



IRAQI  
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية  
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية

ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

**Journal of Language Studies**

Contents available at: <http://www.iasj.net/iasj/journal/356/about>



## The Effect of (DRTA) Strategy on Iraqi EFL Students' Text Comprehension Achievement

**Maqbola Mohammed Rajab\***

General Directorate of Salahudin Education/ AL-Dour Education Department

[mqbwihm2@gmail.com](mailto:mqbwihm2@gmail.com)

&

**Prof. Nagham Qadoory Yahya (Ph.D.)**

University of Tikrit / College of Education for Human Science /Department of

English

[nagyahya@tu.edu.iq](mailto:nagyahya@tu.edu.iq)

Received: 26 / 9 /2023 , Accepted: 5 / 10 /2023, Online Published: 30 / 11 / 2023

© This is an open Access Article under The Cc by LICENSE

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



### Abstract

This study aims at finding out the effect of Direct Reading Thinking Activity(DRTA) on EFL students' achievement in reading comprehension (RC). To achieve the aim of the study, a quasi-experimental nonrandomized control group, pretest-posttest design is employed. Two groups are randomly selected from the fifth preparatory grade in AL-Dour Preparatory School for Boys for the academic year (2021-2022) to represent the sample of the study which conclude (75) students. The two groups (each group consists of 30 students) are submitted to the same pretest in RC to ensure equivalence among groups. Then the first group is taught according to(DRTA) strategy, whereas the first group is taught according to (DRTA) strategy and the second is taught according to the

\* **Corresponding Author** : Maqbola Mohammed, **Email**: [mqbwihm2@gmail.com](mailto:mqbwihm2@gmail.com)

**Affiliation**: General Directorate of Salahudin Education - Iraq

conventional method. After achieving the validity of the test, a pilot study is conducted to (50) students of the fifth preparatory stage /AL-Kastal Preparatory School for Boys. Then the two groups are subjected to the same achievement post-test in RC. The data are analyzed statistically by using ANOVA. The results suggest that there are statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group in achievement post-tests of RC, in favor of the experimental group. The results also show that the second group taught according to (DRTA) strategy is better than the first group taught according to conventional method.

**Keywords:** Direct Reading Thinking Activity Strategy, reading comprehension.

اثر استراتيجيتي (DRTA) في تحصيل فهم النصوص لدى طلبة اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية في العراق

م. م مقبوله محمد رجب

المديرية العامة لتربية صلاح الدين/ قسم تربية الدور

و

الأستاذ الدكتور نغم قدوري يحيى

جامعة تكريت/ كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

### المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة أثر استراتيجيتي (DRTA) في تحصيل فهم النصوص لدى طلبة اللغة الإنكليزية لغة أجنبية في العراق. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة، استعمل الباحث التصميم شبه التجريبي باختبار قبلي وبعدي ومجموعة ضابطة، وتم اختيار مجموعتين عشوائياً من طالبات الصف الخامس الإعدادي في إعدادية الدور للبنين للعام الدراسي 2021-2022 لتمثيل عينة الدراسة التي مثلت 75 طالب في مجموعتين (35 طالب للتجريبية و40 طالب للمجموعة الضابطة). وخضعت المجموعتين للاختبار القبلي نفسه في الاستيعاب القرائي والغرض من ذلك تكافؤ المجموعات، ثم دُرست المجموعة التجريبية الأولى على وفق استراتيجية (DRTA) في حين دُرست المجموعة الضابطة على وفق الطريقة التقليدية. وبعد التحقق من صدق الاختبارات، أجريت دراسة استطلاعية على 50 طالب من الخامس الإعدادي / إعدادية القسطل للبنين. ثم خضعت المجموعتين للاختبار البعدي نفسه في الاستيعاب القرائي. وتم تحليل البيانات إحصائياً باستعمال قانون تحليل التباين الأحادي. وأظهرت النتائج وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية عند مستوى الدلالة 0.05 بين المجموعة التجريبية والمجموعة الضابطة ولصالح المجموعة التجريبية في اختبار الاستيعاب القرائي البعدي، وأظهرت النتائج كذلك أنّ المجموعة التجريبية التي دُرست على وفق استراتيجية (DRTA) أفضل من المجموعة الضابطة التي دُرست على وفق الطريقة التقليدية.

**الكلمات الدالة:** استراتيجية (DRTA)، الاستيعاب القرائي .

## Section One

### 1.Introduction

Reading plays a significant role in students' academic life. Various kinds of information are obtained through reading, It is a receptive skill in which the readers try to understand the written text. Grellet (1996:34) teaching reading is “the combination of word recognition, intellect, and emotion interrelated with prior knowledge to understand the message communicated”. Dubin and Bycina(1991:195) define reading, as a process that occurs between the reader and the text, through which knowledge of the context and different styles, interact with the text to achieve text comprehension. Al-Soufi(2017) agree that reading is crucial to learning as it allows achieving three important goals: building knowledge, acquiring information for accomplishing tasks, deriving pleasure and feeding our interest.

Along with the reading process, that is an important activity for knowledge, literature, and culture extension, utilizing strategies in teaching reading enables learners who might adjust the purpose of reading and understand what they are reading( Nunan, 1991:259).

Understanding various types of text, requires the ability to comprehend the content otherwise, one cannot deliver information accurately and easily(Djiwandono and Soenardi 1996:62). Teacher of EFL, at different stages, believe that learners lack comprehension in learning English since they spend their time in many hard tasks, which make language learning boring; Inadequate interaction makes learners consider reading as a passive activity, which is not, because the brain works consciously and unconsciously to retain information if the proper strategies have applied(Yassen,2013:3). Droff(1988:33) adds that " till now teachers are still facing difficulty in how to provide their students with positive experiences, opportunities and new strategies to learn and reflect their negative experiences of learning".

Based on explanations above, it seems clear that there are still problems faced in teaching reading comprehension. It will be English teachers' task to solve the problem. There are many ways to solve problems and some of these strategies include (DRTA) strategy in teaching reading comprehension for preparatory school's students. This strategy is based on a socialization which derive information from content within discussion by teacher-students, and students-students interaction, enable students to comprehend reading well. So the current study attempts to investigate the effect of DRTA strategy based on text comprehension on the achievement of the EFL students' reading comprehension.

### **1.1 Aim of the study**

The study aims at finding out:

1.The effect of (DRTA) strategy based on text comprehension on the achievement of EFL students' reading comprehension.

### **1.2 Hypothesis of the study**

1- There is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance 0.05 between the mean scores' achievement of the first experimental group which is taught according to (DRTA) strategy and that of the control group which is taught according to the conventional method in Reading Comprehension post-test.

### **1.3 Limits of the Study**

This study is limited to:

- 1-Students at the 5<sup>th</sup> preparatory stage during the academic year 2021-2022.
- 2-The reading texts exist in the 5<sup>th</sup> preparatory stage textbook (English For Iraq /Student book and Activity Book).

## **Section Two**

### **2 - The concept of DRTA**

Much information has been written about the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity and its importance for improving reading comprehension in general. According to Tierney, Readence and Dishner (1995) the DR-TA is a strategy for building independent readers. They improve that this strategy has the potential to equip readers with the abilities to determine purposes for reading, examine reading materials based on these purposes, suspend judgments and make decisions based upon information gleaned from the text. (Richardson et al, 2009:108,109) mention that Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) is an activity that helps students' understanding that each segment of text can help them figure out the next segment. It is because the text is divided into smaller portions, the students can focus on the process of responding to higher - order questions. The use of prior knowledge and prediction is clearly of great value in helping students set purposes for reading and use their own experiences as a basis for comprehending text. Prior knowledge and prediction is utilized in the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) developed in 1969 by Russell Stauffer.

Likewise, Jennings and Shepherd (1969) state that the DR-TA helps students become aware of the reading strategies, understand the reading process, and develop prediction skills. They add that this strategy stimulates students' thinking and makes them listen to the opinions of others and modify their own in light of additional information.

#### **2.1.The Advantages and Disadvantages of DRTA Strategy:**

Any strategy that is used by the teacher in teaching learning process give purposes to the teachers and students. Jennings and Shepherd's (1998), there are reasons why using DRTA strategy in reading class such as it helps students become aware of the reading strategies, understand the reading process, and develop prediction skills. Burn (1996:331) mentions that "DRTA may be useful for improving students' comprehension of reading selections because the student is interacting with the material during reading and making prediction about what will occur in a text encourages students to think about the text message".

#### **2.2 Procedures of DRTA**

DRTA helps students in making predictions about a text and then reading to confirm or refuse their predictions. It helps pupils to be active and thoughtful readers, enhancing their comprehension. When implementing the D R T A, teachers should follow these steps as was mentioned in (Directed Reading Thinking Activity, 2015:82):

**-D. Direct:** Teachers direct and stimulate students thinking prior to reading a passage by scanning the title, chapter headings, illustrations and other explanatory materials. Then, teacher, should use open-ended questions to direct students as they make predictions about the text.

**-R- Reading :** Teacher should make students read up to the first preselected stopping point in the text. The teacher, then, prompts the students with questions about specific information and asks them to evaluate their predictions and refine them if necessary. This process should be continued until students become able to read each section of the passage.

**-T-Thinking:** At the end of reading Teacher should have students go back through the text and think about their predictions students should verify or modify the accuracy of their predictions by finding supporting statements in the text. DRTA may be implemented individually in a small group, or with a whole class. The teacher, the material and the group are all essential to the success of this strategy.

### **2.3 The purpose of DRTA**

The purpose of DRTA is to help encourage students to be active and thoughtful reader and to activate prior knowledge and background knowledge to gain a better understanding of reading and the material. Also it helps students develop monitoring while reading, because the students are always checking to make sure their prediction are right and their understanding. Another purpose is to help the reader to create a link his prior knowledge and the text. Hence, the DRTA may provoke thinking activity and may be more stimulating to the student (Youssef, 1988:83).

### **2.4. The Concept of Reading Comprehension**

Reading is one of essential language skills that must be learnt and developed by all language learners. This is because most of beneficial information and many education sources are come up in a piece of writing that requires every person who wants to get something from it reads it first. This skill is not a matter of reading only, but more crucial than that comprehends what people read. This term is known as reading comprehension.

Kamhi & Catts (2008:226-228) explain that Reading is an interactive process containing inferring, knowing correct sounds and comprehension. Reading is an activity of readers which enable them to get the information from written text and this activity needs skills as understanding the meaning of the text and how to reach this understanding to others.

### **2.5 Factors that Affect Reading Comprehension**

Some factors that influence reading comprehension are background experience, language abilities, and thinking abilities, and affection such as interest, beliefs, motivation, attitudes and feelings( Harrys,1995:18).

Some factors that influence a reader ability to comprehend text; students' motivation, vocabulary /background knowledge, automaticity of decoding, fluent reading, and the nature or the genre of the text itself. Motivation has been a central aspect that impact reading comprehension tasks, and in particular, student performance on reading comprehension assessments, so The students will be motivated to read when they fell that they need something from the text (Brown, 1994:21).

### **2.6 Strategies for Reading Comprehension-**

Strategies are defined as ways of reaching a certain goal. Westwood (2008:14) states that strategies can be applied to enhance reading comprehension. In addition, Brown (2001:306) states that “reading comprehension is primarily a matter of developing appropriate, efficient, comprehension strategies.” In brief, reading strategies helps readers comprehend a text.

There are many experts offering strategies for reading comprehension, among of them are Brown (2001), Richards and Schmidt (2002), and Neufeld (2005). Brown (2001) lists ten strategies for reading comprehension which relate ether to the bottom-up approach or to the top down approach. Those are: identifying the purpose of reading, using graph emic rules and patterns to aid in bottom-up decoding, using efficient silent reading techniques for relatively rapid comprehension, skimming the text for main ideas, scanning the text for specific information, using semantic mapping or clustering, guessing when the readers feel uncertain, analyzing

vocabulary, distinguishing between literal and implied meanings, and capitalizing on discourse markers to process relationship.

## **2.7 Previous Studies**

The strategies in this study are employed by different researchers to see their effects on various variables, not only in RC. For example, Abdel Salam.(2006): The aim of the study is to find that the DRTA method is an effective strategy for developing both referential and inferential comprehension skills. The significance of this study lies in the exploration and verification of an avenue for improving secondary stage EFL students' referential and inferential reading Comprehension to enable them to deal wisely with information in the information age. Santi Erliana (2010): The aim of the study was to describe how the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) Strategy can improve reading Comprehension. The data were taken from observation, field notes, questionnaire, and achievement test. The result of this study state that the DRTA not only improves students' Comprehension but also increases their motivation in learning. The sample of the study were thirty-three students of the second semester of the English Education study programs of STAIN Palangka Raya in 2009/2010.

### **3.1 Experimental Design**

Before revealing the kind of expermental design, it is important to define it. To this, ( Wiersma and jurs,2005:101) argue that the experimental design is in fact, one of the first steps in educational research to determine the adequacy of the design for answering the research questions. Goodman (1973:174) states that the experimental design is " the plan according to which experimental groups are selected and experimental treatments are administrated and their effect is answered

there are a number of designs the selection of each design depends on the nature and aims of the study. Some designs are truly experimental, others are quasi-experimental, a quasi experimental design namely the Non- Randomized Experiment Group pretest, post test design is demanded. Consequently, the two groups of the fifth scientific preparatory school students.

### **3.1 Groups Equalization**

The two groups are equalized in terms of age, parents' academic attainment, students' previous scores in English and pretest scores in RC. The researcher also

attempts to control the effects of extraneous variables jeopardizing internal validity of the experiment that may confuse the implementation as well as the results of the experiment such as maturation, history, instrumentation, selection biases,

experimental mortality and instructor.

### **3.2 Instrument of the Study**

The tool of this study includes an achievement test in RC. (See Appendix A). Basic content analysis of the test and syllabus of the textbook 'English for Iraq' for the 5<sup>th</sup> preparatory stage, Student Book (SB) and Activity Book (AB)(units 1,2,3,4) has been constructed to measure students' achievement in RC. The behavioral objectives of this textbook have been prepared by the researcher relying on Bloom's Taxonomy. See Table (1)

| Topics No. | Knowledge | Comprehension | Application | Analysis | Synthesis | Creating | Total |
|------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|
| 1          | 5         | 5             |             |          |           |          | 10    |
| 2          | 4         | 3             |             | 3        |           |          | 10    |
| 3          | 4         | 3             | 3           |          | 2         | 2        | 14    |
| 4          | 4         | 5             | 4           | 2        | 1         | 2        | 18    |
| 5          | 5         | 5             |             |          |           |          | 10    |
| 6          | 3         | 3             | 3           | 3        | 3         | 3        | 18    |
| Total      |           |               |             |          |           |          | 80    |

### **3.3 Construction of an achievement post-test**

The entire test has been scored out of (60) marks. The first question contains five multiple choice items, is scored out of five marks. Each correct answer is given one mark and zero for the wrong one. The second question, which is in WH question form, is given 15 marks. The third question contains five questions fill in the blanks. The total scores of third question is (5). Question four contains five items about WH questions, and the total



score (15). Question five includes five true/false items and the total score is (5). Question six include discussion and the total score is (15).

### **3.4 Validity of an achievement posttest**

Validity in testing and assessment has traditionally been understood to mean discovering whether a test 'measure accurately what is intended to measure' (Hughes, 1989:22) or uncovering the 'appropriateness of a given test or any of its component parts as a measure of what it is purposed to measure' (Henning, 1987:170).

### **3.5 Pilot study**

A pilot study is defined as "a smaller preliminary study that makes it possible to check out standardized procedures and general design before investing time and money in the major study" (Eyseneck and Flangan, 2000:309). A pilot test is helpful to discover if there are certain points that sizable number of students have failed to master (Valette, 1967:46).

### **3.6 Reliability**

Generally, reliability refers to the accuracy (consistency and stability) of measurement of a test. Any direct measurement of such consistency obviously calls for a comparison between at least two measurements. Reliability asks whether a test given to the same respondents a second time would yield the same results (Issac and Michael, 1977:89).

### **3.7 Final Administration of the test**

Depending on the outcome of the pilot administration which has approved that the test is reliable and valid . It has been applied at the end of the experiment to the sample of the current study . The test is finished in 45 minutes; the students are instructed to read the questions carefully then to write down their answers on their papers. Papers are collected after they have finished their answers. The papers are corrected to know their performance after applying the experiment.

## **Section four**

### **4.0. Data Analysis and Discussion:**

To Achieve the aims of the study , the following hypotheses have been introduced so as achieve the main aim of the current research. To carry out the aim of the research , the researcher formulated the following null hypothesis(There are no statistically significant difference on significant level (0.05) among the mean scores of the achievement of the first experimental group (DRTA) and the mean scores of the control group at reading comprehension.

#### **4.1.Recognition Items**

The mean achievement (recognition items) of the testees of the experimental group (DRTA Strategy) is (14.143) with a standard deviation of (0.810) , and that of the control group (Traditional Treatment) is (13.125) with a standard deviation of (1.558) , The computed F. ratio value is (6.579) while the tabulated F. ratio is (3.07) with degrees of freedom (2 , 107) and at (0.05) level of significant .

**Table (2)**

**Means and Standard deviations for post-test (Recognition items) for DRTA strategy and traditional Treatment**

| Group                 | Number | Mean   | Standard deviations |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|
| DRTA Strategy         | 35     | 14.143 | 0.810               |
| Traditional Treatment | 40     | 13.636 | 1.588               |

**Results of one-way analysis of variance for statistically significant differences between the post test (Recognition items) for DRTA strategy and conventional method**

| Source of variance | Sum of group | Degree of freedom | Mean of square | F. ratio |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|
| Between of         | 19.651       | 2                 | 9.825          | 6.579    |

|              |         |     |       |
|--------------|---------|-----|-------|
| group        |         |     |       |
| Within group | 159.804 | 107 | 1.493 |
| Total        | 179.455 | 109 |       |

- **The value of the F. ratio at the level of significance (0.05) and degrees of freedom (2, 107) is equal to (3.07).**

It is clear from the table (3) that the value of the calculated randomness ratio of (6.579) is bigger than the value of the tabular percentage of (3.07) at the level of significance (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (2, 107), which indicates that there are a statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group. In order to know the statistically significant differences, Scheffe's post-comparative test was used, so the results are as shown in the table (4).

**Table (4)**

**Scheffe's post-comparative test to know the differences in the post test (Recognition items) for DRTA strategy and traditional treatment.**

| Group               | DRTA Strategy | Traditional Treatment |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| DRTA Strategy       | -             | -                     |
| Conventional method | 1.018         | -                     |

**The critical Scheffe's value at the significance level (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (2, 107) is equal to (0.722 , 0.704).**

It is clear from the table (4) that :

1. The computed Scheffe's value for the differences in the post- test (Recognition items) for DRTA strategy and Traditional Treatment which is (1.018) is bigger than the Critical Scheffe's which is (0.704) , which indicates that there is a statistically significant differences at level of significant (0.05) among the mean scores achievement of the first experimental group (DRTA) and the mean scores achievement of the Traditional Treatment group at reading comprehension , And in favor the mean scores achievement of the experimental group (DRTA).

#### **4.2. Production Items**

The mean of the achievement (Production items) of the testees of the experimental group (DRTA Strategy) is (28.657) with a standard deviation of (6.606) and that of the control group (conventional method) is (18.875) with a standard deviation of (3.345) , The computed F. ratio value is (33.799) while the tabulated F. ratio is (3.07) with degrees of freedom (2 , 107) and at (0.05) level of significant .

**Table (5)**

**The Mean Scores ,Standard deviations for posttest (Production items) for DRTA strategy and traditional Treatment**

| Group               | Number | Mean   | Standard deviations |
|---------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|
| DRTA Strategy       | 35     | 28.657 | 6.606               |
| Conventional method | 40     | 18.875 | 3.345               |

**Bar graphs for the experimental group and the control group (Production items)**

the researcher used one-way analysis of variance to identify statistically significant differences, and the results were shown in the table (6).

**Table (6)**

**Results of one-way analysis of variance for statistically significant differences between the post test (Production items) for DRTA strategy and conventional method**

| Source of variance | Sum of group | Degree of freedom | Mean of square | F. ratio |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|
| Between of group   | 2373.303     | 2                 | 1186.651       | 33.799   |

|              |          |     |        |  |
|--------------|----------|-----|--------|--|
| Within group | 3756.661 | 107 | 35.109 |  |
| Total        | 6129.964 | 109 |        |  |

- **The value of the F. ratio at the level of significance (0.05) and degrees of freedom (2, 107) is equal to (3.07).**

It is clear from the table (22) that the value of the calculated randomness ratio of (33.799) is bigger than the value of the tabular percentage of (3.07) at the level of significance (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (2, 107), which indicates that there is a statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group. In order to know the statistically significant differences, Scheffe's post-comparative test was used, so the results are shown in the table (7).

**Table (7)**

**Scheffe's post-comparative test to know the differences in the post test (Production items) for DRTA strategy and conventional method**

| Group                 | DRTA Strategy | Traditional Treatment |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| DRTA Strategy         | -             | -                     |
| Traditional Treatment | 9.782         | -                     |

The critical Scheffe's value at the significance level (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (2, 107) is equal to (3.305 3.412).

It is clear from the table (7) that :

1. The computed Scheffe's value for the differences in the post test (Production items) for DRTA strategy and Traditional Treatment which is (9.782) is bigger than the Critical Scheffe's which is (3.412) , which indicates that there is a statistically significant differences at level of significant (0.05) among the mean scores achievement of the first experimental group (DRTA) and the mean scores achievement of the Traditional

Treatment group at reading comprehension , And in favor the mean scores achievement of the first experimental group (DRTA).

### 4.3. Total Scores

The mean of the Total scores of the testees of the experimental group (DRTA Strategy) is (42.800) with a standard deviation of (7.058) , and that of the control group (Traditional Treatment) is (32.000) with a standard deviation of (4.194) , The computed F. ratio value is (33.375) while the tabulated F. ratio is (3.07) with degrees of freedom (2 , 107) and at (0.05) level of significant .

**Table (8)**

**Means and Standard deviations for post-test (Total Scores) for DRTA strategy and traditional Treatment**

| Group                 | Number | Mean   | Standard deviations |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|
| DRTA Strategy         | 35     | 42.800 | 7.058               |
| Traditional Treatment | 40     | 32.000 | 4.194               |

The researcher is used one-way analysis of variance to identify statistically significant differences, and the results were shown in the table (9).

**Table (9)**

**Results of one-way analysis of variance for statistically significant differences between the post test (Total Scores) for DRTA strategy and traditional treatment**

| Source of variance | Sum of group | Degree of freedom | Mean of square | F. ratio |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|
| Between of group   | 2791.730     | 2                 | 1395.865       | 33.375   |
| Within group       | 4475.143     | 107               | 41.824         |          |
| Total              | 7266.873     | 109               |                |          |

- **The value of the F. ratio at the level of significance (0.05) and degrees of freedom (2, 107) is equal to (3.07).**

Throughout investigation the table (9) that the value of the calculated randomness ratio of (33.375) is bigger than the value of the tabular percentage of (3.07) at the level of significance (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (2, 107), which indicates that there are a statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group. In order to know the statistically significant differences, Scheffe's post-comparative test was used, so the results are shown in the table (10).

**Table (10)**

**Scheffe's post-comparative test to know the differences in the post test (Total Scores) for DRTA strategy a and traditional treatment**

| Group                 | DRTA Strategy | Traditional Treatment |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| DRTA Strategy         | -             | -                     |
| Traditional Treatment | 10.800        | -                     |

The critical Scheffe's value at the significance level (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (2, 107) is equal to (3.826 3.724).

It is clear from the table (10 ) that :

1. The computed Scheffe's value for the differences in the post- test (Total Scores) for DRTA strategy and Traditional Treatment which is (10.800) is bigger than the Critical Scheffe's which is (3.724) , which indicates that there is a statistically significant differences at level of significant (0.05) among the mean scores achievement of the experimental first group (DRTA) and the mean scores achievement of the Traditional Treatment group at reading comprehension , And in favor the mean scores achievement of the first experimental group (DRTA).

## **Section Five**

### **5. Conclusion**

1.This strategy helps to decrease the gap between teachers and students when cooperating together. Training and teaching students require both gatherings to work closely together and this lessens the gap between students and their teacher .

2- DRTA Strategy is modern teaching strategy and has positive effect on evoking EFL students' reading comprehension.

3- DRTA strategy is efficient in teaching reading comprehension .

### **5.1 Recommendations**

1- Iraqi English language teachers are invited to adopt the DRTA and critical reading strategies in teaching.

2- EFL teachers must help and encourage students to be confidence, participate in lessons, and bravery to develop their character. It can be successfully achieved by involving them in cooperative work .

### **5.2 Suggestion**

1- A study can be conducted to investigate the effect of DRTA and critical reading strategies on the female students' achievement at preparatory schools.

2- A study can be conducted to explore the effect of DRTA and critical reading strategies on the achievement of secondary schools .

## **References**

- AL-Soufi, N.(2017). The Effect of Reciprocal Teaching Strategy on Developing Yemeni Secondary Stage Students' EFL Reading Comprehension Skills and Self-efficacy, ph. D. Faculty of Education, Mansoura University.
- Brown, H. Douglas . 2001. **Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Ed.)**. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burns, P.C., B.D., & Ross, E.P.(1996). Teaching Reading in Today's Elementary School.( Sixth Edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). **Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy**. Englewood Cliffs, New York: Prentice Hall Regents.



- Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA). (2015) Reading Rockets, Available at: <http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/shared-reading>.
- Droff, A.(1988:33). **Teaching English**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Djiwandono and Soenardi, M. (1996) **Tes Bahasa dalam Pengajaran**. In FPBS-IKIP.
- Dubin, F., and Bycina, D. (1991) " Models of the Process of Reading". **Celce- Murcia(ed.), Teaching English as a Foreign Language**, 20-3.
- EL- Koumy, A.,A. (2006). **The Effects of the Directed Reading -thinking Activity on EFL Students' Referential and inferential Comprehension**. Full professor Curriculum and Instruction of English as a Foreign Language at Suez Canal University Egypt.
- Eyseneck, M. W. and Flanagan, N. (2000). **Psychology for Advanced Level**. New York: Psychology Press Ltd.
- Grellet, F. 1996. **Developing Reading Skills : A practical guide to reading** <http://www.nea.org/tools/directe> Process. New York: -Harper & Reading Maturity as A Cognitive retrieved on Monday, 20 Row. (Online).Available: September 2016.
- Goodman, K.S. (1973). "Psycholinguistic Universal of Reading Process ." In Smith .F,(Ed) **Psycholinguistic and Reading** . New York : Holt ,Rinehart and Winston(21-29).
- Harrys, J. A & Edward, R. S. 1995. **How to Increase Reading Ability**. New York: Longman.
- Henning, G. (1987). **A Guide to Language Testing: Development, Evaluation, Research**. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
- Isaac, S and Michael, W. (1977). **Handbook in Research and Evaluation**. New York: Robert R. Knapp.
- Jennings, C. and Shepherd, J. (1998). **Literacy and the Key Learning Areas: Successful Classroom Strategies**. Australia: Eleanor Curtin Publishing.
- Kamhi, A. & Catts, H. (2008). **The language basis of reading: Implications of classification and treatment of children with reading disabilities**. In Bulter, K.& Silliman, E. (Eds.) Speaking, Reading, and Writing in Children with Language and Learning Disabilities: New Paradigms in Research and Practice.
- Neufeld, Paul. 2005. "**Comprehension Instruction in Content Area Classes**". International Reading Association, 59, 4, p. 302-312.
- Nunan, D.(1991) "Methods in Second Language Classroom- Oriented Research: A Critical Review". **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 249-274.
- Richards, Jack C. and Richard Schmidt. 2002. **Longman, Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.)**. London: Pearson Education Limited.

- Richardson, J. S., Morgan, R. S., and Fleener, C, (2009), **Reading to Learn in the Content Areas, USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning**, p. 108-109.
- Santi Eriliana (2011). **Improving Reading Comprehension, through Directed Reading - Thinking Activity strategy**. Islamic State College of Palangka Raya. Safierliana @ yahoo. Com. March 2011. Journal English foreign a -on as Language 1(1):49. DOI: 10.23971 / jeft. V2 : 1.36.
- Stauffer, R. G. (1969). **Directing comprehension exercises**. Cambridge University Press d-reading-thinking-activity.html.
- Tierney, R., Readence, J. and Dishner, E. (1995). **Reading Strategies and Practices**. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster Company.
- Valette, R. M. (1967). **Modern Language Testing**. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc.
- Wiersma , W.; and Jure, S., G.(2005). **Research Method in Education: A Introduction** . (9<sup>th</sup> Ed). Published by Pearson Education, Inc.
- Westwood, Peter.2008. **What Teachers Need to Know about Reading and Writing Difficulties**. Victoria: ACER Press.
- Youssef, O. (1988). **The Effect of Two Schema-Based Strategies**. on Egyptian High School Students' Comprehension of EFL, The Faculty of The Graduate School in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements. A Dissertation. Indian. University.

### **Appendix A/ Achievement Posttest**

Read the following passage carefully:

There was once a very old man, whose eyes had become dim, his ears dull of hearing, his knees trembled, and when he sat at table he could hardly hold the spoon, and spilt the broth upon the table-cloth or let it run out of his mouth. His son and his son's wife were disgusted at this, so the old grandfather at last had to sit in the corner behind the stove, and they gave him his food in an earthenware bowl, and not even enough of it. And he used to look towards the table with his eyes full of tears. Once, too, his trembling hands could not hold the bowl, and it fell to the ground and broke. The young wife scolded him, but he said nothing and only sighed. Then they brought him a wooden bowl for a few half-pence, out of which he had to eat. They were once sitting thus when the little grandson of four years old began to gather together some bits of wood upon the ground. 'What are you doing there?' asked the father. 'I am making a little trough,' answered the child, 'for father and mother to eat out of when I am big.' The man and his wife looked at each other for a while, and presently began to cry. Then they took the old grandfather to the table, and henceforth always let him eat with them, and likewise said nothing if he did spill a little of anything.

**Q1. Encircle the correct option in the following items: (5 m.)**

1. The author of this passage is -----.
  - (a) cheerful
  - (b) critical
  - (c) sarcastic.
2. The authors' purpose for writing this passage is to -----
  - (a) entertain the reader
  - (b) persuade the reader
  - (c) convey a moral message to the reader
3. The word "it" in the fourth line of the first paragraph refer to.....
  - (a)spoon
  - (b) cloth
  - (c) broth
4. The word "trembling" means -----.
  - (a) frightening
  - (b) shaking
  - (c)laughing
5. The son and his wife treated the old man.....
  - (a) kindly
  - (b) friendly
  - (c)badly

**Q2. Answer the following questions: (15 m.)**

- (1) What does the word "which" in the last line of the first paragraph refer to?"
- (2) What are the similarities between the son and his wife?
- (3)What is a suitable title for this passage?
- (4) What can be deduced from this passage?
- (5) .How do you arrange the following events in sequence as they happened in the passage:
  - (a) They made him sit in the corner behind the stove and gave him his food in an earthenware bowl.
  - (b) His son and his son's wife treated him badly.
  - (c) As a result, they changed their treatment of the old man and let him eat with them.
  - (d) Therefore, they bought him a wooden bowl.
  - (e) There was once a very old man who had many health problems.
  - (f) The bowl fell to the ground and broke.
  - (g) They once saw their little child creating something for them to eat out of in their old age.

**Q3: Fill in the blanks from the given passage: (5 m.)**

1. There was a very .....
2. When the old man sat on the table he.....hold the spoon.
3. The old man couldn't hold the bowl and it fell to .....
4. The son and his wife brought the old man a.....for a few half pence.
5. The little child began together ..... for their mum and dad.

**Passage No . 2**

**Q4:Read the following passage and answer the questions below:(15m)**

The Oryx is a beautiful antelope with two long horns. It is one of the few big animals that can live in the desert. It gets most of its water from plants; it eats at night when there is some water on the leaves. It walks hundreds of kilometers to find food .

In the 1960s the population of Oryx in the Arabian Peninsula was very small. The animal was endangered because of hunting. It was hunted for two reasons: the local Bedouin people hunted it for meat, and city people hunted it for sport. In the past, when the hunters were on horses, the Oryx survived. But hunters in big four wheel- drive cars were able to follow the Oryx everywhere- it could not get away from them. In 1972 the last wild Oryx was shot but, happily , that was not the end of the story. Zoos around the middle east had quite a good number of Oryx. They got the animals to breed, to build up their numbers. Then in 1982 they put some Oryx back in to the wild in Oman. The programme was a success, and 1990 they did the same thing in Saudi Arabia. Of course, hunting the Oryx is no longer allowed. Today the wild population of these wonderful animals is about 900. Experts say it will probably soon be 1,000.

- 1.What is the Oryx?
2. Where can these animals live?
3. Why are these animals endangered?
4. Why was The Oryx hunted for ?
5. Do Oryx breed successfully in zoos ?

**Q5:Write true (T) for the correct items and false(F) for the false one.(5)**

- 1.Not many big animals can live in the desert.
- 2.Oryx usually stay in a small area.
- 3.Some people liked eating Oryx.
- 4.Oryx was hunted by people on horseback.
- 5.Hunting Oryx is now against the law.

**Q6:** People used to hunt Oryx for food or for sport. Nowadays They don't hunt Oryx anymore. The law do not allow people to hunt them. How do people feel about hunting in your country? Do they go for hunting other animals. Discuss within 50-60 words .

(15m)