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ABSTRACT

The goal of this study was to determine the benefits of prereading activities in reading comprehension performance. In this study the focus was on prequestioning, and a comparison of teacher-generated questions and student-generated questions was made. It has been argued in the literature that prequestioning has a positive effect on reading comprehension and questioning by students increases the effect. This study aimed to find out whether teacher-generated or student-generated questioning was more beneficial for EFL learners.

First of all, the theory, research, and methods on prereading activities were examined in the literature, and prequestioning was chosen as one of the most effective ways to improve reading comprehension. Then, the effects of two prequestioning treatments were studied; teacher-generated and student-generated questions were administered to two experimental groups while no treatment was given to a control group. A total of 42 students at Bilkent University (Ankara, Turkey) participated in the study. The results of the three groups were compared using a One-Way Anova.

The results were inconclusive. Although there was no significant difference between the groups, there was a difference in means between the groups in the
direction expected, indicating that student-generated questioning seemed to improve comprehension more than teacher-generated questioning and more than no questioning. Further research with a larger number of subjects is recommended.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study.

Goodman has described reading as "a psycholinguistic guessing game, in which the reader reconstructs as best as he can, a message which has been encoded by a writer as a graphic display" (Goodman, 1971, p. 135). Goodman views this act of construction of meaning as a cyclical process of sampling from the input text, predicting, testing and confirming those predictions, and sampling further. In this model, the reader need not use all of the clues. Reading is a receptive language process. It starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with the meaning which the reader constructs. There is an essential interaction between language and thought in reading. The writer encodes thought as language and the reader decodes language to thought.

Proficient readers are both efficient and effective. They are effective in constructing a meaning that they can assimilate. The construction of meaning bears the same level of agreement with the original meaning of the author. Efficient readers minimize dependence on visual detail. The better the reader makes correct predictions, the less visual perceptual information the reader requires.
According to Goodman,

.....the reader does not use all the information available to him. Reading is a process in which the reader picks and chooses from the available information only enough to select and predict a language structure which is decodable. It is not in any sense a precise perceptual process. (1973, p. 164)

Carrell (1988) noted that the immediate goal of EFL reading teachers is to minimize reading difficulties and to maximize comprehension by providing related information. Goodman (1979) put the issue into focus when he said that

even highly effective readers are severely limited in comprehension of texts by what they already know before they read. The author may influence the comprehensibility of a text particularly for specific targeted audiences. But no author can completely compensate in writing for the range of differences among all potential readers of a given text. (p. 658)

Rivers and Temperley (1978) emphasised the importance of providing background information, explaining high-frequency words, and using illustrations with reading passages to provide additional meaning to the texts. Coady (1979) suggested that background knowledge might further be able to compensate for certain syntactic deficiencies:

The subject of reading materials should be high interest and relate well to the background of the reader, since strong semantic input can help compensate when syntactic control is weak, the interest and background knowledge will enable the student to comprehend at a reasonable rate and keep him involved in the material in spite of its syntactic difficulty. (p. 12)
Carrell (1988) suggested that since no author can compensate for the individual variation among readers, the teacher in the EFL classroom can approach this problem by manipulating either one of the two variables: the text and/or the reader.

Providing background information and previewing content for the reader seem to be the most important strategies for the language teacher (Carrell, 1988). The teacher can manipulate the students' background information in different ways. Carrell noted that previewing is an important activity for activating background knowledge in the reading classroom, but it is not necessarily a process simply providing a preliminary outline of a given text. Sometimes it can involve teaching a key concept which is culturally loaded, and asking open-ended questions which help the teacher to find out the cultural problems that students themselves bring to the text. The prereading exercises are usually in the form of prediction questions, or information seeking questions. These exercises get the student to predict what the text will be about. They accomplish both goals: building new background knowledge as well as activating existing knowledge.

Thus, in achieving the goal of reading comprehension in the EFL classroom, the balance between the background knowledge presupposed by the
texts the students read and the background knowledge the students possess should be considered.

1.2 Goal and Rationale of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of prereading activities on reading comprehension performance of EFL students. Specifically, this study aims to determine the relationship between the prequestions asked by teachers and prequestions asked by students and the reading comprehension performance of EFL students as measured on a multiple choice exam.

In order for students to complete their university studies, reading is a necessary skill. This skill should be emphasized when students study at the university. Wiriyachitra (1986, p. 148) reported that "our students must demonstrate an acceptable level of understanding of materials designed for native speakers, e.g., political science, biology, etc. Thus, the essential skill is reading although the other skills, listening and speaking, should not be ignored."

As researchers have noted (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Kintsch & Van Dijk, 1978; Wilson & Anderson, 1986) background knowledge has a great impact on reading comprehension. A great amount of research has argued that prior knowledge of text-related
information strongly affects reading comprehension.

Mayner (1984) reported that studies of prereading activities have demonstrated the facilitative effects of activating readers' prior knowledge relevant to the comprehension of the new text. Hansen (1981) suggested that the prereading activities both prepared for the new concepts and make the reading task more enjoyable. These activities also connected the new content more meaningfully to prior knowledge.

Schema theory (Rumelhart & Ortony, 1977) has explained how prereading activities improved reading comprehension. According to this theory, meaning is reconstructed through interaction between the reader's schemata (i.e., knowledge structures in memory) and the text. Rumelhart (1981) explained how the activation of appropriate schemata helps readers to understand text. Comprehension might be impaired if the reader failed to activate the appropriate schema.

A lot of research has been done on prereading activities. One that was done by Taglieber et al. (1988) showed that there was a positive relationship between prereading activities and reading comprehension. The results of this study suggest that prereading activities might be a useful tool for teachers of EFL to prepare students to comprehend what they read.
Prequestioning is one of the prereading techniques that seems practical for EFL learners. Hansen (1981) and Singer & Donlan (1982) reported that students set purposes through prequestioning and ask questions whose answers require reading for comprehension.

1.3 Definitions

Schema, or prior knowledge, is the knowledge a reader brings to a text that is related to the content domain of the text (Carrell, 1987).

Prereading activities are those carried out before the reading task to activate prior knowledge and set a purpose for reading. They may involve pictures, vocabulary preteaching, prequestioning, and other activities.

Prequestioning is one of the prereading activities. Either the teacher asks questions for students to answer while reading or the students generate their own questions to answer. It may consist of giving students the title, a picture, or oral summary of the reading passage, and asking the students to formulate questions.

1.4 Hypotheses

Experimental Hypotheses: There is a positive relationship between prequestioning by teachers and by students and the reading comprehension of EFL students as measured on a multiple choice exam.
Student generated questions will have a greater effect than teacher generated questions.

Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between prequestioning by teachers and by students and the reading comprehension of EFL students as measured on a multiple choice exam.

1.5 Variables

Dependent variable: Reading comprehension performance as measured on a multiple choice exam.

Independent variable: Prequestioning.

Moderator variable: Teachers' and students' questions.

Control variable: Upper-intermediate level students as measured by the progress test.

1.6 Overview of the Methodology

This study was based on a previous study but differently focused. The previous study was done by Taglieber et al. (1988). Their study dealt with three prereading activities and examined the relationship among those techniques and reading comprehension. In this study, the focus was on prequestioning only. In addition, the results were calculated differently from the Taglieber et al. study. They used Manova to test the results. In this study one-way Anova was used.
1.6.1 Subjects

There were two experimental treatments conducted on two groups of subjects of the same English proficiency level. The subjects were at the upper-intermediate level of English as a foreign language as measured by a progress test. There were fourteen subjects in both experimental and control groups. The data were collected at BUSEL (Bikent University School of English Language), Ankara, Turkey.

1.6.2 Data Collection

In the first treatment, prequestions were asked by the teacher about the general theme of the passage and the topic. In the second treatment, prequestions were asked by subjects. The treatment consisted of giving subjects a sentence that was crucial for understanding the theme of the reading passage. The students were asked to formulate some questions that the passage might answer. The topic of the reading passage was also used as a means for generating questions. In the control group a warm-up activity was given. The students were asked if they liked reading, and if not what caused that, and whether they read a lot or not. They were also asked to discuss the kinds of short stories they liked. The same amount of time was used in each treatment and control group; fifteen minutes were given to each
Then the subjects in each group were given fifteen minutes to read a 1425 word passage silently. Afterwards they were given fifteen minutes to complete a test of comprehension. This test consisted of fifteen multiple-choice items.

1.7 Data Analysis

The results of each group were calculated and compared using a one-way Anova. First, the results of teacher-prequestions and then the student-prequestions were compared, and then the results of each group were compared with the control group’s.

1.8 Expectations

The subjects in the student-prequestioning group were expected to perform better than the other two groups. It was thought that the students, by activating their prior knowledge, would gain a better understanding of the reading passage, because readers are more successful if they are actively involved in the reading process. The students activate their schemata, or prior knowledge, either by being questioned or by their own questions. It was also expected that students would be most likely to take more effort to understand what they read when they generate their own questions. The lowest performance was expected by the control group.
1.9 Limitations

This study was limited to the reading skill in EFL situations, specifically prequestioning as a prereading activity. Since the main purpose of BUSEL is to prepare students to study in an English-medium university, it is directly applicable to BUSEL's purpose and it can be applicable to language preparatory programs and other universities with the same purpose.

1.10 Organization of Thesis

The second chapter reviews literature on prereading activities. The third chapter describes the treatment: subjects, materials, data collection, and analysis procedures. Chapter four presents the results of the tests which assessed reading comprehension proficiency. The results of the statistical tests are discussed in this section. The last chapter includes a summary of the study, the conclusions, and their application to BUSEL and other EFL situations. Further research is suggested.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

Prior knowledge that facilitates comprehension has been studied under the title of schema theory. As Adams and Collins (1979) and Rumelhart (1977, 1981) noted, schema theory describes the role of pre-existing knowledge in the process of reading. Schemata are pre-existing knowledge structures, stored hierarchically in the brain, the more general subsuming the more specific. Each reader’s hierarchy of schemata organizes her/his knowledge of language and the world. While reading one forms expectations based on prior knowledge of texts and the world.

In this chapter, the role of schema and prior knowledge on reading comprehension will be discussed. The research about prereading activities and prequestioning will be reviewed in this chapter.

2.2 Prior Knowledge

Texts become easier to read if they correspond to student’s prior knowledge of language and the world. As Hudson (1982) noted background knowledge has a significant impact on the interpretation of the texts. He showed how schemata could override language proficiency as a factor in comprehension. Smith (1988) reported on cognitive research examining the
process of reading and concluded that reading is based on more than the use of decoding skills, such as phonics. If the reader is not able to connect the new information in a text to what he or she already knows, then meaningful reading will not take place.

If reading comprehension depends on what the reader already knows, then teachers should carefully consider students’ prior knowledge when choosing texts. As Nuttall (1982) claimed, reading comprehension depends on the successful match between reader’s prior knowledge and the background knowledge assumed by a text. As Barnett (1989) and Carrell and Kinterhold (1983) noted, the reader constructs the text information based both on the knowledge drawn from the text and from the prior knowledge available to the reader.

Garnham (1985), Kintsch (1988), and Rayner and Pollatsek (1989) reported that schema theory might not be a well-defined framework for the mental representation of knowledge but it has been extremely useful for describing how prior knowledge is integrated in memory and used in higher level comprehension processes. Anderson and Pearson (1984) noted that schema theory can be very useful in suggesting how to improve reading instruction.

Schema, or prior knowledge, plays an important role in prereading activities. Carrell (1987)
and Floyd and Carrell (1987) noted that schema theory provides a strong rationale for prereading activities. Other research on schema theory has argued that a high degree of prior knowledge could overcome linguistic deficiencies (e.g., Hudson, 1982). Barnett (1989), Carrell (1988), and Dubin and Bycania (1991) implied that students should activate prior knowledge of a topic before they begin to read. If the students do not have sufficient prior knowledge, at least minimal background knowledge should be provided. This knowledge will help them to interpret the text at some level of understanding.

2.3 Prereading Activities

It has been shown that prereading activities produce significantly higher reading performance. For example, Taglieber et al. (1988) did research on three types of prereading activities: pictoral context, vocabulary preteaching, and prequestioning. A positive relationship between these activities and reading comprehension performance was obtained.

Different prereading activities may be more or less effective for readers with different proficiency levels. In one study, Hudson (1982) found that prereading activities designed to activate students' schema rather than vocabulary preteaching had a greater effect on reading comprehension. But at the
advanced level neither of these types of prereading activities were any better than the other.

Some existing second language materials include prereading exercises, such as information-seeking or prediction questions for the reader to keep in mind while reading (e.g., Grellet, 1981). Allen and Widdowson (1974) noted that question-posing, prediction, and other prereading exercises supposedly function to motivate students to read. They also function to get students to predict, within a general content area, what the text will be about.

2.4 Prequestioning

Prequestions have been shown to facilitate reading comprehension. Leki (1986) noted in such exercises the teacher should determine two or four important issues that require students to search through their own lives for similar experiences. The questions would not be elaborated. The purpose is simply to trigger within each student a set of associations.

Prequestioning can be directed in two ways: reader-generated questions and teacher-generated questions. Henry (1984) proposed a strategy for improving reading comprehension. Again the reader’s prior knowledge takes center stage. The readers have different ways to accomplish reading comprehension.
Reader-generated questions can help the readers to test their comprehension. The traditional question approach limits students’ comprehension and the students comprehend in a different manner and more naturally when the questions are not imposed by others. Student-generated questioning, on the other hand, would avoid this problem.

There are several techniques that are used in student-generated questioning. Henry (1984) proposed three techniques that can be used to stimulate student-questions: sentence stimulus, thematic stimulus, and picture stimulus.

Another prequestioning type is teacher-generated questions. For example, background information can be provided for the students through a pretest. As Pressy (1926) and Hartly and Davies (1976) found, pretests increased students’ sensitivity to content and consequently students comprehended more when they read. Such pretests can be in the form of multiple-choice and true false questions.

The use of prequestions makes reading an active process. As Andre and Anderson (1978-1979) remarked, by prequestioning students set purposes for reading. In addition to that, the students read to answer their questions or the teachers’ questions, and they think ahead of time what the possible answers are. Devine (1986) added that prequestioning directs the focus of
activity in reading and encourages both student-
teacher and student-student interaction.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The main concern of this chapter is methodology. It gives a detailed explanation of the procedures of the study, including the subjects and data collection. The focus of this study is on prereading activities. As mentioned before in Chapter One, activating students' prior knowledge or schema has an important impact on reading comprehension of students, and pre-questioning is a pre-reading activity that can activate schema.

A lot of research has been done in the field of prequestioning, Cohen (1983) reported that elementary students' learning increased significantly when students generated their own questions, when compared to a control group using only teacher-generated questions. Performance was measured in both a criterion-referenced test and a standardized test of achievement.

Various reasons have been given for why students achieve comprehension when they generate their own questions. Singer (1978) reported that student-generated questions allow students to guide their thinking. In addition, Hansell (1976) suggested that student-generated questions would allow students to
participate without the feeling of frustration or failure. Vacca (1981) stated that if students had curiosity, then they would have greater motivation to read. This curiosity can be accomplished through student-generated questions. One conflicting study was reported by Bernstein (1973). Black sixth graders were divided into three groups: generate own questions, answer peer questions, and answer teacher questions. After students read the passage, they were given a multiple-choice test. The results indicated that all groups performed the same. However, the group required to generate questions had not been actively taught question-generating strategies.

3.2 Subjects

EFL subjects were selected by the researcher at the BUSEL (Bilkent University School of English Language) with the permission of the director of BUSEL. Based on the scores of a progress test recently taken in reading comprehension the means of eight classes were compared, and three classes with similar means were chosen for the treatment. The subjects in each group were matched according to their scores. The lowest score was 10, and the highest one was 18 out of 25.

There were fourteen subjects in each group. This was due to the absence of some students and mismatch of some scores. The age range was 19-21 in the three
groups. All of them were at the L6 level. According to levels of proficiency at BUSEL, this is upper-intermediate. The total number of the subjects in the treatment was 42. The results of the matching are shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1
The Matched Scores of Subjects in the Three Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Materials

The materials used in this study included a short story of 1425 words, two worksheets, and a multiple-choice test.

The short story was appropriate to the level of the subjects (see Appendix A). The short story was taken from a collection of stories used for upper-intermediate level students (Alptekin and Gürel, 1990). This collection of stories is aimed for use
by upper-intermediate students. The theme of the selected story appeals to students' interests and life. It is about a teen-age boy captured by the fashion of the day. He is so influenced by materialistic things to such an extent that he can not prevent himself from stealing things.

The worksheets were prepared by the researcher. The purpose of the worksheets was to activate the background knowledge of the subjects. For the teacher-generated question group, the worksheet consisted of questions that were about the general theme of the story; the questions preceded a short poem (see Appendix B). For the student-generated question group, the worksheet consisted of a sentence that was crucial to the theme of the story (see Appendix C).

The test was also prepared by the researcher to measure the reading comprehension of the subjects (see Appendix D). It was in multiple-choice format, and it consisted of fifteen questions. The use of a multiple-choice exam was preferred because it could be taken in a short amount of time, students were familiar with the format, and it was easy to score.

3.4 Data Collection

In the first experimental group, teacher-generated questions were given to the subjects by the
researcher, and the subjects answered those questions. First of all, the researcher asked some oral questions about the topic of a given story. These questions included who, why, and where type questions. The subjects had various answers for these questions. Secondly, the students were given a worksheet consisting of teacher-generated questions. The students, while answering those questions made associations from their own lives, and in this way they were much involved in the subject matter. They were given fifteen minutes to complete these activities. Then the reading passage was distributed, and the subjects were given fifteen minutes to read it silently. Finally, a multiple-choice test was given to them to complete in fifteen minutes.

In the student-generated questioning group, first of all, the subjects were told to generate some questions about the topic of the given story. The students discussed it among themselves, made guesses about what questions this story might answer. Afterwards, the students were given a worksheet with a sentence about the topic and generated again their own questions related to the story. These activities also took the same amount of time as the previous group. The same reading passage was given to this group. They were also allowed the same amount of time to read and answer the same multiple-choice test.
The control group was given a fifteen minute warm-up activity instead of prequestioning. They were questioned about their hobbies. The focus was on reading. The students expressed their feelings about reading different kinds of short stories (science-fiction, adventure etc.). In the second and third part of the treatment the same procedure was applied. They also read the same passage and answered the same multiple-choice test with same time limitation as the other two groups.

In this research project, the relationships between teacher-generated and student-generated questions and reading comprehension were investigated, in particular, whether teacher-generated and/or student-generated questions were beneficial in reading comprehension performance.

3.5 Variables

3.3.1 Dependent Variable

The reading comprehension of the subjects measured on a multiple-choice exam was the dependent variable in this study. Subjects' reading comprehension depended upon the type of treatment and no treatment.

3.3.2 Independent Variable

The independent variable was prequestioning. The prequestions were produced either by the teacher
or the students as moderator variables.

3.3.3 Control Variable

The subjects proficiency level that was previously determined by the progress test at BUSEL was controlled. The subjects were at the upper-intermediate level.

3.6 Analytical Procedures

The test results of each group were calculated and compared using a one-way Anova. First, the results of student-prequestions and the teacher-prequestions were compared, and then the results of each group were compared with the control group's.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

4.1 Introduction

In this study, it is argued that prereading activities should be used to facilitate reading comprehension. That is, if prereading activities are selected which activate their prior knowledge and set a purpose for reading, students can gain a better understanding of a reading passage.

In order to understand the role of prereading activities in EFL classes, the reading comprehension of students at the preparatory school of Bilkent University (Ankara, Turkey) were studied. Three groups of subjects were given a prereading treatment. In the first group, teacher-generated questions, in the second one student-generated questions, and in the control group warm-up activities were accomplished. Then, the students were given a short story to read, followed by a 15 multiple-choice test to measure their reading comprehension.

It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between prequestioning by teachers and by students and the reading comprehension of EFL students as measured on a multiple-choice exam and student-generated questions would have a greater effect than teacher-generated questions.
4.2 Results

In the first experimental group, teacher-questions were asked as a prereading activity. The results of the test of reading comprehension for this group is given in Table 4.1.

In the second experimental group, student-questions were generated and discussed. The results of the test of reading comprehension for this group are shown in Table 4.2.

In the control group, warm-up activities were provided before the students read. The results of the test of reading comprehension for control group are shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.1
Results of the Test of Reading Comprehension for Experimental Group 1: Teacher-Generated Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2
Results of the Test of Reading Comprehension for Experimental Group 2: Student-Generated Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3
Results of the Test of Reading Comprehension for Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means of the three groups were compared using a one-way ANOVA. The means and standard deviations of the three groups are shown in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4. Means and Standard Deviations of the Three Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Teacher-questions</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Student-question</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Control</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the statistical analysis are shown in Table 4.5. The results of the two experimental groups, teacher-generated and student-generated questions, and the control group were compared. It was found that there was not a significant difference between the groups so the null hypothesis is accepted. However, question-generation may have contributed to greater variance in the scores since the variance of the teacher-generated questions is 22.8, student-generated ones is 20.1 while that of control group is 12.6.

Table 4.5 Results of One-way Anova

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>M.S</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>718.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>359.4</td>
<td>.9933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14113.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>361.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14832.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the test of reading comprehension some of the questions reflected either the teacher-generated or student-generated questions asked during the pre-reading stage. Five of the teacher questions and five of the student questions were in the test.
Subjects' answers were analyzed to determine how many of the teacher-generated questions in the Experimental Group 1, and student-generated questions in the Experimental Group 2 were correct. Then, the rate of success on teacher questions were compared to the rate of success on student questions. The results of this analysis also do not show a significant difference between the treatment groups. However, Group 2 (student-questions) had a higher mean than Group 1 (teacher-questions). The mean of student-questions was 67.1, and the mean of teacher-questions was 60. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.6 and 4.7.

Table 4.6
The Results of the Analysis of Teacher-Generated Questions (n=5) Answered Correctly in the Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=60
SD=26.02
Table 4.7
The Results of the Analysis of Student-Generated Questions (n=5) Answered Correctly in the Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=67.1
SD=16.84

4.3 Discussion of Results

The results of the statistical tests show that there is no significant difference between the groups in terms of teacher-generated and student-generated questions. Therefore the null hypothesis of no difference between teacher-generated and student-generated questions is accepted. Although the statistical results indicate no significant relationship between the groups, in fact, there seems to be some indication of a difference between the groups. Group II (student-questions) achieved higher results than Group I (teacher-questions), and Group I
and Group II achieved higher results than the Control Group as was expected before the application of treatments.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary of the Study

Prereading activities which activate students' prior knowledge have been found to improve students' reading comprehension. Therefore, language teaching authorities emphasize the importance of these activities in the EFL classroom, and prequestioning is one of these prereading techniques. Students benefit from prequestioning by activating their background knowledge, which helps them to perform better on measures of reading comprehension.

This study aimed to find out if there was a positive relationship between prequestioning by teachers and students and the reading comprehension of the students. The prequestioning treatment consisted of two groups: teacher-generated questions and student-generated questions. A control group was not given prequestions. Each of the three groups was given either one variety of the treatment or no treatment, the passage to read, and then a multiple-choice test to measure reading comprehension. The groups, which were at the same language proficiency level, read the same passage and took the same test under the same conditions.
5.2 Conclusions

The analysis of the data collected in this study suggests that both teacher-generated and student-generated questions result in the same reading comprehension performance. There was not a significant difference between the two treatments. While it cannot be concluded that prequestioning significantly increases students' reading comprehension. The results of this study suggest that prequestioning can facilitate reading comprehension. Both of the experimental groups did better than the control group on the test of reading comprehension. In addition, there is an indication that student-generated questions are superior to teacher-generated questions. Although the results may be due to chance, they are in the direction found in previous research, lending support to the theory that activation of prior knowledge facilitates reading comprehension.

It cannot be denied that any pre-reading activity that activates prior knowledge, motivates students, and focuses their attention and/or sets a purpose for reading facilitates reading comprehension. This importance of prior knowledge on reading comprehension has been argued by many first language researchers (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Bransford, Stein, & Sheiton, 1984; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Wilson &
Ancier, 1986). However, it remains to be determined whether it helps foreign language learners as well as native speakers.

5.3 Assessment of the Study

The results of the study may have been affected by several factors. The low number of subjects, the lack of cooperation of the subjects, the timeliness of the study and the lack of appropriate topic may have produced unreliable and invalid results.

First, the attendance of students become lower during the collection of data of this study. This made it difficult to match the students into 3 groups. This, also affected the reliability of the study because of the low number of subjects. Second, the subjects were not fully cooperative. This stems from the general characteristics of prep school students at universities; they sometimes lack motivation, especially if they have spent more than one year at prep school. Third, the experiment was carried out during spring term and the attendance of prep school students becomes lower at this time. They become relaxed and lose their interest in the lessons more than other times of the year. Fourthly, the topic and reading passage which were chosen were not appropriate for generating many questions. The title itself was not adequate to generate questions, and so
other activities were done to aid the prequestioning activity.

Similar results were achieved by other researchers due to insufficient methodological procedures. Wong (1985) stated that in the interpretation of results one should be very careful, since the treatment procedures could be inappropriate and therefore the results could be misleading.

5.4 Pedagogical Implications

The importance of prequestioning cannot be ignored. They are essential for reading instruction. The students make guesses and inferences about the text through prequestioning. Heightened prior knowledge plays an important role for adequate comprehension to occur.

The students should be encouraged to generate their own questions for the benefit of a better understanding. Allowing students to take an active role in their learning should increase their motivation to read. In addition, student questioning encourages the reader to focus attention on the reading material and set purposes for reading. Of the three prereading activities examined in the study, teacher-generated questions was less effective than student-generated questions although superior to control condition.
The role of other prereading activities for better comprehension cannot be neglected. Prequestioning can be more effective if it is integrated with other prereading activities, such as pictoral context. The techniques should be chosen according to the content of the passages. Abstract passages would need prequestioning whereas highly concrete passages should be introduced with the aid of pictoral context (Taglieber et al., 1988).

The goal of teachers should be in the direction of providing a wide range of effective strategies to facilitate reading comprehension. Clarke and Silberstein (1977) reported that students need to be taught reading strategies, such as guessing from the context and finding clues to read effectively and efficiently.

5.5 Implications for Future Research

Several suggestions can be made for future research in the use of prereading activities in EFL classes in Turkey. First, future studies should be carried out with a higher number of subjects, which will give a more reliable result. Secondly, the appropriateness of the title and the reading passage must be taken into consideration. The title of a given passage is the most effective guide for the students in reading comprehension performance. They
can make use of the title if it provides many clues to the topic of the reading passage. But if the title does not make much sense for the reader then it will not be helpful. Third, the application time of the treatment should also be considered. The students lack interest and become overly relaxed during spring time and this affects the attendance of the students and low number of subjects results in less reliable results. Fourthly, the students do not have much practice in generating their own questions so they should be taught to generate questions before the experiment begins. Fifth, the treatment should be applied in several universities in order to achieve more generalizable results.
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APPENDIX A

Thank You, Ma'am

She was a large woman with a large purse that had everything in it but hammer and nails. It had a long strap and she carried it slung across her shoulder. It was about eleven o'clock at night, and she was walking alone, when a boy ran up behind her and tried to snatch her purse. The strap broke with the single tug the boy gave it from behind. But the boy's weight, and the weight of the purse combined caused him to lose his balance so, instead of taking off full blast as he had hoped, the boy fell on his back on the side walk, and his legs flew up. The large woman simply turned around and kicked him right square in his blue jeaned sitter. Then she reached down, picked the boy up by his shirt front, and shook him until his teeth rattled.

After that the woman said, "pick up my pocketbook, boy, and give it here."

She still held him. But she bent down enough to permit him to stoop and pick up her purse. Then she said, "Now ain't you ashamed of yourself?"

Firmly gripped by his shirt front, the boy said, "Yes'm."

The woman said,"What did you want to do it for?"

The boy said,"I didn't aim to."
She said, "You a lie!"

By that time two or three people passed, stopped, turned to look, and some stood watching.

"If I turn you loose, will you run?" asked the woman.

"Yes'm," said the boy.

"Then I won't turn you loose," said the woman. She did not release him.

"I'm very sorry, lady, I'm sorry," whispered the boy.

"Um-hum! And your face is dirty. I got a great mind to wash your face for you. Ain't you got nobody home to tell you to wash your face?"

"No'm," said the boy.

"Then it will get washed this evening," said the large woman starting up the street, dragging the frightened boy behind her.

He looked as if he were fourteen or fifteen, frail and willow-wild, in tennis shoes and blue jeans.

The woman said, "You ought to be my son. I would teach you right from wrong. Least I can do right now is to wash your face. Are you hungry?"

"No'm," said the being dragged boy. "I just want you to turn me loose."

"Was I bothering you when I turned that corner?" asked the woman.

"No'm."

"But you put yourself in contact with me," said the woman. "If you think that that contact is not going
to last awhile, you got another thought coming. When I got through with you, sir, you are going to remember Mrs. Luella Bates Washington Jones."

Sweat popped out on the boy's face and he began to struggle. Mrs. Jones stopped, jerked him around in front of her, put a half nelson about his neck, and continued to drag him up the street. When she got to her door, she dragged the boy inside, down a hall, and into a large kitchenette-furnished room at the rear of the house. She switched on the light and left the door open. The boy could hear other roomers laughing and talking in the large house. Some of their doors were open, too, so he knew he and the woman were not alone. The woman still had him by the neck in the middle of her room.

"She said,"What is your name?"

"Roger," answered the boy.

"Then, Roger, you go to that sink and wash your face," said the woman, whereupon she turned him loose—at last. Roger looked at the door—looked at the woman—looked at the door—and went to the sink.

"Let the water run until it gets warm," she said. "Here's a clean towel."

"You gonna take me to jail?" asked the boy, bending over the sink.

"Not with that face, I would not take you nowhere," said the woman. "Here I am trying to get home to cook
me a bite to eat and you snatch my pocketbook! Maybe
you ain’t been to your supper either, late as it be.
Have you?”

"There is nobody home at my house," said the boy.

"Then we’ll eat," said the woman. "I believe you’re
hungry—or been hungry—to try to snatch my pocketbook."

"I wanted a pair of blue suede shoes," said the boy.

"Well, you didn’t have to snatch my pocketbook to get
some suede shoes," said Mrs. Luella Bates Washington
Jones. "You could of asked me."

"Ma’m?"

The water dripping from his face, the boy looked at
her. There was a long pause. A very long pause.
After he had dried his face and not knowing what else
to do dried it again, the boy turned around, wondering
what next. The door was open. He could make a dash
for it down the hall. He could run, run, run, run!

The woman was sitting on the day-bed. After awhile
she said, "I were young once and I wanted things I
could not get."

There was another long pause. The boy’s mouth opened.
Then he frowned, but not knowing he frowned.
The woman said, "Um-hum! you thought I was going to
say but, didn’t you? You thought I was going to say,
but I didn’t snatch people’s pocketbooks. Well, I
wasn’t going to say that." Pause. Silence. "I have
done things, too, which I would not tell you, son-
neither tell God, if he didn’t already know. So you set down while I fix us something to eat. You might run that comb through your hair so you will look presentable."

In another corner of the room behind a screen was a gas plate and an icebox. Mrs. Jones got up and went behind the screen. The woman did not watch the boy to see if he was going to run now, nor did she watch her purse which she left behind her on the day-bed. But the boy took care to sit on the far side of the room where he thought she could easily see him out of the corner of her eye, if she wanted to. He did not trust the woman not to trust him. And he did not want to be mistrusted now.

"Do you need somebody to go to store," asked the boy, "maybe to get some milk or something?"

"Don’t believe I do," said the woman, "unless you just want sweet milk yourself. I was going to make cocoa out of this canned milk I got here."

"That will be fine," said the boy.

She heated some lima beans and ham she had in the icebox, made cocoa, and set the table. The woman did not ask the boy anything about where he lived, or his folks, or anything else that would embarrass him. Instead, as they ate, she told him about her job in a hotel beauty-shop that stayed open late, what the work was like, and how all kinds of women came in and out,
blondes, red-heads, and Spanish. Then she cut him a half of her ten-cent cake.

"Eat some more, son," she said. When they were finished eating she got up and said, "Now, here, take this ten dollars and buy yourself some blue suede shoes. And next time, do not make the mistake of latching onto my pocketbook nor nobody else's—because shoes become devilish like that will burn your feet. I got to get my rest now. But I wish you would behave yourself, son, from here on in."

She led him down the hall to the front door and opened it. "Goodnight! Behave yourself, boy!" she said, looking out into the street.

The boy wanted to say something else other than, "Thank you, ma'm," to Mrs. Luella Bates Washington Jones, but he couldn't do so as he turned at the barren stoop and looked back at the large woman in the door. He barely managed to say, "Thank you," before she shut the door. And he never saw her again.
APPENDIX B

Teacher’s worksheet for Teacher-generated Questions

"You can knock me down, step on my face....
(but) don’t you step on my blue suede shoes.
You can do anything
But lay off my blue suede shoes..."

Blue Suede Shoes
Written by C. Perkins
Sung by Elvis Presley

Blue Suede Shoes was a popular song in the 1950s, when this story was written.

a. How important were the blue suede shoes to the writer of the song?
b. Why do you think they were important?
c. Is there anything in youth culture today that is similar in importance to blue suede shoes?
APPENDIX C

Students' worksheet for
Student-generated Questions

"I just wanted to buy some blue suede shoes Ma'am"
APPENDIX D

READING COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS

1. The large woman`s purse included....
   a. only hammer and nails.
   b. no hammer and nails.
   c. everything with hammer and nails.

2. The boy fell down because,
   a. He was not able to carry the purse.
   b. He slipped and fell while running away.
   c. The large woman kicked him right square.

3. The woman did not release the boy because,
   a. He would escape.
   b. He told her a lie.
   c. He would tell her the truth.

4. When the woman said when I get through with you, sir, you are going to remember Mrs. Luella Bates Washington Jones. Roger thought that,
   a. The woman would advise him to be honest.
   b. The woman would punish him.
   c. The woman would take him to the jail.

5. "He did not trust the woman not to trust him" This means that,
   a. He wants to be mistrusted.
   b. He doesn`t want to be mistrusted.
   c. He doesn`t want to be trusted.

6. At one point in the story, the boy frowned, because,
   a. He was astonished.
   b. He was excited.
   c. He was angry.

7. To Roger, what was the significance of the blue suede shoes?
   a. He liked them.
   b. He did not like them at all.
   c. He liked them very much.
Choose the true statement

8. a. The large woman used to steal things
   b. The large woman has never stolen anything in her life.
   c. The large woman always helped the poor.

   b. Mrs. Jones did not talk about him, but rather about herself.
   c. Mrs. Jones talked both about him and herself.

10. a. Mrs. Jones gave Roger twenty dollars for the shoes.
    b. Mrs. Jones cut him a half of her ten cent cake.
    c. Mrs. Jones bought him some blue suede shoes.

11. a. Both Mrs. Jones and Roger lived alone.
    b. Mrs. Jones lead a prosperous life.
    c. Mrs. Jones lived in a boarding house.

12. a. Roger was delicate.
    b. Roger was not sensitive.
    c. Both Roger and Mrs. Jones were cruel.

13. a. Mrs. Jones was kind to Roger.
    b. Mrs. Jones reacted violently to Roger.
    c. Mrs. Jones was always suspicious about Roger.

14. a. Roger had no folks.
    b. Mrs. Jones had to work late at night.
    c. Mrs. Jones' work was not colorful.

15. a. In fact, Roger did not want to say something more than "thank you" at the end.
    b. Roger learnt a lot from his encounter with Mrs. Jones.
    c. Roger was not much influenced by Mrs. Jones.