages</th>
<th>Easibility(Percentile)</th>
<th>Readability</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>NRT 73</td>
<td>WC 82</td>
<td>DC 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FKGL 2.6</td>
<td>LXI 430</td>
<td>WN 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>NRT 71</td>
<td>WC 79</td>
<td>DC 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FKGL 2.4</td>
<td>LXI 470</td>
<td>WN 292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRTVT = narrativity; WC = word concreteness; DC = deep cohesion; FKGL = Flesch Kincaid’s Grade Level; LXI = Lexile Index; WN = word number

From the analysis, the two passages are assumed to be equally easy to the extent that they are highly narrative having many concrete words and many connectives that explicitly link the sentences in causal relations. Also, the two passages are assumed to be equally readable to early grade levels in L1 standard and have the compatible length.
An additional passage was also used for practicing recall test. It also has relatively compatible readability (3.3 Flesh-Kincaid grade, 400 Lexile, 360 words). Since this practice material dealt with a different topic from the testing passages, there existed no practice effect for the topic.

### 3.4.1.2. Scoring of the Recall Protocols

The scoring templates to score the students’ pre- and post-recall protocols were respectively developed for each of the pre- and post-test passage (See Appendix 7 and 8). There is a general agreement that a simple tally of idea units accurately recalled lends itself to a valid measurement of reading comprehension ability (Bernhardt, 2011; Johnston, 1983). On the other hand, some studies adopt a weighted scoring method that gives different values to the individual idea units according to the relative importance to the text meaning (Joh, 2000; Ponce, 2000; Rinehardt et al., 1986). The present study develops the scoring templates that reflect not only the number of the idea units and the relative importance of the idea units, following the procedures demonstrated in the study of Bernhardt (2011).

Developing scoring templates included two steps. First, the two passages were parsed into idea units, which were defined as simple or subordinate clauses that have independent meanings (Carrell, 1985). It was found that
both pre-and post-test passages contained 45 idea units. Since the recall language was Korean, the idea units were propositionalized in Korean.

Second, the propositionalized idea units were analyzed with the weighted propositional analysis scheme proposed by Johnson (1970). All the idea units in the pre- and post-test passages were given a weight among the three values according to their relative importance to the storyline. A value of 3 was given to the most important ideas. In terms of the explanation on the understanding of narrative discourse (Best et al., 2008), the most important ideas include the information that directly manifests the characters, settings, actions and events of the storyline. For instance, the idea unit on the pre-test passage ‘Salim lost his left arm’ was included in this group of ‘high-level importance’. A value of 2 was given to the supporting ideas to the important ideas (e.g., Salim was playing kite). These idea units were leveled as ‘mid-level importance’. A value of 1 was given to the least important ideas such as trivial or background information (e.g., Afghanistan is in Asia). These idea units were leveled as ‘low-level importance.’

In order to maximize validity on judging the relative importance, two proficient English readers were invited as raters. One is a native English speaker with a university degree in an American university and the other is

4 Although Bernhardt (2011) used four values from 1 to 4, the present study gave three different weights to simplify the procedures.
an experienced English teacher in Korea. Through discussions, any disagreement was resolved and final values on each idea unit were determined. As a result, the scoring templates for both passages were finally developed. The number of idea units categorized into high-, mid- and low-level was 8, 25 and 12 for both the pre-test and the post-test passage. The results of the idea unit analysis are summarized below (see Table 3.6). The scoring templates were given in Appendices (see Appendix 6 and 7).

**Table 3.6**
A Summary of the Number of the Idea Units in the Two Passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea Units</th>
<th>Pre-test passage</th>
<th>Post-test passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to score the students’ recall protocols in terms of the number of the idea units, their protocols were parsed into idea units by the researcher. Then, the recalled idea units were scored for presence or absence of the propositions pre-analyzed in the scoring template and were given one point if it is correct. Paraphrasing was allowed such as ‘The court was
irresponsible for the dogs’ for its original English sentence, ‘The court did not take care of these dogs’. However, distorted messages were strictly excluded from scoring. For example, the recalled segment, ‘Salim’s arm got hurt from the war,’ was not counted since the original message was that Salim’s arm got hurt from electricity shock not from the war. Then, the number of correctly recalled idea units was tallied from the each protocol.

In order to score the students’ recall protocols in terms of the quality of the recalled idea units, the idea units on the students’ protocols were assigned one of the three importance values according to the scoring template. Then, each number of idea units under the three different importance level was respectively summed up. In order to eliminate the rater’s bias, the entire scoring procedure was carried out with students’ names blinded. To maximize the reliability of the scoring and propositional analysis, another expert participated in the scoring. Any disagreement between the two raters was resolved through discussion.

3.4.2. Survey, Interview and Teacher’s log

To achieve triangulation, three type of data collection methods were used. First, survey on the learning experiences were given with several open-ended questions. Second, the researcher conducted interview with
focal students that could give more understanding on the students’ learning experiences. Third, the researcher observed the participants engaging in the classroom activities and left notes. The questions on the survey are as follows:

- Describe how you had read English text in the regular English class.
- If any change, what are some similarities and differences on the way of reading after joining the program compared to the way you used to read in the regular English class?
- If any, what are some advantages you experienced after joining the after-school reading program?
- If any, what was the benefit of the summarization task you did?
- If any, what are some difficulties you went through during the after-school reading program?

All the questions on the survey were given in Korean and students answered in Korean as well. Their responses were translated into English by the researcher and the translated versions of the responses are presented in the thesis.

An interview was conducted in a semi-structured way. Campbell, McNamara, and Gilroy (2004) mentions that the informality of such an
informal interviewing is suitable to research contexts where the researcher is working with the participants. The focus of the interview was to explore the students’ opinion or feeling on the summarization task and the reading passages they read and summarized. The researcher took care to facilitate the giving of information or opinion and tried to reduce bias. She rehearsed the interview with her colleague who could give her constructive feedback on her interviewing and open-ended questions were only used “to allow the respondents to develop their responses in ways which the interviewer might not have foreseen” (Campbell et al., 2004, p. 99). The interview started with a set of preplanned questions as bellows and impromptu questions were given according to the responses of the students in order to elicit elaborated explanations. The researcher transcribed all of the interview data verbatim and translated them into English.

- How did you feel on summarization task you did during the course?
- How were the reading materials you read during the course compared to the reading passages in the textbook?

The researcher kept teacher’s log from the inception of the program to the end. The teacher’s log included documentation on the program design, her observation on the students’ behaviors and reflection on them and daily
record on the students’ summary writing, vocabulary quizzes and their watching of the video lessons. This documentation generated by the researcher was mainly used in the qualitative inquiry.

Quantitative data contains recall test scores and the statistical data on the analysis of the students’ recall protocols. On the other hand, the narrative data contains students’ retrospective accounts from the survey and interview and the researcher’s reflective notes on the Teacher’s log.

3.5. Data Analysis

This section describes the procedures of analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. The procedure of analyzing students’ recall protocols and the narrative data from the survey, interview and the teacher’s log are described.

3.5.1. Statistical Analysis

The students’ pre- and post-recall protocols were analyzed to provide quantitative evidence on development of the participants’ reading ability. They were analyzed in two dimensions in terms of the scoring templates
developed by the researcher: the total number of the correctly recalled idea units and the number of the idea units in three importance levels. The total number of correctly recalled idea units and each number of the recalled idea units in three different importance levels are put into the statistics in order to see if the participants experienced significant changes in their reading ability after the reading program.

Since the number of participants did not meet the conditions for using the parametric analysis, a non-parametric statistics, the Wilcoxon Signed Rank test, was employed. The statistical analyses were carried out using the statistical software SPSS ver. 21 with the level of significance set at .05.

3.5.2. Qualitative Analysis

In order to answer the second research question on the students’ learning experiences of English reading, a qualitative inquiry was conducted on the narrative data. Students’ survey, the teacher’s log and some of the students’ recall protocols were analyzed qualitatively as well to see any meaningful changes on the students’ reading behaviors and their perceptions of the program. The overall procedures of analyzing the qualitative data followed the procedure suggested by Creswell (2014).

The researcher organized the raw data to render them manageable. She
highlighted interesting parts from the raw data and wrote notes. In order to code the data in a more systemic way, the researcher adapted the guideline suggested in Creswell (2014). First, one segment of document was chosen and asked “what is this about?” Then the idea was written in the margin. This task was done on the several segments of the data. Second, the recurring regularities among ideas became a topic and a list of topics was generated and made into columns. The topics were abbreviated as codes. Third, the topic list was taken to the raw data and all the segments of data were coded according to the list. Any new topic was added if a segment of data has no relevant codes. Fourth, the relevant topics were grouped and reduced into several categories.

The researcher constantly continued the comparison within and between the emerging categories until all the categories become “mutually exclusive” and “conceptually congruent” (Merriam, 1998, p.184). The categories were discussed as meaningful findings and they were interpreted in relation to students’ English reading ability development proven by the quantitative data.

3.6. Validity, Reliability and Ethical Considerations

Research ethics are secured when the research ensured validity and reliability. This study employed several strategies to address possible threats
to affect validity and reliability and some other ethical issues.

The validity of the quantitative interpretation was secured by confirming test-takers’ sincerity while taking the test and researcher’s ethics involved in analyzing. The qualitative inquiry underwent validation by implementing the basic techniques that commonly suggested by qualitative researchers (Merriam, 1998; Creswell, 2014). First, methodological triangulation was used by collecting data from multiple sources such as informal interview, an open-ended survey, and the researcher’s teacher’s log. Second, the researcher asked peers to comment on emerging themes throughout the investigation.

This case study addressed reliability by taking the notion of reliability from Lincoln and Guba (1985, cited in Creswell, 2014). It is “consistency” of the results obtained from the data (p. 288). Thus, efforts were made in order to make the results consistent with the collected data rather than to expect others to gain the same results. First, thick, rich descriptions were provided on how the data were collected and how the findings were derived from the data. Second, the study used scripts at all stages of research including instruction phase, scoring, and data analysis process. Using scripts adds consistency to the research, which helped to secure reliability as well as confidence in the accuracy of the findings.

Anticipated ethical issues were addressed in every phase of the study...
(Creswell, 2014). In the beginning of the study, the purpose of the program was disclosed. In order to avoid the Hawthorne effect, anticipated changes were never told to students. The researcher established trust with the students and regarded them as collaborators. In the data collection phase, the researcher made endeavor not to take advantage of the participants. The entire program was conducted with being strictly grounded in the researcher’s educational philosophy. Lastly, permission was secured on the use of their accounts on the beginning and closing surveys, recall test scores and teacher’s observation notes. In the data analyzing phase, the qualitative findings were triangulated by multiple perspectives to embrace diverse perspectives on the topic; in the quantitative investigation, contrary data were also reported although they disconfirmed the researcher’s hypothesis. In order to protect privacy of participants, their names were coded into alphabets in reporting any findings from the participants.
CHAPTER 4.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the results of the study and discusses the findings pertaining to the questions raised in chapter 1. Section 4.1 presents to what extent the present English reading program affects the students’ reading comprehension ability. Section 4.2 qualitatively illustrates the students’ reading experiences during the reading program in terms of their reading behaviors and perceptions on the reading passages. This qualitative inquiry will explain not only what aspects of the reading program was facilitative of the students’ reading ability development, but also why some individuals did not demonstrate any growth.

4.1. The Change on the Reading Comprehension Ability

The first research question was to examine the changes of the students’ English reading comprehension ability in terms of their performance on the pre- and post-recall test, which was respectively administered before and after the students received the instruction. The segment 4.1.1 presents the individual students’ change of the recall test scores along with the change
made by a group. The segment 4.1.2 presents the individual students’ change of the quality of the recalled idea units along with the change made by a group.

4.1.1. Changes of the Recall Test Score

The individual students’ performance on the pre- and post-recall tests and their changes are presented in terms of the recall test score calculated by the total number of the correctly recalled idea units (see Table 4.1). Among the thirteen participants, nine students gained on the post-test ranging from one to thirteen. On the other hand, four students, Student A, E, J and K did not gain any or even lost on the post-test. This extreme result is thoroughly discussed focusing on six representative students’ reading experiences of the program in the next chapter. Student D, F, I and L will represent the high-achievers of the program, whose reading experiences of the program will provide insight as to how the present reading program could facilitate the L2 readers’ reading comprehension ability. On the other hand, Student E and K will represent the low-achievers of the program, whose reading experiences of the program will suggest some significant pedagogical implications.
Table 4.1
A Summary of the Recall Test Scores of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Pre &lt;br&gt;( n=45 )</th>
<th>Post &lt;br&gt;( n=45 )</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N=13 \)

Note. The six focal students for the qualitative inquiry are marked by asterisk ‘*’.

Statistical analysis was undergone to see if the positive gains are a meaningful change. In terms of median, the participants recalled an average
7 out of 45 idea units on the pre-test and an average 12 out of 45 on the post-test (See Table 4.2). Also, the ranges of the individual students’ score became broad from 17 to 25. This means that the participants’ achievements are rather extreme. Since a mean score obtained from a small group can be distorted by extremely large or small values (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991), the median and the range were chosen to describe the data.

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics on the Recall Test Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total:45</th>
<th>N=13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes. Scores were calculated by tallying the idea units correctly recalled.

These changes were statistically examined using the Wilcoxon Signed ranks test, which is frequently used as an alternative to paired t-test for the data that normality cannot be assumed for various reasons including small sample size (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991). The result reveals that the change of the recall test scores between the pre- and post- tests is statistically significant.

5 The calculation is “on the basis of [the] ranks above and below the median (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991, p.274)” not the mean scores. Thus, the statistical hypothesis is based on the median.
significant at .045. See Table 4.3.

### Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive ranks</th>
<th>Negative ranks</th>
<th>Ties</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.006</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.05

The results above lead to the conclusion that the present reading program affected the improvement found in some students of the ability to comprehend English passages in terms of the assumption of recall test as reading comprehension assessment (Bernhardt, 1991; Johnston, 1983; Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; Zwaan & Radvansky, 1998). They completed to read the eight news reports with average 350 words for total twelve hours of the eight sessions. Also, they wrote summaries of the news reports they read within the class hour after involving group discussion. The researcher believes that these experiences of English reading during the reading program were reflected on the improvement of the test scores.

One could point out that this positive gains may be due to the practice effect between the task of the program (i.e., summarization) and the testing task (i.e., free written recall). The two tasks share similar cognitive demand in that they require readers to represent what they have comprehended in
written protocols. However, the researcher judged recall test as a legitimate way to elicit the reading performance that was expectedly developed through the present reading program. Summarization in this reading program aims to develop the ability to build coherent mental representation of the text’s meaning during the reading. Discourse comprehension researchers theorize that such mental representations are reflected on the free written recall protocols produced by the reader (Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; Zwaan & Radvansky, 1998). This argument is empirically proved and supported by reading researchers as well (e.g., Bernhardt, 1991; Johnson, 1983). In addition, the use of free written recall in L1 for the assessment of L2 reading is advocated because it is “an integrative measurement of reading comprehension in a second language” (Bernhardt, 2000, p.797).

Moreover, there are a number of classroom studies that used free written recall test to demonstrate the effectiveness of the summarization instruction in reading comprehension in both L1 and L2 contexts (e.g., Armbruster, Anderson, & Ostertag, 19876; King, Biggs, & Lipsky, 1984; Ponce, 2000; Taylor & Beach, 1984).

---

6 Although the authors described their instrument as summarization, the present researcher denotes it the recall task because the summarization task was performed without availability of the passage to summarize.
4.1.2. Changes of the Quality of the Recalled Idea Units

In order to examine the qualitative change in the recalled idea units on the students’ recall protocols, the changes of the number of recalled idea units in each three importance level were compared (see Table 4.4). Loosely following the interpretation (Lee, 2009; Riley & Lee, 1996), the changes would be interpreted as a qualitative increase if the gain of the total test score is yielded from the increase of the recall of high- and mid-level idea units, whereas they would be interpreted as a qualitative decrease if the gain of the total test score is yielded from the increase of the low-level idea units. The researcher included the increase of the number of mid-level idea units into the qualitative improvement, because the idea units categorized into mid-level had still modest importance in formulating the coherent ‘macro-structure’ among the textual information in these narrative passages.
### Table 4.4.
A Summary of the Weighted Propositional Analysis the Recall Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** 1. The number inside the parenthesis ‘( )’ refers to the number of the idea units categorized into the particular level of importance.
2. C stands for ‘change’.
3. Student who low-achieved on the post-test in terms of the recall test score was marked with asterisk ‘*’
The nine students who showed growths in terms of the total test score all showed the qualitative increase in their post-recall protocols. The number of the idea units in mid-level was increased on all of the nine students, although the number of the idea units in high-level remained same or decreased produced by some students (e.g., Student G, H, L and M). Among the four students who did not gain any on the post-test (i.e., Student A, E, J and K), Student E produced more idea units in high- and mid-level idea units on the post-test, while the decrease predominantly occurred in low-level idea units. This result implies an improvement in her reading ability although it was not revealed by the total score.

Statistical analysis was undergone to see if the qualitative increases shown to some students’ recall protocols were statistically meaningful. Table 4.5 presents the changes in the number of idea units in high-, mid- and low-levels by median. According to the median value, the thirteen students recalled 4 high-level idea units out of 8 on the pre-test on average while they recalled 5 out of 8 on the post-test, which is one increase. With respect to the mid-level importance level, the students recalled 2 out of 25 idea units on the pre-test while they recalled 5 out of 25 on the post-test, which is more increase than the high-level idea units. With respect to the low-level importance level, the students recalled 2 out of 12 idea units on the pre-test while no one recalled any idea units that fell into low-level idea units.
Table 4.5
Descriptive Statistics on the Number of the Idea Units in Three Importance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Pre-test Median/total</th>
<th>Post-test Median/total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-</td>
<td>2/25</td>
<td>5/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-</td>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>0/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test also reveals that the increase in the number of the mid-level idea units in the participants’ recall protocols is statistically significant ($z$=-2.879, $p$=.004), whereas the increase of high-level and the decrease of low-level idea units are not significant (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6
Results of Wilcoxon Test on the Qualitative Changes between the Pre- and Post-recall Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High-level</th>
<th>Mid-level</th>
<th>Low-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>-.542</td>
<td>-2.879</td>
<td>-1.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.004*</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P$<.05
This result is interpreted as a modest enhancement in their awareness of distinguishing the major and minor information after the summarization practice. This interpretation is consistent with the previous studies in L1 and L2 reading. The L1 and L2 researchers demonstrated that summarization process helps the readers build the gist by making them more sensitive of the relative importance among the idea units of expository texts (L1: Armbruster et al., 1987; Rinehart et al., 1986 / L2: Fan 2009; Joh, 2000; Kim & Park, 2001; Ponce, 2000; Yang, 2014). Among them, Armbruster et al. (1987) and Rinehart et al. (1986) provided quantitative evidence by showing more recalled idea units in top-most levels after summarization training. Similarly, Joh (2000) and Ponce (2000) yielded the parallel results using summary protocols with L2 readers. While reading, the present students presumably paid more attention to propositions that were more relevant to the storyline and less attention to those that give trivial information.

4.2. Students’ Reading Experiences

Students’ reading experiences of the program are explored based on the analysis of the response on the interview and survey of the selected six focal students. The notes on the teacher’s log are used to make up for the students’
accounts. The six students are those who were highly engaged in the program in terms of attendance and submission of the summary assignments regardless of different levels of achievement in terms of the recall test score.

The reading experiences of Student D,F,I and L were leveled as the case of high-achieving students of the program; the reading experiences of Student E and K were leveled as the case of low-achieving students of the program.

The two cases are discussed separately with the following steps. First, the English learning profiles of each student are presented focusing on their English reading history. Given that their learning experiences made at regular curriculum are compatible, the six students’ extra-curricular learning experiences of English reading are shown. Second, their reading experiences during this program are described in the light of their reading behaviors during the summarization task and the perceptions on the reading passages.

Since behaviorally demonstrative engagement in classroom affects the outcome of learning (Guthrie, Wigfield, & You, 2012), the selected students’ class engagement is presented in terms of their attendance rate, summary submission rate and accomplishment on the vocabulary quiz regularly given on the new words learned in every previous session (see Table 4.77.). While

____________________

7 This record was documented in the teacher’s log. The researcher summarizes the record to effectively show the trend in their class engagement.
the selected six students all showed perfect performance on attendance and summary submission, they showed varied performance on the domain of vocabulary quiz and watching video lessons. According to the record on the vocabulary quiz, Student D, F and I gained more than 80% in every eight session whereas Student E, K and L occasionally did not reach the standard. Also, the Student E watched only one out of eight video lessons while Student D, I and K watched all.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Students’ Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Submission</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Quiz</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching Video Lessons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1. Performance on the vocabulary quiz is assessed in terms of the number of the quizzes that the student got more than 80% out of total

4.2.1. Student D, F, I and L: High-achieving Students

Student D, F, I and L are those who made some increase in their recall test scores. With respect to their class engagement, they attended all the
instructional sessions submitted the summary assignment at every session. They attained more than 80% on the vocabulary quiz at total eight sessions or seven sessions. With respect to the performance of watching video lessons, Student D and I watched all; Student L watched seven out of eight; Student F did three out of eight lessons (see Table 4.7). The four students’ reading experiences during the program are holistically discussed in relation to the contributions to their demonstrable achievement.

4.2.1.1. Profile of Learning Experiences of English

Student D, who was in the second grade level, had two years of private education for learning English. She went to a local language institute for one year when she was seven years old, where she memorized short sentences in the textbook and was checked by the teacher. She said that the studying method was manageable. She practiced English speaking through phone-call with a native speaker for one year at the grade level 3. She frequently read a series of English chapter books with the audio companions on her own for six years until the 6th grade.

Student F, who was first grade level, attended an after-school class at 3rd grade for one year. Besides this, the only instruction she received is the phone-talk with native speaker. She practiced English speaking through the
phone-talk lesson from a native speaker every day for two years since 5th grade of elementary school. She read English children’s books from time to time at home since 5th grade.

Student I, who was first grade level, have attended to local English institutes regularly since the 1st grade level of elementary. She learned grammar, vocabulary and read some children’s books there. There was no excessive assignment given. She is currently attending to a local institute while she was participating in this after-school reading program. She is learning textbook related contents including grammar and vocabulary.

Student L, who was the first grade level, attended after-school English class, which was programmed by a popular language academy, for three years from 3rd to 6th grade in elementary school. The class was given for one hour every day, where she learned English grammar and read some children’s books.

4.2.1.2. Reading Behaviors

4.2.1.2.1. To read independently

Summarization task in this program served to create an adequate context in which the students should independently explore the passages with care.
Prior to composing a summary of the given passage in every session, the students had the uninterrupted individual reading time for about 15 minutes. This independent reading rarely occurs in regular English classrooms where the reading instruction mainly focuses on grammar and vocabulary (Ahn, 2007; Heo, 2015; Joh & Choi, 2001; Lee, 2009). The four students commonly expressed the appreciation on the opportunity for independent interaction with texts. The following excerpts illustrate this.

Data Excerpt 1 Survey Response of Student D

During the regular class, I learn vocabulary that appears on the passage. Also, I try my best to master the grammar used in the passage. I had little time to read for myself because my teacher is busy covering the materials [that will be tested in the exam]. In the after-school class, I could read for myself. I think I read a lot…

Data Excerpt 2 Survey Response of Student I

In regular class, I listen carefully to what my teacher says. And I try to memorize the whole passage by thinking the translation what my teacher gave us. In the after-school class, I think I actively participated in getting the message of the news reports.

Data Excerpt 3 Interview with Student I

(Why did you like the time for reading for yourself?)

I don’t know..I just liked it. In class, I know the content of the passage already, so the reading was different from the reading in regular class. (In your

---

8 The italicized sentences are the teacher’s questions.
hagwon, how much time is given to you to read for yourself?) I have little. (How little?) Three or four minutes? The passages are short, so we do not need that much time.

Data Excerpt 4 Interview with Student F
Because I knew I had to write a summary of the passage after reading it, I made more effort to comprehend the given passage. I liked the time reading by myself.

Data Excerpt 5 Interview with Student L
Reading in regular class was like memorization, but reading in this after-school class was to read for comprehension. (Why was it like that?) Because without a full understanding [of the passage], no one can write the summaries.

As the students perceived, the present reading program emphasized independent reading so that the students could explore the passage in order to find important information and conclusively to get the main idea. Such independent reading constitutes the essence of sustained silent reading, which is a common literacy practice in instructional setting (Garan, 2008). The students in this program were given a sustained period of time to read without the teacher’s direct instruction at every session. Giving time for independent silent reading is pointed out as a key characteristic of the effective instructional practices for literacy class (Foorman et al., 2006). Also, a good number of studies prove that the positive effect of SSR on many aspects of reading including reading motivation, fluency or
comprehension (Garan, 2008; Yoon, 2002).

The students who appreciated independent reading generated some recognizable self-directed reading behaviors. One is that they monitored their comprehension process by drawing underlines on sentences perceived important or rereading particular sentences to solve confusions. The studies on L1 and L2 reading found that repeated encounters with the text is effective in improving the comprehension of the text (L1: Dowhower, 1987; Young, Bowers, & MacKinnon, 1996 / L2: Taguchi, Takayasu-Maass, & Gorsuch, 2004). Here are the related comments.

Data Excerpt 6 Survey Response of Student D
I had to understand the passage at my best in order to write a complete summary of the passages. So, I reread whenever I faced confusing parts. As I reread the neighboring sentences several times, I could make myself understand the problematic parts.

Data Excerpt 7 Interview with Student I
I took a habit of drawing underlines on the important sentences. *(How do you know they are important?)* I ask myself ‘does this sentence have to be there to form the gist of the passage?’

Another significant behavior is that the students stopped reading to locate answers. The students tried to read persistently in order to obtain a fuller understanding of the message of the given passage. This reading
behavior was revealed more salient when they compared with how they read for the multiple-choice items task or short answers task, which are the common reading comprehension tasks used in English reading instruction in Korea. The interview excerpts show this.

Data Excerpt 8 Interview with Student F
Reading English for me was to skim through the passage. I read only beginning and final parts. (Why did you read that way in the past?) Because it was enough to find answers! But in this class, I should read very carefully.

Data Excerpt 9 Interview with Student I
When I read passages in the drill books for test preparation, I never read to understand the message of the text but read to detect the clues for answering the questions. But now, unless I read carefully, I know, I cannot successfully summarize the passage. So, I make more focused effort to read carefully [for comprehension].

Data Excerpt 10 Interview with Student L
The goal of reading was changed. I used to read roughly to grasp the overall points. Now, I found myself fully engaged in reading to reach the fullest comprehension because I knew I had to summarize what I was reading.

Of course, there would be some occasions that scanning the passage without an attempt of full comprehension is beneficial depending on the type of tasks or goals of reading. However, there is a general agreement
among English teachers in Korea that students are too much concerned about developing test-specific reading strategies (Choi, 2008). Even Student F and L, who had little experiences of test-specific instruction due to the limited experiences of private education, turned out to prefer the particular reading strategy of scanning to locate answers. Now, they expressed that the task of summarization adjusted their reading strategy and brought them to a clear goal of reading more persistently. The researcher interprets this reading behavior as a sign that summarization task encouraged the students to adopt a higher ‘standard of coherence’ (Linderholm et al., 2004) than when they were given close-ended tasks including multiple-choice or short answer questions.

Although the current reading program did not aim to implement the sustained silent reading practice, independent reading came into play because it was necessary to compose a good summary of the passages. As a result, the four students could take advantage of the opportunity to independently interact with the text.

4.2.1.2. To extract the main point more actively

Comprehending narrative discourse including the news reports used in this program means that the reader has understood the major information of
the text including characters, settings, actions and events that feature the story line of the particular text (Best et al., 2008). Requiring summarization tasks made the students exert more effort of identifying major information of the passages during reading and increased awareness of how to select the major information on such narrative discourse. Some quotes from the students’ interview and survey demonstrate this.

Data Excerpt 11 Interview with Student D
I used to just read without any thinking on the main point on the passage. So, I ended up with nothing left in my brain after finishing reading. But, the activity of finding important ideas and writing summaries made me read by continuously thinking like ‘what’s the theme?’.

Data Excerpt 12 Interview with Student I
As the review after studying helps me memorize [the main points] better, summarizing after reading English passages helps me learn the main idea more efficiently.

Data Excerpt 13 Interview with Student F
I focused on finding major information of the text. *(What was exactly the major information like?)* It is to understand the person, setting or main events or how the case was solved.

The students’ reading behaviors of deliberately focusing on the major information is partly supported by the result of the weighted propositional
analysis on the present group’s recall protocols. It is believed that such reading behaviors made over the eight sessions were facilitative of improving the ability of distinguishing the relative importance among the idea units, as shown by the qualitative increase in their recall protocols after the program.

**4.2.1.2.3. To read interactively with peers**

The summarization task designed in this program incorporates group discussion as a means to help the students write summaries and facilitate class engagement. The students perceived helpful and enjoyable the opportunities to interactively clarify how they comprehended particular sentences and to learn their peers’ viewpoints on the important information to the story line. This learning experience was reported to be facilitative of producing good summaries as well as understanding better the given text.

Data Excerpt 14 Survey Response of Student D
I had fun doing the activity of comparing the list of important ideas with friends. I could notice different ways of thoughts among my friend and learn that we have different standards on the importance.

Data Excerpt 15 Survey Response of Student I
I told my friends the way I understood the given sentences. I could understand the passage more precisely while sharing ideas and
learning other’s perspectives. Because of this, I could write a better summary.

Data Excerpt 16 Survey Response of Student L

I like to make the headlines together with friends. When I had to do it by myself, I usually did not know how to start. But, when I talked with friends, some ideas popped up.

Data Excerpt 17 Interview with Student L

(I did not explain the every sentences in the passages unlike what your English teacher does in regular class. Did you have difficulty?) No.. it was okay. (What did you do when you had parts you couldn’t understand?) I asked my friend and she explained well. I had some sentences I cannot get the meaning from, but the video lessons helped me solve the problems.

Although the interactive reading with peers were not directly yielded by the summarization task, but more attributed to the group discussion, it is still worthwhile to note. This is because such peer interaction would not be generated actively if the given comprehension task was in other close-ended forms such as short answers questions, which are frequently used in classroom. The reading comprehension task including summarization invokes a higher level of coherence as the goal of reading (Linderholm et al., 2004). Accordingly, the summarization task was effective of stimulating group discussion because it was structured enough to provoke meaningful interaction to achieve understanding of the text (Klingner & Vaughn, 2000).
Reversely, the collaborative dialogue assisted the students’ language learning including summary writing and reading comprehension (Klingner & Vaughn, 2000; Momtaz & Garner, 2010; Swain, 2000). The students in the present program took advantage of the group discussion for their reading comprehension and summarizing process, which otherwise could have been completely a private, individual process that could be tedious.

The researcher admits that the group discussion was not instructionally supportive enough for the low-achieving students to write summaries and understand the text better. Klingner and Vaughn (2000) warns that the benefits of peer learning are not automatically drawn to all the L2 learners, but they can only be maximized when the class is appropriately structured to have good quality of interaction among the participating peers. As discussed in the previous segment (4.2.2), the restricted result is attributed to the reading materials that were beyond the ability level of some students. Some related pedagogical suggestions for future practices are presented in the next chapter.

4.2.1.3. Perceptions on the Reading Passages

As Student E and K, who made low-achievement in this program, these four high-achieving students expressed positive impression on
the passages in relation to the narrative feature. Here are some of the related comments.

Data Excerpt 18 Interview with Student F
I liked the passages because they were somewhat different from the textbook passages. *(How different?)* I think they were like story.

Data Excerpt 19 Survey Response of Student I
The passages in the textbook are artificial writing whereas the stories dealt in this class were real stories.

Distinctively, these four students showed positive comments with respect to the full-length news reports because reading them simulated real-world reading behaviors. Some excerpts of the student’s responses reveal this.

Data Excerpt 20 Interview with Student D
I have tried to read English books at home. But I honestly feel difficult. *(why?)* Because they are long and take time to finish. *(Then, how were the passages in this class?)* The news reports are long but not too long. I felt that I was reading real writing.

Data Excerpt 21 Survey Response of Student F
I am not overwhelmed by the length anymore when I have to read lengthy texts. I felt like I read real English.
Data Excerpt 22 Interview with Student I
Of course, reading long ones was difficult. But I enjoyed the feeling of reading English writing. At school or the private institute I have attended, I usually practiced English reading by short passages. But they do not make me feel that I am reading English.

Data Excerpt 23 Interview with Student L
Reading was not easy. *(why?)* The vocabulary was difficult and the passages were long. But, the vocabulary part was manageable because I read the passage after I learned the new words. I sometimes felt lazy to read because the passages were longer than those in the English workbook. *(What were your feeling when you read such long passages in this class?)* Since I read and understand what was going on for myself, I felt like I was reading a book. When I read the passages in textbook, I don’t feel like that way because I have already learned the content from the workbook.

In fact, Bae (2017) mentioned that a consensus was drawn from the related studies that any texts containing over twice or three times the amounts of words than the shorter counterparts can be evaluated as longer ones. The average number of words in the passages was 378 while the textbook of first graders contains average 160 words in a passage. In this regard, the length of the passages used in this program might be felt longer by the most of the first graders or the second graders who did not have affluent experiences of intensive reading and writing instruction in private education.

Students’ positive comments regarding the length of the passages lead to the explanation that reading longer texts has something more reflective of
real-world reading than reading short segmental texts that they have usually read to practice English reading. This explanation is supported by the argument made by Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978). If reading comprehension is defined as the forming of a coherent mental representation of the textual meaning, longer texts tend to be more conducive to such way of reading because longer texts provide expanded or redundant information including time frames or locations that can be used as clues or contexts to grasp the central idea (Armbruster, 1984; Swaffer et al., 1991). This notion provided the rationale of using longer text in reading assessment in order to neutralize the biasing effect of reader’s background knowledge in comprehension performance (Johnston, 1984). Yang (2014) left a final remark that summarization instruction would elicit more meaningful reading comprehension performance when it is conducted with longer passages to read.

4.2.1.4. Discussion in relation to their Achievement

These four students’ retrospective accounts on their reading during the intervention of the program can lend themselves into the interpretation that the present reading program facilitated the development of reading comprehension ability of the L2 readers who do not have affluent
experiences of private education for English.

Three meaningful reading behaviors were identified. First, the students had opportunities for independent reading without teacher’s involvement. During the independent reading, rereading frequently occurred and the students read the given passage persistently to achieve a higher level of understanding compared to their previous reading behaviors. This independent reading experience is believed to play a significant role in improving reading ability as proved by studies on SSR (Foorman et al., 2006; Garan, 2008; Yoon, 2002).

Second, the students were more engaged in finding important information during reading because they were aware of the task demand of summarization. Previous studies in L1 and L2 reading demonstrated such cognitive behaviors in various ways (e.g., Armbruster et al., 1987; Fan 2009; Joh, 2000; Kim & Park, 2001; Ponce, 2000; Rinehart et al., 1986; Yang, 2014) and explained the benefits of summarization in line with the increase in the metacognitive effort of distinguishing the major information from minor one from the text (Pearson & Fielding, 1996).

Third, the students were assisted by each other through the social interaction with peers that occurred during performing summarization. Swain (2000) explained such collaborative dialogues shared between peers help the learners go beyond their own ability. Empirical studies revealed that
the social interaction in reading class facilitated reading comprehension process and lead to the improvement of language ability of the EFL readers (Klingner & Vaughn, 2000; Momtaz & Garner, 2010).

Although the described behaviors may not be seen extraordinarily special, the comparison with their past reading behaviors suggests that the students obtained more agency in their reading process. As a result, the students became more active readers during the program, which is a real value that teaching summarization strategies attempt to achieve (Rinehart & Thomas, 1993).

With respect to the perception on the reading passage, the length of the passages gave them an impression that the reading experiences in this program simulates the real-world reading. The long passages were facilitative of developing reading comprehension ability because the rich information in the text helped them trace a central thread to formulate the gist (Armbruster, 1984; Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; Swaffer et al, 1991). Also, Johnston (1984) admits that the passages should be long enough to have central ideas to be extracted, which is the essence of summarizing after reading.
4.2.2. Students E and K: Low-achieving Students

Student E and K were those who made decreases in their recall test score although Student E made some qualitative increase in her recalled idea units. With respect to their class engagement, they attended all the sessions, and completed all the assignments of writing summaries although they did not make good performance on the vocabulary quizzes. Student E rarely watched video lessons while Student K watched all (see Table 4.7).

4.2.2.1. Profiles of Learning Experiences of English Reading

Student E, who was the first grade level, had affluent experiences of learning of English. She received private tutoring from a Korean teacher at the age of six for two years. She learned how to read out English words and sentences and read some short children’s book from the teacher. She attended an after-school class at the first grade of elementary school for one year, where she learned chants and read some children’s book. At the same time, she went to a small institute giving instruction for listening and reading. After quitting it, she attended three language academies for four years from 2nd grade until 6th grade consecutively. First two institutes, she read short chapter book series regularly and did follow-up speaking and
writing activities. The writing activities included summarization in English. At the third institute which she attended at the 6th grade, she read very difficult English passages and was asked to discuss and write essays on the topic. She reported that those academies assigned a large amount of vocabulary to be memorized, which was reckoned as an unforgettably unpleasing experience.

Student K, who was first grade level, went to a local institutes for two years since 1st grade of elementary school. She learned listening, speaking, reading and writing from a material developed by the institute. At 5th grade, she attended an after-school class, where she learned English grammar and speaking from a Korean and English native teacher. Since 6th grade until currently, she conducted in independent reading at home through online library linked from the homepage of her school.

Despite the different amount and intensity in their previous learning experiences, they both showed similar performance at the end of the program.

4.2.2.2. Perceptions on the Summarization Task

The two students commonly regarded the summarization task helped them understand the news reports. The difference between their perceived
experiences is that one student was benefitted in enhancing confidence while the other student in developing a reading strategy. The following survey excepts represent this.

Data Excerpt 24 Survey Response of Student E
Summarization helped me understand the news reports… My reading ability was improved due to the practice of summarization. I think I am able to read better than before.

Data Excerpt 25 Survey Response of Student K
I could understand the news reports better because of the summarization task…When I read English in the past, it was difficult because I did not know how to read. And I didn’t not make effort to find main ideas while reading. As I practiced summarization after reading in this class, I think I learned a good reading strategy.

Regardless of their perceived positive effect of the summarization task on their reading performance in this program, Student E and K did not actively participate in group discussion on their selected important ideas, which was a part of summarization task in this program. The following excerpts illustrate this.

Data Excerpt 26 Teacher’s log (written in April 20)
While the students were talking about why they chose particular sentences in their Hot Seven list, Student E and K were observed listening to their friends not talking anything. They had their own list they chose themselves.
Data Excerpt 27 Interview with Student E
(Why didn’t you talk that much when we had group discussion on comparing the Hot Seven list with friends?) I just didn’t know what to say. I think I didn’t have nothing to say..

Data Excerpt 28 Interview with Student K
(Why didn’t you talk that much when we had group discussion on comparing the Hot Seven list with friends?) I think I didn’t understand the passages enough.. But my friends’ talking was helpful to me in understanding the text better.

Their lack of active participation in group discussion seems to indicate that the students were not able to establish a full understanding of the text meaning although they selected their own important idea units, presumably with the help of friends or the instructor’s help. Also, the quantitative result on their recall test also shows that Student E and K did not make any demonstrable growth after the program, which needs critical explanations on the reason. The researcher attributes the reason to the reading passages whose readability was beyond their reading ability. The following segment illustrates their reading experiences regarding the reading passage.

4.2.2.3. Perceptions on the Reading Passages

Student E and K valued positively the reading passages assigned in this program because the real-world stories were related to them or
interesting compared to other reading materials they usually read to study English. The following is the students’ comments.

Data Excerpt 29 Survey Response of Student E
The passages were interesting.

Data Excerpt 30 Interview with Student K
They [the passages] were real stories. They were different from textbook passages.

The researcher believes that the students’ positive evaluation on the reading passages was presumably due to the narrative discourse of the reading materials. The familiar topic (Graesser et al., 1996) and familiar rhetorical sequences (William et al., 2004) may influence the students’ perception on the easiness of reading the text. These features of the reading passages are considered to have played a role of intriguing and sustaining the students’ motivation in reading.

On the other hand, the linguistic level of the passage and its extended length were not considered appropriate to the two students regardless of the researcher’s effort to choose appropriate reading materials satisfying the participants’ readability9. As their low performance on the vocabulary quiz

9 The range of the Lexile index of the eight passages in this study was between
class shows (see Table 4.7), the vocabulary of the passages assigned to them was turned out to be challenging for them. The researcher recognized that some of the reading passages contained grammatical structures that were not covered yet by the regular curriculum of grade 1, although they were relatively simple (e.g., complex structures having conjunctions such as ‘because’ or ‘when’). This yielded difficulty to the student like Student K whose grammatical knowledge predominantly depends on the language input given by the school due to the limited learning experiences of English outside school. This is illustrated in some excerpts from the students’ responses on the survey and a series of observation notes from the teacher’s log.

Data Excerpt 31 Survey Response of Student E
I had hard time learning new words. But I could understand more than 90%.

Data Excerpt 32 Interview with Student E
Summarizing helped me to understand the texts better. (What was the difficulty you had during reading?) I didn’t have any. (Were you able to read the text without difficulty?) I had some but I could manage.

490 and 710; range of the number words was between 343 and 417. According to Lee (2014), the approximate range of the Lexile index among the middle school grade 1 textbooks range from 300 to 500. According to the calculation done by the researcher, the grade 1 textbook used by the students has average 160-word-long reading passage in each chapter.
Data Excerpt 33 Teacher’s log (written in April 20)

I noticed that Student E was translating individual sentences while other group members were talking about the selected sentences as seven important ideas. While other students in her group were talking about their Hot Seven list, she was fully occupied with reading the passage. She just listed down a series of the translated individual sentences to compose a summary. When she was asked to explain what the story says, she told me some peripheral information but did not tell me an overall idea.

Data Excerpt 34 Survey Response of Student K

I felt overwhelmed by the length of the passages. I couldn’t decipher well.

Data Excerpt 35 Teacher’s log (written in May 18)

I made Student K verbalize what she was understanding at every paragraph. She had difficulty in comprehending the ideas worded in a complex structure having subordinate conjunction or relative clause structure such as ‘because’ or ‘when’, which was not yet covered in her regular English class.

Data Excerpt 36 Teacher’s log (written in May 25)

Student K could not demonstrate what she understood in her own words although she could literally encode the sentences into Korean.

In fact, Student E and K were different in that Student E perceived the reading passages were readable while Student K admitted that the reading passages were difficult to her. Nevertheless, considering the researcher’s consistent observation on the students’ performance on the summarization
task and their recall protocols, Student E as well as Student K are seen to have had difficulty in processing the textual meaning.

In order to compensate for the students’ difficulties yielded by the passages’ linguistic level, the researcher exerted several instructional efforts such as giving subsequent video lectures on the difficult grammatical structures that appeared on the reading passage, questioning on what they read as a way of scaffolding their reading process or matching them to the proficient student to receive peer help. These instructional practices were implemented in hope that that teacher’s supportive involvement is pedagogically needed to facilitate adolescent students’ reading engagement in the instructional setting (Skinner & Belmont, 1993) as shown in the empirical study on a group of East Asian adolescent students (Shih, 2008). Nevertheless, such instructional involvements did not link to the demonstrable outcome on the post-recall test, the two students regarded them supportive.

It is seen that the readability level of the passages was beyond the level at which the two students can comprehend the passages on their own. There is an assumption in L1 and L2 reading that the slow and inefficient processing in word- or sentential levels (i.e., lower-level processing, Grabe, 2009) consumes the readers’ working memory resources that might otherwise be used for higher level process such as inference generation. This
yields poor comprehension of the text (Grabe, 2009; Perfetti, 1985). As a result, the 12 hours of instructional experiences for summarization after reading seem not enough for them to attain some level of proficiency in reading comprehension, presumably because the students’ cognitive resources were frequently occupied with processing word- or sentential level textual meaning, not devoted to building a coherent representation of the whole text meaning. This limited result yields pedagogical suggestions, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

4.2.2.4. Discussion in relation to their Achievement

Students E and K, who were hard workers during the program but low-achievers on the test, performed the eight summarization tasks with care. Their summaries included major information of the passages, which admittedly might be the result of the group discussion for summarization. Student E perceived that the summarization task helped her to understand the passage better and Student K regarded the series of summarization task as developing a reading strategy.

However, their positive reading experiences in relation to the summarization task were not linked to the growth in terms of the recall test. The researcher seeks the reason from the incongruence between the
readability of the passages and the students’ reading level. This difficulty was reported by the two students both regardless of the different amount and intensity of their previous extra learning experiences of English between them. Due to the linguistic difficulty, what they practiced from a series of summarization tasks seems to encode individual sentences, not to build a more comprehensive picture of the textual meaning. And these challenges were not solved through the researcher’s instructional efforts to assist them to read the passages. This implies that the effect of summarization on reading comprehension is manifested when the reading passages are readable to the extent that the explanations at word- or sentential level are minimally required. Nevertheless, they had some enjoyment in reading due to the event-based story line on real-world stories, which is believed to the contributor of maintaining the less proficient English readers’ engagement in reading.
CHAPTER 5.
CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the results and discussions in the previous chapter. Section 5.1 presents the major findings of the present study. The section 5.2 suggests some pedagogical implications on teaching and learning of second language reading. Finally, section 5.3 discusses the limitations of the present study and provides suggestions for future studies.

5.1. Major Findings

The purpose of this study was to introduce an English reading program focusing on summarization for middle school students and to explore learning experiences in terms of the reading ability development and reading behaviors during summarization task and perceptions on the passages. The major findings are summarized as follows:

First, the present reading program improved some of the participants’ reading comprehension ability although some did not change.

Second, the ability to distinguish major from minor information was moderately improved after practicing summarization. This is revealed by the
quantitative analysis of the recalled idea units and the qualitative analysis of the students’ reading experiences.

Third, although the summarization task in this program was perceived helpful in developing English reading ability by both of the low- and high-achievers, the low achieving students’ performance on the summarization task did not transfer to the development of English reading ability. This is because the reading passages were difficult for them in terms of vocabulary and grammar, which hindered them from building a coherent representation of the textual message, but made them continuously engage in sentential-level processing of the text during the summarization task.

Fourth, the summarization task implemented in this program resulted in several implicational reading behaviors during reading. Requiring summarization after reading pushed them to engage in independent reading. The independent reading to summarize generated some self-directed reading behaviors including rereading for problem-solving and reading persistently for overall comprehension not for detecting clues. Students practiced extracting the main points while reading for summarization. Summarization task made the group discussion for reading comprehension interactive.

Fifth, the narrative-like passages were positively appreciated by the students in general including those who had linguistic difficulty. On the other hand, the lengthiness of the passages was conducive to writing
summaries or reading for summarization because they had rich contexts to formulate gist. However, the positive value on the lengthiness was only found to the students who showed high achievement.

Overall, this study made claims of summarization being contributable to enriching English reading experiences in classroom and improving reading ability. The summarization task was facilitative of interactive reading through group discussion and the relatively long reading passages were conducive to writing summaries. Nevertheless, such effects were not demonstrated to some low-proficient readers whose ability was below the given passages. This limited result lends itself to pedagogical suggestions.

5.2. Pedagogical Implications

Based on the major findings of the study described above, the present study suggests the following implications for pedagogical practices for second language reading.

First, requiring summarization as a reading comprehension task creates a natural context for independent reading.

Second, summarization task facilitates self-directed reading behaviors. Summarizing English texts in Korean can also be an effective way of improving reading comprehension ability.
Third, the reading materials should be carefully chosen in terms of the readability in order to manifest the positive effect of the summarization practice and the group discussion for summarization on the reading comprehension development.

Fourth, if the readability of the passage is adequate to the students’ reading proficiency level, lengthier passages will be more facilitative of developing reading comprehension through summarization practice.

Fifth, when narrative texts are used for summarization instruction, the focus of the assessment should be given to different aspects. For instance, the teacher can evaluate how comprehensively the summarizers formulate the story line with key features of narratives including characters, events, settings and resolutions, not evaluating how much hierarchically important information the summarizers found.

5.3. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies

The present study admits several limitations that yield some suggestions for future studies. First, the quantitative result on a large proportion of the students who did not demonstrate any growth after the program is self-explanatory of the limitation of the present study. This aspect is fully discussed in the previous chapter in the light of the incongruence between
the readability of the material and the participants’ reading proficiency. The modification of the reading material was not made directly because there was little reading materials that were not only readable to lower-level L2 readers, whose Lexile is presumably around 400, but also cognitively intriguing enough to the early adolescent learners. Future studies can be designed with more flexible instructional practices. For instance, the instructor can assign different reading materials according to the students’ different reading abilities.

Second, the mixed methods design used by the present researcher itself bears some weakness. Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) suggests that researchers who are academically experienced in multiple methods should try the research design otherwise it is very difficult to avoid some major challenges. The present researcher, who is in an M.A program, recognizes herself as a novice researcher. Nevertheless, she incorporated both methods into this case study because she hoped to draw a fuller picture of the students’ performance of the program. Future studies can be conducted more professionally as a form of co-work between more experienced researchers in academia and experienced teachers in field.

Third, some limitations are present in the data collection phase. The survey and interview might not have elicited sufficient quantity and quality of descriptive responses from the middle school participants due to some
realistic reasons such as time constraints and the young adolescents’ limited capability to describe their reflective thoughts. Future studies can implement subsequent in-depth interviews to the students who need some extra explanations to understand them.

Fundamental goal of English reading pedagogy is to enable the learners to read extensively for pleasure or for education outside classroom. Middle school English learners in EFL context such as Korea needs some instructional help to equip the ability to perform to that extent. The English reading program focusing on summarization allowed the students to have constructive learning experiences that can be resources to be independent L2 in the near future. From this perspective, in this study pose implicational suggestions for English classroom in middle school.
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APPENDIX 1.
Worksheet for Summary

#7(6/1) Petcube

Name _____

A. 중요한 부분을 7군데 찾아 써보세요. (6분 동안 쓸 것)

B. 위에 쓴 내용을 갖고 한편의 요약문을 한국어로 써봅시다.

<요약문 작성 요령>
1) 기사문 전체에 대한 중심문장을 만든다.
2) ‘Hot Seven’에 고른 문장을 포함하여 중요한 문장을 고른다.
3) 고른 문장을 연결어(그리고, 그런데, 그려나 등)와 지시어(그, 그녀)를 적절히 사용하여 하나의 단락으로 만든다.
4) 글을 매끄럽게 다듬고 아래 공간을 넘지 않게 써본다.

♥ Checklist to polish my summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes / No</th>
<th>지켰나요..?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
<td>1. 중심내용을 찾았나요?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
<td>2. 5가지 이상의 중요한 정보를 적었나요?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
<td>3. 덜 중요한 정보를 포함시키지 않았나요?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______</td>
<td>4. 연결어, 지시어를 사용하여 흐름이 자연스러운 요약문을 완성하였나요?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In this file photo taken Oct. 11, 2013, Malala Yousafzai speaks about her fight for girls' education in Pakistan on the International Day of the Girl at the World Bank in Washington. In 2012, she was shot by Pakistani Taliban fighters because she spoke out for girls' education. Photo:

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan — Middle Eastern teen activist Malala Yousafzai was shot in the head in 2012 and survived. She was shot by Taliban fighters. They were angry with her because she was trying to help girls go to school in Pakistan. Yousafzai was just 15 and on her way home from school at the time. Two other girls were also injured in the attack.

Yousafzai has since become famous around the world. Although she is only a teenager, she acts much older than her age. Since being shot, she has called for getting more girls educated in very religious areas of Pakistan. Her views upset Islamic extremists. They believe that girls should not go to school. They think they should stay in the home.

The Shooters Have Been Caught
On Friday, Pakistan’s army said that it has arrested 10 fighters. They believe those 10 men helped to attack Yousafzai. The fighters were a part of a terror group.

General Asim Saleem Bajwa is the Pakistani army spokesman. He said the men were acting on orders from Mullah Fazlullah. He is the head of the Pakistani Taliban, a terror organization.

Malala is from the Swat Valley area of northwestern Pakistan. Fazlullah used to live there too, until Pakistan’s army began attacking fighters in the Swat Valley in 2009. The fighters wanted to take over Pakistan. The group wanted to force everyone to obey extreme Islamic laws. Since 2009, Fazlullah has been on the run.

Pakistan thinks he may be hiding across the border in Afghanistan. Pakistan’s government asked the Afghan government about Fazlullah. Afghanistan said it didn’t know anything. The two countries do not trust each other. They blame each other for letting terrorism happen. Bajwa said Pakistan will capture or kill Fazlullah.

**Malala’s Father Is Hopeful**

Malala’s father, Ziauddin Yousafzai, said the arrests of the 10 men is good news for his family. He said it is also important for the people of Pakistan and the world. It gives hope to "the hundreds of thousands of people whose lives have been affected by terrorism." The Yousafzai family now lives safely in Britain.
APPENDIX 3.
Worksheet for Recall Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Student No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

지문을 덮고 기억나는 내용을 한국어로 써보세요. 단어를 나열하는 것이 아니라 문장으로 써보세요. (6분 동안 쓸 것)
APPENDIX 4.

Reading Passage for Pre-recall Test

★ 아래 지문을 4분 동안 읽어보세요. 다 읽고 지문을 안보고 빈 종이에 중요
한 내용을 한국어로 쓰불 것입니다. 주제와 관련이 큰 내용을 쓰수록 점수를 더
받게 될 것입니다.

Salim lives with his mother and father, six brothers and lots of family in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is in Asia. It is a country at war. Salim has left Afghanistan for now. He is in the United States. Now Salim lives with Sandy Tabor-Gray and Jim Gray in North Carolina.

Salim is 14 years old. His left arm was hurt badly. Salim is living with the Gray family so doctors can help his hurt arm. The help is free. Solace for the Children is paying for it. Solace means help.

Solace for the Children is a group that helps children from countries that are at war. Solace for the Children brings kids to the United States every summer. They pay $6,000 to $8,000 for each child. The money they need comes from people who want to help. People work for them without pay.

In 2013, Salim hurt his left arm badly. Salim touched a wire while trying to get his kite. He got an electric shock. Doctors had to operate. They took off much of his arm.

In 2014, Salim came to the United States for help. Doctors gave him a new arm. It is not real. This year he came back for more care. “Hey, buddy. How ya doing?” Doctor Glenn Gaston asked Salim. He was in the exam room. Salim smiled shyly. He said his arm did not hurt.

Salim will be with the Grays for a few more weeks. Then he will go back to his family in Afghanistan. Salim is getting stronger. He is learning to do things with the new arm. The Grays have helped 10 children. They feel Solace for the Children helps to bring peace. “We send them home as friends,” Sandy said. Salim said that Sandy loves him as if he was her own son. “She's really nice,” Salim said.
Some people are not kind to animals. They hit or kick their pets. They do not give them enough food. What they do is against the law. Police can arrest them. They might go to jail. Then the animals are taken from their homes.

For a long time, the courts and police in Chicago had a problem with the animals. Chicago is a city in the state of Illinois. The problem was that the animals had no place to go if their owners went to jail. So the animals were in jail too. People called it dog jail. Judges and courts did not care for these pets the right way.

Court cases move slowly. The animals would sometimes be in jail for years. Most dogs were put to sleep when the owner's case ended. The vets who killed the dogs made sure they died fast. They were not in pain. People who fight for animal rights in Chicago were angry. They said this was unfair. Then they came up with a plan. They worked with a group called ‘Safe Humane Chicago.’ The group started the Court Case Dogs program in 2010. It helped to get the animals out of cages.

The program works with the dogs to make them healthy. It helps dogs in many ways. It finds new homes for them. There is even a picture book about some of the dogs. In the past, only 2 out of every 10 dogs in jail used to get out alive. Now 7 out of 10 dogs live. So far the program has taken care of 760 dogs.

Cynthia Bathurst runs Safe Humane Chicago. "These are the dogs everyone should care about," she says.
### APPENDIX 6.

**Scoring Template for the Pre-recall Protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Idea Units</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>salim은 가족(아빠 엄마 6 형제)들과 산다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>salim은 아프가니스탄 아이이다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>아프가니스탄은 아시아에 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>그는 [현재] 미국에 있다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>살림은 아프가니스탄을 떠났다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>그는 현재 미국에 있다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>살림은 그레이 가족(미국의 한 가족)과 산다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>살림은 노스캐롤라이나에서 살고있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>살림은 14살이다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>그는 원쪽팔을 다쳤다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>다친 팔을 치료받고 있다</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>치료는 무료이다(무료로 도움을 받고 있다)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>봉사단체가 도와준다</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Solace는 도움을 의미한다</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Solace for Children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SFC는 전쟁중인 나라의 어린이들을 돕는다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SFC는 아이들을 미국에 데려온다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SFC는 아이들을 때 어린이마다 데려온다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SFC는 6000~8000달러를 각각의 어린이를 위해 지원한다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SFC는 돈이 필요하다</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SFC는 지원금을 후원 받는다</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>후원자들은 SFC를 위해 봉사한다(대가 없이 일한다).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>살림이 왼팔을 다친 해는 2013년이다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>살림은 전선을 만쳤었다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>전선을 만칫을 때 살림은 연을 꺼내고 있었다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>그는 전기감전을 당했다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>살림은 미국에 도움(치료)을 받으러 왔다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>그것은 (살림이 미국에 치료를 받으러 온 것)2014년 이었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>의사들은 그에게 인공팔을 주었다(인공팔을 이식 받았다).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>응해(2015년) 치료를 받기 위해 다시 왔다. [미국에]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>&quot;잘 지냈지&quot;라고 Gaston의사선생님이 말한다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>살림은 검사실에 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>살림은 부끄럽게 웃고 있다</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>그는 팔이 아프지 않다고 말했다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>살림은 그레이 가족과 있을 것이다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>살림은 몇 주 더 [그레이 가족과] 있을 것이다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>그 후 그는 그의 가족 품으로(아프가니스탄으로) 돌아가고 있었다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>살림은 점점 나아지고 있다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>그는 새 팔로 일을 처리하는 것을 배우고 있다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>그레이 가족은 10명의 어린이들을 도와왔다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>그레이 가족은 SFC가 평화를 가져온다고 생각한다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>&quot;우리는 어린이들을 친구로서 집으로 보낸다&quot;라고 샌디가 말했다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>살림은 샌디가 그를 사랑한다고 말했다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>살림은 마치 샌디가 그를 자신의 아들과 같이 여긴다고 말했다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;샌디(그레이 가족)는 정말 친절해요&quot;라고 살림이 말했다.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(  ): 같은말 [  ]: 생략된 말
APPENDIX 7.

Scoring Template for the Post-recall Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Idea Units</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>어떤 사람들은 동물에 친절하지 않다</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>동물에 친절하지 않은 사람들은 애완동물을 때리고 발로 찬다. 동물에 폭력을 행사한다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>애완동물에 먹을 것도 주지 않는다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>이러한 행위(때리거나 굴기는)는 법에 저촉된다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>경찰은 그런 사람들(때리거나 굴기는)을 체포할 수 있다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>그 사람들(동물을 때리거나 굴기는 사람들은)은 감옥에 가게 된다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>그러면 그 동물들은 그들의 집에서 나오게 된다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>오랫동안 시카고에서는 동물관련 문제가 있었다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>시카고 경찰과 법원은 이러한 동물들과 관련된 문제가 있었다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>시카고가 있다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>그래서 그 동물들도 같이 감옥에 넣어진다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>사람들은 그것은 'dog jail'이라 불렀다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>판사와 법원은 이러한 애완동물을 돌보지 않았다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>옳은 방식으로 [돌보지 않았다].</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>판결은 천천히 진행된다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>감옥에 있는 애완동물들은 수년 동안 감옥에 있게 된다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>대부분의 개들은 악화하고 있다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>개들의 주인 소송이 끝날 때 [대부분의 개들은 악화하고 있다.]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>수의사가 [개들을 죽인다]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>수의사는 개들이 신속하게 죽는지를 확인한다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>개들은 고통 없이 죽는다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>동물권리를 주장하는 사람들이 있다</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>시카고에서 [동물권리를 주장하는 사람들이 있다]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>[동물권리를 주장하는 사람들]은 분개하였다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>동물권리 옹호자는 이 상황이 불공평하다고 생각한다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>동물권리 옹호자는 한 계획안을 제안하였다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>동물권리 옹호자는 한 단체와 일을 하였다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>그 단체의 이름은 'Safe Humane Chicago'이다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>그 단체는 한 프로그램을 시작하였다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>그 프로그램의 이름은 Court Case Dog 이다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2010년에 [Court Case Dog] 프로그램을 시작하였다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>그 프로그램은 동물들이 감옥에서 구출되도록 도왔다.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>그 프로그램은 여러 방식으로 개들을 돕는데. 그 동물들을</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>번호</td>
<td>문장성분</td>
<td>단어수</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>그 프로그램은 개들을 건강하게 해주기 위해 일한다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>그 프로그램은 개들에게 새 가정을 구해준다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>그 프로그램으로 구출된 개들에 관한 그림책도 있다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>과거에</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>[과거에] 감옥에 가둬진 10마리중 단지 2마리만이</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>소수만 살아서 나오곤 했었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>지금은 많이 살아 나온다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>10마리중 7마리가 [살아나온다]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>지금까지 그 프로그램은 760마리의 강아지를 보살펴왔다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cynthia Bathurst란 여성이 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>어떤 여성이 Safe Humane Chicago를 운영한다.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;이 개들은 우리 모두가 돌봐야 할 아이들이다&quot;라고 말했다.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) : 감은말 [ ] : 생략된 말
국문 초록

이 연구는 한국 중학교 영어학습자들이 교실에서의 풍성한 영어 읽기 경험을 할 수 있고 궁극적으로 그들이 스스로, 능숙하게 영어를 읽을 수 있도록 도와주는 영어독해수업을 제시하는데 목적이 있다. 주요 과업은 요약하기이다. 요약하기 과업은 부분적으로 협동학습으로 이루어지며, 수업에서 사용한 읽기 자문은 네러티브적 요소를 지닌 완전한 길이의 신문 기사이다. 이 연구는 참가학생들의 학습경험을 두 측면 즉, 영어독해능력이 얼마나 향상되었는지 그리고 수업 중에 읽기 행동과 자문에 대한 인식 측면에서 어떠한 읽기 경험을 했는지에 관해 기술된다.

수업의 참여자는 서울의 일반 중학교에 다니는 13명의 학생이다. 이 수업은 10회차로 구성되어 있다. 처음과 맨 끝 회차는 모국어를 활용한 원안회상(the L1 free written recall)을 사용하여 학생들의 독해능력 변화를 알 수 있는 정보를 수집하였다. 가운데 8회차 동안 독해 수업이 진행된 다. 8차시 수업에서 학생들은 8개의 신문기사를 읽고 요약하기를 위한 일련의 수업활동을 하였다. 프로그램에서의 학생들의 읽기 경험을 보여주는 정보는 맨 마지막 차시에 실시한 설문조사와 인터뷰를 통해 수집하였 다. 학생들의 원안회상 검사지 (recall protocols)는 회상된 정보의 총 개수와 그 정보의 중요도를 중심으로 기술적, 통계적으로 분석되었고, 인터뷰 및 설문조사 응답 자료와 교사일지의 기록들은 질적으로 분석되었다.

회상된 정보의 총 개수로 계산된 사전 사후 검사의 점수를 통해 학생
개개인은 상이한 성취도를 보였음을 알 수 있었다. 집단 전체의 향상 정도는 통계적으로 유의미한 정도였지만, 비교적 많은 학생들의 점수가 오르지 않거나 오히려 떨어지기도 하였다. 한편, 지문을 읽고 각 정보 (proposition)의 상대적 중요도를 분별하는 능력에는 약간의 긍정적 변화가 있었다. 이 결과는 학생들의 자신들의 임기행동에 관한 경험담에 근거하여 메타인지적 발전으로 해석된다.

학생들의 임기 경험에 대한 긴장된 탐구를 통해 본 독해수업의 영어능력 발전에 공헌한 점, 그리고 수업에서 개선되어야 할 점을 고찰해보았다. 요약하기 파업은 학생들이 스스로 임을 수 있는 장을 마련하였고, 임을 때 중심내용 파악에 집중하도록 하였다. 또한 요약하기 파업은 모둠 토의를 활발하게 하여 임기가 사회적 활동이 되었다. 지문에 대한 인식 측면에서 지문의 네리처적 성격 덕분에 지문이 쉽게 인식되었으며 상대적으로 긴 지문의 특징은 요약문을 작성하는데 있어 이롭다고 인식되었다. 하지만 이러한 경험은 점수가 오른 학생들에게 주로 일어났으며 점수가 오르지 않은 비교적 많은 수의 학생들의 학습경험은 이 독해수업에 중요한 시사점을 제시한다. 즉, 학생의 임기수준보다 높은 지문을 사용하는 것은 요약하기 수업의 긍정적 효과를 누리는데 치명적으로 방해요소이며 이것은 이후 수업에 있어 개선될 점으로 꼽는다.

주요어: 제 2언어 학습환경, 제 2언어 임기, 요약하기, 원안회상, 질적탐구
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