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Abstract

This thesis is concerned with finding the impact of applying guided reading activities on Kindergarten 1 (KG1) students’ reading performance. The current study focuses on two reading skills which are word recognition and reading comprehension. The main objective of this thesis is to examine how guided reading can affect KG1 learners’ reading performance. The research included 50 KG1 students as participants of the study. A quantitative research method was used. The data was collected via the use of pre-posttest research instruments. The study found that guided reading has a positive impact on KG1 learners’ reading performance. The research results showed significant differences between the control group and the experimental group on students’ word recognition and reading comprehension performance in favor of the experimental group. The study demonstrated that guided reading helps teachers to scaffold early years students’ reading performance and facilitate their learning.

Keywords: Guided Reading, Early Learning, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as a Second Language (ESL)
تأثير القراءة الموجهة على أداء القراءة لدى طلاب الروضة الأولى

الملخص

إن الهدف من هذه الدراسة هو معرفة تأثير القراءة الموجهة على أداء القراءة لدى طلاب الروضة الأولى. تناولت هذه الدراسة عنصري القراءة: التعرف على الكلمات والفهم والاستيعاب. تم تطبيق الدراسة على 50 طالب من الروضة الأولى. اشتملت هذه الدراسة على منهج البحث الكمي لجمع البيانات اللازمة للاجابة على أسئلة البحث. قامت الباحثة باستخدام أداة البحث (pre-test/posttest) لجمع البيانات الكمية للدراسة.

أظهرت نتائج هذه الدراسة تضمنت إثبات صحة التأثير الإيجابي للقراءة الموجهة على الأداء القرائي لطلاب الروضة الأولى باللغة الإنجليزية. أظهرت نتائج البحث الفرق الواضح في القراءة باللغة الإنجليزية بين المجموعة الضابطة (control group) والمجموعة التجريبية (experimental group) في عنصري القراءة: التعرف على الكلمات والفهم والاستيعاب. أثبتت الدراسة أن القراءة الموجهة تساعد المعلم على تقديم أداء القراءة لدى الطالب منذ المراحل الدراسية الأولى لتحقيق مهارات القراءة لدى الطالب في اللغة الإنجليزية.

مفهوم البحث الرئيسي: القراءة الموجهة، التعلم المبكر، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة ثانية، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Overview

Children usually first learn language through listening to their surroundings, grasping some repeated sounds and words to transmit them into oral knowledge, followed, eventually, by the development of reading skills; therefore, acquiring vocabulary is the key component in becoming fluent in a language, especially a foreign or second language (Armbruster, 2010). Moreover, reading requires using many skills, including decoding, reasoning and schema development (Roskos & Neuman, 2014). Additionally, there is a need to expose children consistently to key vocabulary and to teach them some vocabulary words explicitly. Consistent targeted exposure to key vocabulary facilitates the learning process and supports the development of productive and receptive vocabulary (Taylor, 1990).

Within the context of the United Arab Emirates (UAE), His Highness Shaikh Khalifa bin Zayed Al Nahyan, the President of the UAE, announced the National Reading Law in 2016, as part of a 10 year plan to spread the culture of reading among the citizens of UAE (Radan, 2016). As a result, the direction of education in UAE has shifted into searching for strategies to support the law. There are many strategies which have been shown through research to be useful in teaching reading, including: emergent reading, shared reading, reading aloud and guided reading (GR). GR is a research-based strategy to support the development of early reading skills (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). Educators who implement GR must cover different aspects to maintain its effectiveness, including providing differentiated activities for the different homogenous groups to ensure the high quality of the teaching and learning process.
Moreover, teachers who implement GR must provide students with adequate levels of the selected texts (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012).

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to find the impact of GR on kindergarten 1 students’ reading performance in English as a foreign language (L2) context in the UAE. During the study, KG1 students will receive frequent and consistent instructions from the teacher during the application of GR. This study investigates the impact of this intervention on students’ word recognition and reading comprehension skills. It is hoped that through the application of this study on KG1 students, students will ultimately be able to enhance their reading performance in L2.

1.3 Objectives and Significance of the Study

Usually, in UAE, the private American system school’s curriculum is based on Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Consequently, children at KG1 mainly focus on learning phonics and frequency words as a start point of their early reading process (CCSS, 2018). Reading works as an essential source of learning and introducing new words for young learners. The need for language is necessary to communicate with the surrounding community. Van Kleck (2003) expressed that English second language learners are more likely to end up with less developed vocabulary, as they lack the opportunity for early literacy exposure. Moreover, major differences in vocabulary knowledge appear during the ages of kindergarten students (Hart & Risley, 1995).

In order to support language development, there is a need for enough knowledge of vocabulary and comprehension skills to empower students to reach a point where they can use expressive language orally. On the other hand, if words and comprehension
skills are gained through reading, that may positively affect the reading performance of the students. Van Kleeck, Stahl & Bauer (2003) found that children’s books provide a rich source of new words, embedded in meaningful contexts. It is widely acknowledged that reading books with children plays an important role in word acquisition and the development of reading skills. (Coyne, Simmons, Kame'enui & Stoolmiller (2004) concluded that implementing shared reading correctly as a strategy was an effective method of enhancing the level of vocabulary of children who were experiencing reading difficulties.

This research seeks to apply GR on KG1 students within the UAE context, Gulf Region, to enrich the research in the Middle East regarding the use of GR. Moreover, this study will initiate the application of GR in schools in the UAE, in order to help learners from an early age to scaffold their reading performance, rather than waiting until primary school to learn how to read properly.

1.4 Research Questions

The study is set to answer the following questions:

1. What is the effect of GR in L2 on KG1 students’ word recognition?

2. To what extent does GR in L2 improve KG1 students’ reading comprehension?

1.5 Scope of the Study

As the school site for the study follows common core standards, some of the related reading standards skills are to “Read emergent-reader texts with purpose and understanding” (CCSS, 2018). Yet, based on the school internal data, the previous
school performance showed that children were not reaching this standard, as reading stories was infrequently applied inside the classrooms.

The aim of this study is to explore the effect of GR on KG1 EFL students’ reading comprehension and word acquisition skills.

1.6 Rationale and Significance of the Study

This study aims to find out to what extent GR might affect the word acquisition of KG1 students. The result will highlight the potential significance of GR on children’s reading comprehension and word acquisition. In GR, the teacher works with small homogenous groups. In that case, each single student is provided with the opportunity to improve their reading, through grasping a targetted number of sight words, in order to increase childrens’ comprehension.

Decision makers should take into consideration a focus on shedding the light on childrens’ reading comprehension. Children are the most important category in the community as they will end up as decision makers one day. Therefore, teaching comprehension for children following such strategy should be a school objective, standard, aim and goal, or students may end up at risk. Lyon (2003) states that if children were not exposed to appropriate reading instruction at a young age, they are likely to have reading problems in adulthood.

Curriculum developers could add GR strategies into the country’s curriculum to benefit children and enlighten teachers about the importance of exposing children to high quality reading instruction strategies.

This study is significant as there is a lack of dedicated research on using GR in KGs to improve childrens’ word acquisition in general and in the UAE in particular.
The study hopes to provide a source for many educators who are eager to develop children's reading levels and make a difference in their educational levels, especially during English language learning.

1.7 Summary of Chapters

This chapter presented the significance of the study, the scope of the study.

Chapter two reviews the foundation of GR based on the related theories and the literature review, and discuss them in more detail. It states the gaps in student performance literature, upon which this study is based.

Chapter three reviews the methodology of conducting the research, and discuss the reasoning for the required measurement tools. Additionally, it justifies the reason behind choosing the research design. Finally, it shows more details about the sample and the results of the study.

Chapter four states the main results of the study regarding the impact of GR on KG1 students’ reading performance. Thus, it shows the posttest results of using GR, in terms of focusing on word recognition and reading comprehension for both groups. Moreover, Chapter five discusses the findings regarding the two research questions and highlighting the implications of the current study. Also, it presents the limitations and will suggest some recommendations regarding the application of GR on KG1 students’ reading performance.
Chapter 2: Guided Reading- Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into two sections. The purpose of the first section is to establish a theoretical background and literature base on GR strategies and the different skills GR influences. Moreover, it presents the importance of teaching sight words and reading comprehension to young learners and the procedure of applying GR. The second part sheds light on the related past studies and highlight points upon which they might correlate, conflict, agree or disagree. This section also tackles the impact of GR on reading comprehension and word acquisition of the students. Additionally, it points out the main gaps in the studies to draw the investigation line of this study and point out the main areas this research will deeply look at.

2.2 The Skill of Reading

The skill of reading is a complex skill which requires various key components to perform appropriately. Children begin learning to read starting with learning the alphabetic principles which involve letter-sound recognition (Ehri & Wilce, 1985; Bus & Van IJzendoorn, 1999; Justice & Sofka, 2013). During this period children start to create their first schema, the prior background knowledge the reader uses to comprehend reading material (Rumelhart, 1980). A common way used to teach children letter-sound correspondence is the total physical response teaching method, which involves associating the letter-sound with some movements and actions that help students respond to, recall, and remember the previous knowledge, in order to acquire the basic knowledge of the language (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill & Krathwohl, 1956; Asher, 1969; Ball & Blachman, 1991). When the teachers or parents (or any supportive adult) expose the child to regular reading with a repetitive pattern
s/he will be able to gain more knowledge and build the foundation of reading (Vukelich, 1984; Willingham, 2015).

Children start gaining vocabulary and make sense of it through dialogic reading, which mainly focuses on reading pictures to develop vocabulary, then connecting it with the print (Arnold & Whitehurst, 1994). This stage might occur at home and school, as children tend to learn the language fast when they are young. Reading aloud is another type of reading strategy, which helps children to improve their fluency, listening comprehension, and expressive language (Arnold & Whitehurst, 1994; Willingham, 2015). Parents are advised to start reading aloud to their children at period of infancy (Whelan, 2014). There are different sub-skills children need to acquire to improve their overall reading skills and move forward to become independent readers. Some of the key components of reading are reading comprehension and word acquisition, which will be discussed separately below.

2.2.1 Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension is one of the most important elements in reading. Researchers have many definitions of reading comprehension. For example, Woolley (2011) identifies reading comprehension as “the process of making meaning from text” (p15). In fact, students, especially kindergartners, extract the meaning from the text by looking at different pieces. For instance, they start looking at the pictures to extract the meaning from them (Whitehurst et al., 1998). Then, they tend to look at the print to connect between the picture and the print (Adams, 1994; Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998; Woolley, 2011). After that, they use their reading schema to recognize some of the print which they recalled, and they decode known high frequency words (Carrell, 1984; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Woolley, 2011). Next, they might look at some
simple words, such as “cat” and “hot,” using their phonological knowledge. Later, they will try to analyze and think about some words which they do not know, but they might still figure out their meaning from the pictures (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998; Woolley, 2011).

Reading comprehension is very important for students as it helps them to understand the text and improve their reading skills and educational performance (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006; Cornoldi & Oakhill, 2013). Children learn more when they are enjoying the process of reading, which allows them to comprehend and grasp new vocabulary and increase their understanding. Still, reading comprehension requires rich vocabulary and fluency, which allows children to listen to themselves and comprehend what they heard (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006; Pearson, 2018). What helps the students to increase their vocabulary the most is receiving the correct instruction that matches their instructional level. GR provides the students with the correct instructional approach as their teachers keep ongoing assessment records of their students in order to support them. Teachers facilitate the process of reading during GR to improve students’ reading comprehension skills. In addition, they scaffold the students’ learning to help them to improve their reading comprehension skills. Sarikas (2018) identified scaffolding as a way of supporting the student’s learning by pairing him/her with another student or teacher who are more expert and have more knowledge in a specific topic. Therefore, students use the reading comprehension skills they grasped during GR and apply them when they are reading alone or with others in order to comprehend different texts (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006).
2.2.2 Word Recognition

EFL students start to learn the language first by what they hear and listen to. After that, they connect between what they heard and what they first decode and read. Word acquisition is the primary initial component of reading as students need to acquire some words in order to start their first reading of the print. Acquiring new vocabulary helps students to have better performance in reading fluency, which will lead to better reading comprehension (Clark, 1973; Meara, 2009).

Furthermore, vocabulary development affects reading comprehension directly. If the students want to comprehend a text, they need to know most of the vocabulary words in the text. Learning words helps students to extract the meaning of their reading. Moreover, it helps them to study the words and understand their direct and indirect meaning based on the text (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997; Kear & Gladhart, 1983; Cornoldi & Oakhill, 2013). Furthermore, the more vocabulary the students know, the more time they can spend on reading to focus on other things like reading comprehension, rather than focusing on learning the words’ meaning (Nation, 2001; Woolley, 2011). Learning new words for reading starts with decoding frequency words as they are the most repeated and occurred words in print.

2.2.2.1 Teaching Sight Words

There is another essential component of teaching reading, which is teaching sight words. Sight words like: (we, you, blue,…) are a group of words children learn by heart from sight as they have no spelling rules foundation and they form up to 75% of the total number of children’s vocabulary in print (Kear & Gladhart, 1983). Teaching these sets of words depends on repetition and drilling them on a regular basis (Schmitt & McCarthy, 1997; Ehri, 2005). Teaching sight words helps students to be fast readers.
Furthermore, sight words are categorized under the section of vocabulary teaching which will lead to reading fluency and comprehension in addition to gaining new vocabulary words (Tan & Nicholson, 1997; Ehri, 2005). When children gain more vocabulary words, they tend to build their background knowledge about different topics in different areas (Ehri & McCormick, 1998; Ehri, 2005; Armbruster, 2010). Acquiring sight words, especially with young learners gives them confidence in their early reading attempts. Learning sight words promotes reading comprehension as these form 50% of the written texts, which will make it easier for young learners to extract the meaning from the texts and facilitate the decoding. After that, students can shift their attention and focus on other elements of reading (Kear & Gladhart, 1983; Ehri & McCormick, 1998).

2.3 Guided Reading

GR is one type of reading that improves students’ reading performance in different language learning areas, including: reading comprehension, reading fluency and word acquisition (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012; Iaquinta, 2006). GR is a balanced teaching method for reading, which usually requires grouping students with similar reading skill levels in order to receive similar instructions. Fountas and Pinnell (2010) define GR as “small-group reading instruction designed to provide differentiated teaching that supports students in developing reading proficiency” (p. 2). GR is useful both for students who are struggling with reading and independent readers (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2001; Iaquinta, 2006). The primary purpose of this reading instruction strategy is to increase students’ reading performance in different skills, including reading comprehension, fluency, speaking and sometimes writing (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006; Pinnell & Fountas, 2010). Moreover, it helps students to deal with difficult texts,
including extracting meaning from text and comprehending difficult vocabulary and sentence structures (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2006; Antonacci, 2000; Iaquinta, 2006). Gradually, the students will improve their skills around dealing with more challenging texts. In addition, it increases the students’ reading skills and helps them to be independent readers as they receive support from both the teacher and their peers (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2001; Iaquinta, 2006). Furthermore, it gives the teacher an opportunity to be aware of the process of the text selection; the text must meet the targeted student’s interest and instructional needs. Additionally, GR provides a vast range of differentiated activities to support students’ learning styles and needs (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006, 2010, 2012).

2.3.1 Framework for GR

Fountas and Pinnell (1996) introduced GR first in the USA through their publication Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Students. They developed a framework for implementing GR which is based on providing differentiated instructions within small groups. It is widely used by researchers around the world. Although GR was first used in the USA, it was introduced in New Zealand and Australia in 1980s via small group instructions (Pinnell & Fountas, 2010). The framework consists of different components.

As GR is a method of teaching reading, it has a systematic strategy which differs significantly from other methods of teaching reading, such as traditional reading groups. Students are grouped according to their reading level in the traditional reading group, yet they are grouped according to both their reading performance and instructional need in GR. Furthermore, teachers scaffold and model the new targeted skill for the students based on the selected text and prepared outcomes; however, in
traditional reading groups the text is not selected based on specific skills; therefore, 
the teacher does not model a specific skill for the students (Eldredge & Butterfield, 
1986; Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012). Moreover, in traditional reading groups, the 
teacher used to have the dominant role and to be the main piece of the puzzle during 
shared reading. In contrast, in GR there are specific roles for both the teacher and 
student defined throughout the GR (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Iaquinta, 2006).

In a GR situation, the student is an active reader who thinks critically and interacts 
with the text to extract the meaning and deal with the problematic contexts (Fountas 
& Pinnell, 1996; Iaquinta, 2006). GR is therefore a flexible way of teaching reading 
that highlights the mutual interaction between the teacher and the student, and the 
mutual relationship between the student and the text itself. Moreover, it has guidelines 
for selecting and matching the texts with the students’ level. Additionally, GR has a 
dynamic grouping system (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Suits, 2003; Iaquinta, 2006), as 
will be illustrated below.

2.3.1.1 Grouping System

GR is designed to serve differentiation, differentiated group activities, and to ensure 
that no student is left behind. Thus, the grouping system is based on a systematic way 
of selecting and grouping students with the same reading level and instructional need 
(Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Suits, 2003; Iaquinta, 2006). The program has a dynamic 
grouping system as the educators have the freedom of regrouping the students based 
on their ongoing assessment results, which define the kinds of support the students 
might need. Furthermore, in each group the number of students ranges between 4-6 
students who typically spend 20 minutes reading individually by taking turns and as a
group along with the discussion with the group members and the teacher (Avalos, Plasencia & Chavez, 2007; Fountas & Pinnell, 2012).

2.3.1.2 Text Selection

It is important to match the text with the reader in order for both the teacher and the student to work on the correct strategies for reading during GR. It enables the educator to support the student in the area that s/he needs using specific textual resources. The teacher tailors learning experiences for the student to receive instruction based on needs in order improve reading skills such as comprehension, decoding or any other skills in that domain (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012; Fawson & Reutzel, 2000; Iaquinta, 2006; Avalos et al., 2007). It is essential that the selected text be of interest for the students in order to attract them and to establish a mutual interaction between all the students, the teacher and the text. Fink and Samuels (2007) suggest that struggling readers can turn to higher-level readers when teachers tap into the interests of the students and provide reading materials corresponding to those interests. Another critical point in selecting a text is that the text needs to serve the learning outcomes; otherwise, it will be useless for all the concerned parties. At the same time, it is better to select a text appropriate for each member in the homogenous group. Teachers should take into their consideration the level of the chosen text, which should be right at the point where students cannot read all the text by themselves, and they need support from others. The text should be in the medium range of difficulty, neither too easy nor too difficult (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012; Iaquinta, 2006).

2.3.1.3 Text Introduction

After the text selection, the teacher makes sure to introduce the text for the students before they read it individually. Teachers help students to connect with the text by
making it authentic and connecting it to their real lives, backgrounds knowledge or literary experiences. Additionally, they motivate the students to share their predictions about the text and the author and draw their attention to what they like about the text. Moreover, text introduction helps the students to overcome the difficult vocabulary (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Antonacci, 2000).

2.3.1.4 The Role of the Teacher

The teacher’s role during the process of GR is as significant and important as the materials and resources used during instruction. One characteristic of a teacher who performs better in teaching GR is a teacher with a good background in literacy; teachers should know what to select and when to interfere and support, and how to apply and transfer the knowledge to those who might need it. The capability of the teacher to create full picture of the learners’ need is a key component in his/her role as well (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001, 2012; Fawson & Reutzel, 2000; Biddulph, 2002; Iaquinta, 2006). Moreover, the teacher is an observer who observes the students’ progress and measures the amount of support to provide. S/he is a facilitator who provides differentiated activities for the different leveled students to meet their instructional needs. The educator's role starts with selecting the appropriate text, going through introducing, discussing and assessing the students, and ends with creating an independent learner (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012; Biddulph, 2002; Iaquinta, 2006).

2.3.1.5 The Role of the Learner

The student’s role starts when the teacher defines their instructional needs and the area they need to receive support with. The students receive the maximum benefit when they are fully aware of the targeted learning outcomes and interacting with their peers along with the teacher to accomplish the outcomes (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012).
Students’ role may vary throughout the different stages of applying GR. At the beginning, they might be engaged in a conversation with their peers to discuss and raise questions about the story they are going to read. Furthermore, they share their predictions about the story and point out some new vocabulary they need further help with (Biddulph, 2002; Fountas & Pinnell, 2010, 2012; Cox, 2017). Then, students read the text silently and seek assistance as needed. Finally, they discuss what they read with their group members and revisit the text to answer specific questions (Biddulph, 2002; Fountas & Pinnell, 2010, 2012; Cox, 2017). Students who are considered as more knowledgeable help their peers, which builds mutual benefit and trust to transfer and scaffold each other’s learning (Avalos et al., 2007).

2.3.1.6 Procedures of GR

Before applying GR, educators divide the students into homogenous groups of 4-6 students based on the level of their reading skill and their instructional need. After that, the teacher selects the text to match the students with the appropriate texts (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012). Next, according to Villanueva de Debat (2006), the teacher introduces the text whether by following a top-down approach, which "focuses on the background knowledge a reader uses to comprehend a written texts" (p.8), or a bottom-up reading approach, where the reader extracts the information from the text using letters and words in a systematic way (Gough, 1972), to support students’ later problem-solving attempts. The introductory phase is where the teacher builds the foundation of problem-solving skills within the text and explains the difficult vocabulary (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Biddulph, 2002; Cox, 2017).

Next, students practice reading the whole text or a specific part of it individually to read for meaning and extract the new vocabulary, while the teacher observes the
students closely, making decisions for the next steps, accordingly. Later, the teacher encourages, confirms and scaffolds the students’ attempts to solve the problem (Biddulph, 2002; Fountas & Pinnell, 2010; Schirmer & Schaffer 2010). Then, s/he runs a discussion, individually or within the group, about what they read, and check the students’ comprehension skills and ability to make meaning of the text. Finally, both the teacher and the students reexamine the text and demonstrate a variety of comprehension strategies which might range between the top-down and bottom-up learning approaches (Gough, 1972; Fountas & Pinnell, 2006; Cox, 2017).

2.4 GR and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

When Fountas and Pinnell (2006) established the framework of GR, they built it on a solid theoretical foundation based on Lev Vygotsky’s theories, which provided the rationale for GR framework. There were three key points of Vygotsky’s work that supported GR: actual learning occurs within the zone of proximal development, language is the main mean of communication, and learning occurs in social context (Vygotsky, 1978).

2.4.1 Zone of Proximal Development

According to Vygotsky (1978) the ZPD is “the distance between the actual development level” of the student “as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 81). ZPD refers to the learning process of children and to what extent they can perform a task independently or with support. For the teachers, they will observe and assess the progress of the students to measure their instructional needs in order to prepare for appropriate support and relevant learning resources (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000; McLeod,
The students will work with different activities like problem solving, word work and observing their peers and teachers to accomplish one or more tasks until they master specific targeted skill(s) (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Iaquinta, 2006; Cox, 2017). Gallimore and Tharp (1990) suggest that children’s learning process which occurs in the ZPD goes through four stages (see Figure 2.1). The first stage of learning starts with the assistance the students receive from the more knowledgeable ones (MKO).

Vygotsky (1978) considers the MKO a person with better knowledge and skills than the learner. He explains how the interaction between the MKO and the learner would increase the whole sensitive learning period during the ZPD. Likewise, this MKO might be an adult or a peer. It is not only represented by the teachers but also it could be a parent or any adult. When the child is interacting with the MKO, this will trigger the child’s creativity and thinking skills. The child can observe and copy or even

---

**Figure 2.1: Model of the four stages in the zone of proximal development (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990:185)**
absorb the guided instructions to attain a new skill (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Antonacci, 2000; Iaquinta, 2006; McLeod, 2014).

A major part of GR is the text introduction, which occurs after the careful choosing of the text according to specific aforementioned criteria. During this period the teacher is considered as the MKO who provides knowledge and builds the student’s schema. After that, the teacher supports students’ learning through different activities, including prediction, word work and questioning. The teacher might ask the students about the cover page of the selected story and their predictions about the story (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Antonacci, 2000; Iaquinta, 2006). Additionally, s/he might introduce the new sight words and ask students to find them to be familiar with them. The teacher scaffolds the students’ learning through modeling, where the students have the chance to observe, communicate and practice the targeted skill(s), which will lead to moving forward to the second stage of ZPD (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Antonacci, 2000; Iaquinta, 2006). The concept of scaffolding is reflected in the support provided for an individual by others, especially the MKO, during learning. This kind of knowledge differs according to the level of the child; it might increase or decrease accordingly. Scaffolding occurs for a specific time only- until the child absorbs the instruction and is able to apply the new skill individually (Antonacci, 2000; HQ, 2017; Sarikas, 2018).

Generally, children who are not able to do the task properly need support from a more experienced person. Vygotsky (1978) shifts the focus from the individual focus on learning process to the peer and group assistance to provide the child with suitable and rich instruction. Likewise, he emphasizes the interaction between society and the learner, as they are affected by each other. The provider of instruction could be a father, mother, teacher, sister, brother, or even a friend. Gradually, this support
minimizes and fades away (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000)

At the second stage, the student starts to apply what s/he observed and learned until reaching a specific point and improving his/her skills. Students might do some problem solving, such as word works. The teacher in this case will observe the students’ progress and may reduce the number of questions according to the need of the learner (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000). Students use the knowledge they absorbed at the beginning phases of the learning process and self-direct themselves to analyze the cover page of the selected text as they start to find clues to predict what the story is about. Next, teachers assess students by observing and taking notes for further support or planning for the next session of GR. Teachers may provide minimal help to direct the students at this stage of ZPD (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000; HQ, 2017).

After students work through the first two stages of ZPD during GR, they will be ready to move forward and reach the third level where their “performance is developed, automatized, and fossilized” (p.184) (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990). At this stage, the students reach higher levels of performance, where they do not need help as they use all the background knowledge they built with the teacher and their peers to perform smoothly and independently. Within GR, students at this stage of ZPD need no help to create their own prediction of the story using the pictures and clues (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000). Students will spend a short time to do this as they will have mastered the targeted skill by this stage. They can support their other friends and act as the MKO. Moreover, they can go smoothly over the story and look for different

The final stage of ZPD focuses on how students experience a long-life learning process whereby although they have reached and mastered the targeted skill(s) through the previous stages, there are always additional skills to learn and master (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000). By the final phase, students will have created their schema for a specific target and they will review the previous stages to restart building a new schema and experiences of learning. During GR, the teacher sets targets for each group and supports students to remain in their ZPD throughout the process in order to make sure that the students reach their targets and they are now ready to level up and change their groups into higher level groups (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000; Biddulph, 2002).

2.5 Language is the Main Means of Communication

Vygotsky (1978) focuses on the interactive communication between the community and the child as the primary model of knowledge transition. He emphasizes the necessity of language as a means of communication to transmit knowledge and information among the individuals and their surroundings. Thus, children need to acquire the language to receive and produce knowledge. Communication in GR is a primary tool (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012; Antonacci, 2000). Teachers and students use simple language in the beginning of GR; for example, the teacher might start with simple yes or no questions about the cover page of the selected story or some basic prediction questions about the story. When students listen to each other, they improve
their listening and speaking skills, which will later be connected to the print (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012; Antonacci, 2000; Cox, 2017).

Even during learning activities, students need to express their ideas, for example, within a group activity where using language is a must to perform the task. The teacher’s role is observing, facilitating and directing students for further support and planning. Students demonstrate their mastery of skills via the use of language, whether to read, discuss, ask or answer questions during the session of GR (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2012; Antonacci, 2000; Biddulph, 2002; Iaquinta, 2006).

2.6 Learning Occurs in Social Context

Vygotsky (1978) proposes that one of the essential keys of human development is the dynamic interaction that occurs between the society and individuals. The nature of the child is to be a curious observer, discoverer, copier, imitator, or developer of newly grasped skills from society. Vygotsky believes in the mutual impact of these two factors, society and individuals, on each other (Antonacci, 2000; HQ, 2017).

The social context of the child is reflected by the school, the teacher, the group within the classroom, the friends, the family or community. Any surrounding that provides learning opportunities for the child is a social context full of rich experiences for the children to learn and practice. Students start as passive learners, yet after absorbing knowledge, they become active learners when they communicate with others in their surroundings and enhance their knowledge through new experiences (Vygotsky, 1978; Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Gallimore & Tharp, 1990; Antonacci, 2000; McLeod, 2014).

Within the GR framework, students need to exist in a small social context, their groups, to interact with them. Moreover, they will be exposed to different learning
styles and instructions which help them to become independent learners, after observing, imitating and practicing the new skill(s) (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2010, 2012; Iaquinta, 2006).

2.7 Summary of the Theoretical Framework

The first section of chapter 2 covered thoroughly the main aspects of GR and its theoretical foundation. It showed the significance of the main reading skills involved in GR, including reading comprehension and word acquisition, on childrens’ reading performance.

The literature revealed the framework of GR, the factors involved in it, and its dynamicity. Furthermore, it stated the theoretical establishment of GR, which was based on Vygotsky’s ZPD construct of his socio-cultural theory. Additionally, this section explored the different stages of the process and the ways in which students’ reading skill development is supported in each phase. Also, it reviewed the literature on differentiated activities for different leveled students in different stages.

To sum up, GR is one of the effective ways of teaching and improving childrens’ reading performance and developing their reading skills, in addition to creating a long-life independent learner.

2.8 Previous Studies on GR

This section reviews studies on GR. It looks at major studies that were done in international contexts on GR and moves on to talk about studies that have been conducted in the Gulf region. It critically reviews the studies and points out the main relevant points to this study.
2.8.1 Studies on GR in International Contexts

GR becomes widespread rapidly, internationally, as it proved its effectiveness on the students’ performance; therefore, many researchers investigated its efficacy with different aspects of language learning. Many studies explored GR and its effectiveness with students who had learning difficulties in language learning. The current study focuses on the impact of GR on students reading comprehension, fluency and word acquisition; therefore, the reviewed studies were selected according to their relevance to the current topic.

Deegan (2010) investigated the effect of GR on second graders’ reading comprehension. The researcher conducted the study in Pennsylvania in the USA. The researcher used a qualitative and quantitative methodology to run the study and determine the effect of GR on the students' comprehension. She used classroom observation (anecdotal report), questionnaires completed by teachers and students, the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), and the Storytown reading theme as tools to collect her data. She used pre-test and posttest to determine if there was a statically significant difference of the effect of GR on the students' reading comprehension. She had an average of seventeen students in each of the four classes which were included in the study and four female teachers completed the survey.

The results of the study showed that GR increased the students’ motivation for reading and participating. Students tended to spend more time reading and grasping the new vocabulary words as they comprehend the targeted texts after they utilized GR. Finally, the study demonstrated the statistically significant positive impact of GR on students’ reading comprehension.
Huber (2011) examined the impact of implementing GR in grade three, four and five students’ achievements in reading. The targeted school was located in a suburban school in Southeastern Pennsylvania in the USA. The sample of the study included 347 students from grades 3-5. The researcher used mixed-methods research to collect data using qualitative and quantitative instruments. She distributed a survey among the teachers to collect the qualitative data, and utilized Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) tests to collect the quantitative data and measure the students' progress.

The findings were significant only with grade 5 students who showed an improvement in their reading comprehension, word acquisition and decoding, reading fluency and reading skills. The results were not statistically significant with grade 3 and 4 students; however students improved their reading skills in general. Huber found that students needed more focused activities on reading comprehension, which was the difference between the three grades levels, as the grade 5 students were exposed to these activities, unlike the other grades.

DeVos (2012) conducted an action research study to examine the effect of GR on first-grade students' reading abilities. The study took place in one rural southwestern Minnesota primary school in the USA. The sample consisted of twenty purposefully selected first grade students in a single class. The researcher used a quantitative research methodology. She used the tools of Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) and running records to collect the data.

The researcher found an improvement in students' reading levels, including reading fluency and reading comprehension. Moreover, the results revealed that in order for the students to read texts at their level, they had to know most of the vocabulary words in the text and would grasp the remainder during the implementation of GR. Finally,
the students became independent readers, more responsible for their learning, and more aware of their role during the reading process.

Hardie (2013) recruited 21 kindergarten students for her research, over five weeks, to examine the role of GR on younger learners’ literacy improvement. The sample's school was located in a suburban community in Western New York in the USA. The children joined the school with the ability to recognize the alphabet. The researcher used quantitative and qualitative research methods to collect the data; tools included anecdotal records, observational field notes, and running records.

The findings supported the positive impact of GR and its role in students' literacy improvement. Moreover, the results showed that GR developed critical reading skills, which are the foundation for improving reading skills, including: word acquisition, reading comprehension, fluency, and supporting the child to develop into a more independent reader. Additionally, the nature of GR and its differentiated activities facilitated the reading process for the students who were reading on their level and supported the educator to identify the students' instructional needs based on their results.

Araim (2016) conducted a study at a school located in the Central Valley of California in the USA. The purpose of the study was to explore the impact of GR, frustration levels, and instructional levels on improving the reading levels, of a group of second graders. The researcher had a sample of 18 students of different ethnicities, with similar reading levels. The study consisted of qualitative and quantitative research methods, which was reflected in the research tools used to collect the targeted data. The researcher used a survey for the teachers who participated in the study, and a pre-posttest for the students.
The findings showed that the students had more improvement in their reading level when they were reading at their frustration level, where they dealt with more challenging texts, than reading at their instructional level although GR was used in both cases. Moreover, the study proved that GR improved the students' reading comprehension, word acquisition, and reading fluency. Furthermore, students demonstrated more confidence and enjoyment throughout the process.

Makumbila and Rowland (2016) had a sample of 152 third grade students participate in their study in one South African primary school. They measured the effect of using GR to improve the students' reading skills. The researchers used the teachers' assessment checklist for three levels—developing, transitional and independent—in addition to teachers' observation forms to collect and analyze the data. The researchers prepared workshops and professional development sessions to train the assigned teachers on the different methods of applying GR activities and on data collection for the study.

The results showed that the percentage of struggling students dropped after implementing GR over an eight-month period. Furthermore, the results revealed a noticeable improvement in the students’ phonemic awareness; fluency; word recognition and acquisition; and reading comprehension, within a small group of students. In addition, the study showed an improvement in students’ engagement during reading and in their motivation towards it.

O'Rourke (2017) applied a quantitative research method using an experimental design to collect data for investigating the influence of GR on students' word recognition, reading comprehension, and reading fluency. The researcher had two assigned groups of 21 second graders (age 7-8), each to conduct the experiment and compare their
The study was conducted in the USA. The researcher used the Independent Reading Level Assessment (IRLA) to collect the targeted data, in addition to the teachers’ observation.

The findings revealed that the students’ reading comprehension levels improved, which was attributed to the GR process meeting their instructional needs. Moreover, the findings showed that the students improved their fluency and word recognition, which increased their vocabulary acquisition.

Teets (2017) implemented her study at one of the southeastern public schools in the USA to investigate the impact of GR on fourth and fifth graders’ reading levels. The researcher randomly selected the sample of 100 students in grade four to be placed in the control or experimental group. The researcher used a quasi-experimental design, with a nonequivalent control group. The researcher used pre-posttests of DRA to collect the quantitative data and to compare and analyze the data.

The results revealed a significant effect for GR on students’ reading fluency. Students recognized and acquired the vocabulary words, improving their reading fluency level. Moreover, the study suggests more investigations on the impact of GR on students’ reading comprehension, as GR promotes using critical thinking to interact with the texts.

Stuckey (2018) explored to what extent GR could affect third graders’ performance in reading. The study took place in one of Georgia’s public schools in the USA. The targeted sample was a group of 21 third graders, aged between 8-10 years old. The research applied a mixed methods research design to collect and analyze the data. She used the MAP test as an instrument to collect the data. Furthermore, the researcher
used the MAP test as pre-posttest to measure the effect of GR on the students' reading performance. Additionally, she used running records, an assessment tool which provides information on a score of word reading accuracy, and anecdotal records, simple brief stories about something that happened, to analyze the data.

The study revealed the significant influence of GR on students’ reading performance. The students showed improvement in their reading comprehension, reading fluency and vocabulary acquisition, as they received GR based on their instructional needs. Additionally, students’ motivation and engagement were enhanced during the process of reading.

According to Washington (2018), GR improves students’ word recognition and reading fluency. The researcher reached this conclusion based on a study conducted in Georgia in the USA on one class of twenty kindergarten students aged between four and five years old, which examined the effect of GR on students’ reading ability. The targeted school principal selected the participants. The researcher used running records as a tool to collect the research data.

The results revealed a noticeable and measured improvement in the students' reading ability, particularly in their independent reading skills. GR affected students’ word acquisition and recognition and, consequently, their reading fluency. This study showed the impact of GR strategies on increasing the students' word recognition and decoding skills, which led to a better comprehension level as well as an enhanced independent reading level. Additionally, the differentiated activities of GR supported the varied levels of students and increased the effectiveness of the instructional materials that the teacher provided/delivered.
Overall, most of the reviewed studies were conducted in different places around the USA and were chosen based on their relevance to the current study. The review shows the significance of GR and its impact on students’ reading performance, in general, as well as on their attitude. The studies further revealed the positive effect of the GR program on enabling students to become independent and enthusiastic readers.

2.8.2 Research on GR in the Gulf Region

There are a number of studies that have been conducted in the Middle East region (Al Odwan, 2012; Asl, Davaribina & Abdi, 2015; Almuslimi, 2016; Alshumaimeri, 2017). However, these studies have focused on reading comprehension in general, rather than GR; therefore, these studies will not be reviewed because they fall outside the limits of this study. This section will review the studies that have investigated GR specifically.

Ali (2010) investigated teachers and students’ perception of the implementation of GR and its effectiveness for students. The researcher conducted the study in Bahrain’s primary schools. The sample consisted of 35 teachers and 15 female students. The study applied qualitative and quantitative research methods to collect data using questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The researcher recruited the sample from 14 schools in Bahrain, yet only 12 schools participated in the study: seven of them were boys schools, and the five were girls schools in four different towns in Bahrain.

The analysis of the data concluded that there was a need for implementing GR in the classrooms and to be integrated into the curriculum. There was a consensus of teachers and students regarding the usefulness of implementing the GR program. According to...
the teachers’ responses to the questionnaire, there was an improvement in the students’ reading comprehension performance, word acquisition, listening, and speaking based on their performance in the language test. The study was limited to the teachers and students feedback on implementing GR and it was a qualitative study in nature. However, the research did not include any data for the students’ tests results, and the number of the students who were exposed to GR was not mentioned in the study.

Salhyyah (2011) explored the influence of GR on grade four students’ reading comprehension performance. The study examined the treatment on 60 students in the UAE who were divided into a control group and experimental group. The researcher used a pre-posttest design to collect and analyze the data. The treatment took place over three weeks to assess the impact of GR on the students’ reading comprehension performance. The study applied a quasi-experimental design to investigate the effectiveness of GR.

The results showed that GR had a significant impact on improving the students’ reading comprehension performance. Students appeared more motivated during the treatment and were comfortable within their homogenous group, which increased their self-esteem. The study was limited in that it only investigated the effect of GR on reading comprehension skills.

Yazdani and Mohammadi (2015) investigated the effect of GR and direct reading thinking activity (DRTA) on students’ reading comprehension in their study of 61 grade one students in Bojnourd city, located in Iran. The students were divided into three groups, one control group and two experimental groups. The researchers used quasi-experimental design to conduct the study. They used a preposttest to collect the study data.
The findings showed interesting results as DRTA had better results with students’ reading comprehension performance than GR. The study revealed that there was no effect of GR on students’ reading comprehension performance. However, the study was limited to investigating reading comprehension, only.

2.8.3 Summary and Evaluation of Literature

Although studies were varied and numerous in the international contexts, there was a considerable lack of studies which tackled the GR program thoroughly in the Middle East region.

Generally, there were more studies within the international context especially in USA. Although there are different types of reading strategies, most studies demonstrated the effectiveness of moving GR strategies into practice as it supports the differentiated instructions to meet students' individual needs. Interestingly, there was agreement among the studies on the need for improving the students’ reading comprehension as it affects their overall reading performance level. Most of the reviewed studies investigated the impact of GR on students’ reading comprehension, fluency or word recognition and acquisition.

However, some studies (Ali, 2010; Deegan, 2010; Salhyyah, 2011; Yazdani & Mohammadi 2015; Teets, 2017; Washington, 2018) examined the effect of GR on developing one or two reading skills, such as reading comprehension, fluency or word recognition and acquisition. However, they suggested further investigation for the other skills, like phonics as their findings showed the positive influence of GR on their targeted skills.
Reading comprehension was a significant component of reading skills which was investigated in the previous literature as students need higher critical thinking skills in order to understand text. GR supports reading comprehension as students receive tailored support targeted to their instructional needs in order to scaffold their skills. Most studies' findings showed a significant improvement in the students' performance after the GR intervention. Surprisingly, one study (Araim, 2016) found that students could even perform well and show improvement in their reading comprehension if they read at their frustration level when they were applying the GR strategy.

Additionally, the studies explored the effectiveness of GR on enhancing the reading fluency level for the students. Similarly, to reading comprehension, most results showed that there was an enhancement in the students' reading fluency as they had the opportunity to practice a wide range of activities during GR sessions (Huber, 2011). The findings showed that the students reached a comfort zone when it comes to reading fluency as they read and listen to their peers who were at their same proficiency level, which raised their confidence and consequently their performance (Araim, 2016; Makumbila & Rowland, 2016).

The last skill which previous studies touched upon was word acquisition and recognition. Generally, the studies reached a consensus on the usefulness of using GR strategies to increase students' word acquisition and recognition. Several studies (e.g., DeVos, 2012; O'Rourke, 2017; Washington, 2018) focused on the recognition of frequency words, which helps students to improve their fluency and reading comprehension. Most findings agreed that GR has a significant positive effect on improving students' word acquisition because it provides the opportunity to introduce
the targeted texts via explaining the targeted vocabulary terms. As a result, the students’ fluency improved as they practiced.

After reviewing the literature and past studies, the impact of GR was clear, especially with its effect on the students’ reading performance. In GR, students’ performance is scaffolded based on their instructional needs, and differentiation is provided so that no child will be left behind, particularly those who struggle in reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, 2001; Iaquinta, 2006). In addition, GR is a child-friendly strategy for teaching different reading skills and empowering students to become long-life independent learners (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012).

On the other hand, the studies reviewed above generally confirm the role of GR in supporting students’ needs in different reading aspects and in helping students to develop and establish different reading skills, including promoting their critical thinking skills. Some skills like reading comprehension and word acquisition play an important role in students’ performance in later grades (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997). Therefore, it is essential to do more investigations on the influence of GR on kindergartners, as it is the age during which students develop the essential skills of reading.

All the reviewed studies covered GR relatively to the current study by investigating the effect of GR on students’ performance on one, two or three reading skills. Therefore, not all the studies examined the impact of GR on all the skills. Furthermore, only Hardie (2013) and Washington (2018) conducted their research on kindergartners. However, none of these were conducted in the Arab region, particularly in UAE context. The rest of the studies had primary students and older students as the sample group in their studies. Many international studies were conducted years ago,
while most studies conducted in the Middle East region were more recent. There were only three relevant studies on the topic and one of them only (Salhyyah, 2011) was conducted in UAE context with grade four students and it was limited to specific elements. Moreover, the study by Yazdani and Mohammadi (2015) reveals the considerable need for more studies in this area. However, the results of their study conflicted with the other studies (Ali, 2010; Deegan, 2010; DeVos, 2012; Hardie, 2013; Araiim, 2016; Makumbila & Rowland, 2016; O'Rourke, 2017; Stuckey, 2018) in terms of the effectiveness of GR on improving the students’ reading comprehensions performance. Therefore, there is a need for further investigation on GR especially within the UAE context, particularly with kindergarten students, to study its effectiveness and establish a useful source of data for implementing such strategy.

The ultimate goal of this study is to examine the impact of GR on kindergartners’ reading performance. It studies the effect of GR on students’ reading comprehension, and word recognition and acquisition therefore it will add to the literature especially regarding the targeted sample and the effectiveness of implementing GR on improving students’ reading skills. Moreover, it will be a useful resource for those who are interested in implementing GR with UAE EFL learners. Additionally, educators who are eager to solve their students’ reading problems and empower their students to be long-life learners will find this research to be a good head start. Also, at the same time, it will be a good source for teachers who seek to provide their students with instruction tailored to individual the needs in order to ensure that no child is left behind. Furthermore, curriculum developers might add GR strategies to the curriculum to benefit children and enlighten teachers about the importance of exposing the child to GR.
2.9 Research Questions

This research is designed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the effect of GR on KG1 students’ word recognition?

2. To what extent does GR improve KG1 students’ reading comprehension?

The following chapter illustrates on the methodology used in this research.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of Guided Reading (GR) on kindergartners’ reading performance. It examines the effectiveness of GR on students’ reading comprehension and word recognition. This chapter tackles the methodology of the current research. First, it restates the research questions for the reader’s convenience. Next, the chapter reviews the relevant parts of the educational system in the UAE. Then, it elaborates on the research design, setting and participants. It also explains the instruments, data collection procedures, and discuss ethical issues. After that, it sheds light on the validity and reliability of the study.

3.2 Research Questions

This research is set to answer the following questions:

1. What is the effect of GR on KG1 students’ word recognition?

2. To what extent does GR improve KG1 students’ reading comprehension?

3.3 Research Design

This quantitative research used a quasi-experimental method. Therefore, a pretest-posttest design was used to examine the impact of the intervention on the targeted sample. The researcher collected the quantitative data using the pre-posttests.

3.4 The Education System in the United Arab Emirates

In 2017, the UAE adopted the Emirati School Model to be in line with the vision of UAE by 2021. Sheikh Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum, the Vice President and Prime Minister of the United Arab Emirates, and Ruler of the Emirate of Dubai,
launched the vision of UAE which aims to place the UAE among the best countries around the world in different fields, and the education system is one of them (MOE, 2015; Zaman, 2017).

The Emirati School Model focuses on improving the national curriculum and enhancing the pedagogical and assessment methods. The model ensures that each student will receive a high standard of education within an attractive and comfortable learning environment. The agenda of the national curriculum and different international curricula of the Ministry of Education (MOE) is to enhance the students’ skills in critical thinking, constructive criticism, analysis, discussion, and decision making (MOE, 2015; Gulf News, 2019).

The curriculum’s emphasis is on science and math, as well as on practical subjects like health sciences and technology. The purpose of the curriculum is to help the students meet the needs of the current and future employment market and prepare them to cope with their surroundings, both regionally and internationally. The three main axes that guarantee the aim of the MOE are: curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment; therefore, the system is undergoing dramatic changes to achieve these aims. One of the important enhancements in the curriculum is focusing on reading, writing and practical knowledge (MOE, 2015; Gulf News, 2019).

According to MOE, the kindergarten (KG) curriculum includes six main principles. The first principle focuses on building students’ skills from different aspects, which are: psychological, social, linguistic, mental, and physical development. The curriculum embeds these five aspects via different subjects, which are to be delivered through integrative teaching resources and methods. The second principle shows that students learn when they build constructive relationships with their teachers, peers,
and environment. These relationships help them to be engaged within an interactive learning environment, through whole class, small groups, and individual activities (MOE, 2015). The third principle is that students learn best in a stimulating and safe learning environment. The fourth principle states that there is a need for building an effective and collaborative relationship between the school and the parents, to monitor the students and set plans to decide on the next step of the student’s learning journey. The fifth principle highlights the curriculum, which focuses on science and provides learning by reasoning and concrete resources as that is how children learn during that age (4-6 years old). The last principle emphasizes the role of the bilingual learning environment to enhance students’ linguistic skills and develop their language via daily exposure to both Arabic and English and encouragement for the development of enthusiasm for reading (MOE, 2015).

3.5 Schools in Abu Dhabi

The Emirati School Model is implemented in over 800 public and private schools across the country, which follow the curriculum of the MOE (Gulf News, 2019). The education system in Al Ain is within the Abu Dhabi educational system, which is mainly divided into three types: Public Schools, Private Schools, and Higher Education. The public schools follow the MOE system and provide education from kindergarteners to adults. The core learning is divided into three cycles and starts from grade 1 to grade 12 (ADEK, 2019).

In 2014-2015 there were 105 public schools, compared to 58 private schools in Al Ain with 61,698 students in public schools and 53,506 students in the private schools (MOE, 2019). The curriculum in private schools is not unified where each school
follows different curricula like: MOE, American, British, Indian, and Iranian (ADEK, 2019).

3.5.1 Context of the Study

The study took place in one of Al-Ain’s private schools. Al-Ain is a city located in the Eastern region of the Emirate of Abu Dhabi in the UAE. It has a population of 766,936 (WAM, 2017).

The private school where the current study was conducted follows the American curriculum. English is the primary language of instruction at the school. The school is accredited by AdvanceED. Also, the school was recently rated band A by the Abu-Dhabi Department of Education and Knowledge (ADEK). It is a mixed gender school which provides education for students from KG to grade 12 (K-12). The school curricula are based on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), with respect to the cultural diversity of the UAE.

The subjects that the school provides are the following: English, Science, Maths, Social Studies, IT, Art, Physical Education (PE), Arabic, Islamic Studies and Arabic Civics, which follow MOE guidelines. Moreover, English is the language of instruction for English, Maths, Science, Social Studies, IT, and Art. The rest of the subjects, including Arabic and Islamic Studies, are taught in Arabic.

The school delivers different subjects to the kindergarteners, including English, Arabic, Maths, Science, Islamic, Social Studies and Physical Education. There are 125 students in KG1. Students come from different ethnicities. Most of the students are from the UAE nationality.
3.5.1.1 Kindergarten One (KG1)’s English Curriculum

The English subject in KG1 is based on CCSS where students have different skills to learn. The English standards are divided into four bands: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The knowledge of language includes learning new vocabulary and the ability to use and understand it when they are reading. The listening and speaking bands focus on the way the students listen, and how they follow the teacher’s directions. They also focus on the students’ ability to comprehend the materials that they are listening to. Also, students demonstrate the appropriate use of the learnt language which they often express via speaking. In reading, the student learns how to read high frequency words and the principles of Consonant-Vowel-Consonant (CVC) words where they spell it after they absorb the letters’ formation and sound (Core standards, 2019). Moreover, students are exposed to English through-out the school day except during the Arabic and Islamic periods.

3.6 Participants

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of GR strategies on KG1 students’ reading performance; therefore, the selected sample had to be in KG1, 4-5 years old pupils. The sample was chosen purposively due to the accessibility of the researcher and due to the sample’s homogeneity. The study had control and experimental groups which involved two mixed gender classes, one class for each group. The control group, class A, had 25 students. It consisted of three sub-groups: high (6 students), middle (13 students), and low achievers (6 students). The experimental group, class B, included another 25 students. It had three sub-groups: high (6 students), middle (13 students), and low achievers (6 students). The middle level in both control and experimental classes were divided to two groups (middle high level and middle low
level) due to the large number which reached 13 students in each class. As a result, the middle group was divided to middle high level with 7 students, and middle low level with 6 students. The final distribution of the groups in both control and experimental classes were as followed: Group 1- high level, Group 2- middle high level, Group 3- middle low level, and Group 4- low level. Class A and B received the exact same instructional curriculum.

The study involved two teachers (Teacher A and Teacher B) to teach the control and experimental groups. Teacher A is usually assigned to teach class A and Teacher B teaches class B. To avoid bias, teachers did not implement the GR intervention with their own regularly assigned classes. Teacher A was assigned to teach class B, and conversely, Teacher B was assigned to teach class A. The researcher was not one of the assigned teachers in this study. The teachers were classroom teachers. Teacher A had 8 years of experience in teaching KG1 and teacher B had 10 years of experience in teaching KG1. Teacher A and B completed their teaching experience at the assigned school and had a bachelor degree in education (BEd).

3.7 Data Collection Instruments

The researcher collected the data by means of pre-posttests design for the control and experimental groups. The quantitative data was collected from the word recognition and reading comprehension tests. The current study compares between the control and experimental groups with their sub-divisions with respect to the word recognition and reading comprehension performance. The data collection procedures and analysis are explained below.
3.7.1 Word Recognition

The word recognition test was in the form of word list. There were three lists used in this study. List A was used to assess the high achieves in class A and B. List 2 was used to assess the middle high and middle low achievers in both control and experimental groups. Finally, list three was used to assess the low achievers in class A and B.

3.7.2 Reading Comprehension

There were three different reading comprehension tests (1, 2, and 3); each test included five questions. The assigned teachers used the reading comprehension test 1 to assess the high achievers in the control and experimental groups. They used the reading comprehension test 2 to assess the middle high and middle low achievers in both classes. Furthermore, they used the reading comprehension test 3 to assess the low achievers in both control and experimental groups.

3.7.3 Pretests

To begin with, the researcher distributed consent forms to the parents of the selected students to take their approval for the application of the study. Parents received and signed the consent forms, and the researcher collected them.

The researcher used two variables (word recognition and reading comprehension) to compare between the control and experimental groups. Teacher A and Teacher B swapped their classes, as was mentioned earlier. After receiving the consent forms, the teachers gave the word recognition and reading comprehension pretests to their assigned classes one week before applying the treatment. The treatment was conducted over six weeks. Each student took the assessment individually outside the classroom.
to eliminate the interruption factor and help the student to focus and relax. The students started with the word recognition pretest followed by the reading comprehension pretest. The two pretests took approximately 20 minutes for each student. The duration of administering the two pretests lasted for two days.

The researcher met with the two assigned teachers to explain the purpose of the study and what resources to use. Moreover, the teacher who was assigned to teach the experimental group had training sessions with the researcher on how to apply the GR. Nonetheless, teacher A and teacher B were responsible of rating their assigned classes too.

3.7.3.1 Pretest Results

In order to find if there were any significant differences between the control and experimental groups for the word recognition and reading comprehension exams in the pre applications, paired sample T tests were conducted.

3.7.3.1.1 Word Recognition

The researcher compared the results of the pretests between the control and experimental groups in regard to the first variable, word recognition, to begin to address the first research question (What is the effect of GR on KG1 students’ word recognition?). The results of the word recognition pretest showed no significant differences between the control and experimental groups (see Table 3.1). Table 3.1 shows the minor differences of the pretest results on word recognition between the control and experimental groups.
Table 3.1: Mean of Word Recognition for Control and Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Recognition</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3.1, the mean of the word recognition for the control group was 4.26 and 4.16 for the experimental group ($t = 0.42$).

Sample pretests 1 (control) and 2 (experimental) in Appendix A are examples of the students’ pretests.

In order to find if there were significant differences between the control and experimental groups for the word recognition in the pretest, paired samples T test was conducted. Table 3.2 below lists the results for the control and experimental Group 1 (high-level students) for word recognition.

Table 3.2: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 1 High-Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 3.2, the mean of the word recognition for Group 1 (High Level) in the control group was 4.3 and 4.32 for the experimental group ($t = 0.44$). The value of the true significance level is larger than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the word acquisition exam, which confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the pre-applications for Group 1 students.

Table 3.3 presents that the mean of the word recognition for Group 2 (Middle High Level) in the control group was 4.5 and 4.35 for the experimental group ($t = 0.046$).

Table 3.3: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 2 Middle High Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>t-statistical</th>
<th>t-Critical</th>
<th>Freedom degrees</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noted from Table 3.3 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the word acquisition exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the pre-application. Table 3.4 shares that the mean of the word recognition for Group 3 (Middle Low Level) in the control group was 4.45 and 4.56 for the experimental group ($t = 0.043$).
Table 3.4: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 3 Middle Low Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noted from Table 3.4 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the word acquisition exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the pre-applications in favor of the experimental group for Group 3.

As shown in Table 3.5, the mean of the word recognition for Group 4 (Low Level) in the control group was 3.7 and 3.32 for the experimental group (t = 0.00).

Table 3.5: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 4 Low Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be noted from Table 3.5 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the word recognition exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the pre-application in favor of the control group in the word acquisition exam of Group 4 students.

### 3.7.3.1.2 Reading Comprehension

The researcher compared results of the pretests between the control and experimental groups in regard to the second variable reading comprehension to begin to address the second research question (To what extent does GR improve KG1 students’ reading comprehension?). The results of the reading comprehension pretest showed no significant differences between the control and experimental groups (see Table 3.6). Table 3.6 shows the minor differences of the pretest results on reading comprehension between the control and experimental groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.6: Mean of Reading Comprehension on the Pretest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for reading comprehension was 4.01 for the control group and 4.25 for the experimental group ($t = 0.14$).

Sample pretests 3 (control) and 4 (experimental) in Appendix B are examples of the students’ pretests.
T-test results for the pretests between control and experimental groups related to the
difference between the mean scores of Group 1 high-level the in regard to reading
comprehension are shown in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7: Mean of Reading Comprehension for Group 1 High-Level in Control and
Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3.7, the mean of the reading comprehension for Group 1 (High-
Level) in the control group was 4.1 and 4.65 for the experimental group ($t = 0.00$). It
can be noted from Table 3.7 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than
the level of assumed significance ($p$ value <0.05) in the comprehension exam, which
confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores
of the control and experimental group students in the pre-applications in favor of the
experimental group of Group 1 high-level students.

Table 3.8 presents that the mean of the reading comprehension for Group 2 (Middle
High Level) in the control group was 4.2 and 4.36 for the experimental group ($t = 0.07$).
Table 3.8: Mean of Reading Comprehension for Group 2 Middle High Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of the true significance level is larger than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the comprehension exam, which confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the pre-applications of Group 2 students.

Table 3.9 shares that the mean of the reading comprehension for Group 3 (Middle Low Level) in the control group was 4.5 and 4.64 for the experimental group (t = 0.082).

Table 3.9: Mean of Reading Comprehension for Group 3 Middle Low Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The value of the true significance level is larger than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the comprehension exam, which confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the pre-applications of Group 3 students.

As shown in Table 3.10, the mean of the reading comprehension for Group 4 (Low Level) in the control group was 3.1 and 3.28 for the experimental group ($t = 0.02$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noted from Table 3.10 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the reading comprehension exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the pre-application in favor of the experimental group in the comprehension exam of Group 4 students. This will be excluded from the comparison of the posttest because the experimental group outperformed the control group in the pretest.
3.8 Experiment and Procedure

As previously mentioned, each sub-group from both control and experimental groups had the exact same resources which were three stories for each group. Each subgroup in the control and experimental groups studied each story for two weeks. For instance, the lower performing students in the control group received the same stories as the lower achievers in the experimental group. The teachers sat with each sub-group for 30 minutes twice a week.

3.8.1 Control Group

The control group had four subgroups- high, middle high, middle low, and low achievers. The teacher used the pre-selected stories for each group as resources to teach the students. The teacher followed the traditional way of teaching stories, which was routinely used in the school, to teach all the groups in the control group. In week one, the teacher read the story aloud, and the students listened. After that, the teacher showed the students a number of high frequency word flash cards. The teacher said the words and the students repeated each word twice. The teacher did not ask any reading comprehension questions. The teacher spent 30 minutes with each group and met with them twice a week. The teacher followed the same procedure with all the three subgroups. Every two weeks, the teacher changed the story and the sight words. The same procedures used in week 1 were followed in weeks 2-6. After one week, the teacher started with the posttests (word recognition and reading comprehension tests). Each student was tested individually and outside the classroom. The teacher spent two days to test the whole class. The students started with the word recognition posttest followed by the reading comprehension posttests. The two posttests took approximately 20 minutes for each student.
3.8.2 Experimental Group

The experimental group had four subdivisions- high, middle high, middle low, and low achievers. The teacher applied the GR strategy to teach the groups. The sessions took place outside the classroom time to help students concentrate and focus. The teacher spent 30 minutes with each group, in which she met with each group twice a week. Each group had the chance to go over three stories, in two week intervals, per story. Similarly, the teacher taught each group different sight words every two weeks. The teacher first set the objectives for each group and prepared the proper activities and resources accordingly. In their groups, the students were exposed to different texts that matched their level, yet they received the same skills taught by the teacher.

The students received instructions on different skills, such as: reading and recognizing sight words, using picture cues, tracking print from left to right, making predictions, activating prior knowledge, retelling, sequencing, phonemic awareness and recognizing the concept of print.

The procedures used during the GR sessions had three stages: before-reading, during-reading and after-reading.

3.8.2.1 Before-Reading Stage

The teacher focused on building the students’ background knowledge and went through the pictures in the story. She encouraged the students to predict what they thought the story would be about. This helped her to set a purpose for reading. Moreover, she helped the students to use the front cover to guide them in making connections between the story and their background knowledge, to build upon it. Furthermore, she went through the pictures in the story and discussed them with the students, to help them
use the pictures as visual cues to improve their reading skills. The teacher drew the students’ attention to the assigned sight words to introduce and emphasize the targeted sight words.

3.8.2.2 During-Reading Stage

During the reading, the teacher modeled reading the text aloud at the beginning, then the students followed along. The students pointed at each word using their pointers to connect between the spoken words and the print. Next, each student in the group had the chance to read the text individually and then read it in pairs. The students used a microphone while they were reading to give them more confidence and encourage them to improve their performance and fluency. During that time, the teacher was listening and observing the students as they were reading, and she provided support whenever it was needed. The teacher made notes for future sessions.

3.8.2.3 After-Reading Stage

After reading the text, the teacher focused on the strategies or skills she selected to teach during the session. The students worked on different activities that involved word work and retelling. After that, the teacher went through the reading comprehension questions. The teacher asked questions and observed the students’ responses and behavior during the activities, while the students completed group, pair, and individual work (see Table 3.11 for GR procedure).
Table 3.11: GR Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Reading Stage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Introduce text (read title), gather understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of student background information, discuss text features,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocabulary (sight words).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Setting a purpose for reading by asking a question or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying a word/strategy to focus on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During Reading Stage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Students will echo the text as the teacher reads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students read independently and in pairs while the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher listens and observes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher assists students by prompting when necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After Reading Stages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on the pre-selected strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students work on different activities that cover word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work and retelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students will go over the comprehension questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The teacher observes the students and take notes for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher followed the same procedure during week 2-6. The teacher revised the covered words with the students each session with all the subgroups. After one week, the teacher started with the posttests (word recognition and reading comprehension
tests). Each student was tested individually, outside of the classroom. The teacher took two days to test the whole class. The students started with the word recognition posttest followed by the reading comprehension posttests. The two posttests took approximately 20 minutes for each student.

3.9 Summary of Chapter 3

The current chapter tackled the education system in the UAE, and it explained the application of the education system in public and private schools in Al Ain. Also, the chapter shed light on the English language curricula and common core standards which are used in international schools in Alain. The chapter mentioned the type of curriculum used in the school in which the study was conducted, and discussed the KG1 English curriculum, for which the current study was designed. Additionally, the chapter described the participants, including students and teachers. Then, data collection procedures were presented in detail, including an explanation of the word recognition and reading comprehension pretests. Next, the procedure of research data collection was explained for both the control and experimental groups. Finally, the chapter presented the analysis for the pretest results.

The following chapter presents the research results and findings regarding the word recognition and reading comprehension posttests.
Chapter 4: Results and Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the main results of the study regarding the impact of GR on kindergarten students’ reading performance.

All the participants from both groups were given word acquisition and reading comprehension posttests, with a duration of approximately 20-25 minutes. The tests were administered within the first two days of week 6. The students had individual sessions to finish the tests. Each teacher assembled the groups (control and experimental) tests for data analysis.

4.2 Posttest Results

In order to find if there were statistically significant differences between the control and experimental groups for the word recognition and reading comprehension exams in the pre/posttest applications, paired samples T test was conducted.

4.2.1 Word Recognition

This section answers research question one which states that “What is the effect of GR on KG1 students’ word recognition?” To answer the research question, the researcher compared results of the posttests between the control and experimental groups in regard to the first variable, word recognition. The results of the word recognition posttest showed significant differences between the control and experimental groups (see Table 4.1). Table 4.1 shows the differences of the posttest results in word recognition between the control and experimental groups.
Table 4.1: Mean of Word Recognition for Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Recognition</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.1, the mean of the word recognition for the control group was 4.53 and 4.87 for the experimental group ($t = 8.88054E-08$).

Sample posttests 5 (control) and 6 (experimental) in Appendix C are examples of the students’ posttests.

In order to find if the GR improved the students’ word acquisition, the means, standard deviations, and frequencies were calculated for the posttest exam. Moreover, paired sample T tests were conducted to find if the differences were statistically significant.

Table 4.2 below listed the results for the control Group 1 (High Level) students for the word recognition exam.

Table 4.2: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 1 High Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.2, the mean of the word recognition for the control group was 4.8 and 4.85 for the experimental group ($t = 0.22$). The value of the true significance level is larger than the level of assumed significance ($p$ value <0.05) in the word acquisition exam, which confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the post application of Group 1 students.

Table 4.3 presents the mean of word recognition for middle-high level in control and experimental groups.

Table 4.3: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 2 Middle High Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>$t$ statistical</th>
<th>$t$-Critical</th>
<th>Freedom degrees</th>
<th>$P$ Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that the mean of the word recognition for Group 2 (Middle High Level) in the control group was 4.5 and 4.88 for the experimental group ($t = 0.00$). It can be noted from Table 4.3 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance ($p$ value <0.05) in the word recognition exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the post application in favor of the experimental group in the word recognition exam of Group 2 students.
Table 4.4 shows the mean of word recognition for group 3 (low-level) in control and experimental groups.

Table 4.4: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 3 Middle Low Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It shares that the mean of the word recognition for Group 3 (Middle Low Level) in the control group was 4.5 and 4.91 for the experimental group (\( t = 0.00 \)). It can be noted from Table 4.4 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the word recognition exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the post application in favor of the experimental group in the exam of Group 3 students.

Table 4.5 reveals the mean of word recognition for group 4 (low-level) in control and experimental groups on the post test.
Table 4.5: Mean of Word Recognition for Group 4 Low Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Acquisition</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.5, the mean of the word recognition for Group 4 (Low Level) in the control group was 4.3 and 4.83 for the experimental group ($t = 0.00$). It can be noted from Table 4.5 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the word recognition exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the post application in favor of the experimental group in the exam of Group 4 students.

From the findings of the study, it is noticeable that the impact of applying GR on KG1 students’ word recognition has positive and significant effects for most groups.

4.2.2 Reading Comprehension

This section answers research question two which asks: “To what extent does GR improve KG1 students’ reading comprehension?” To answer this research question, the researcher compared the results of the posttests between the control and experimental groups in regard to the second variable, reading comprehension. The results of the reading comprehension posttest showed significant difference between
the control and experimental groups (see Table 4.6). Table 4.6 shows the difference of the posttest results on reading comprehension between the control and experimental groups.

Table 4.6: Mean of Reading Comprehension on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for reading comprehension was 4.25 for the control group and 4.8 for the experimental group ($t = 8.99724E-05$).

Sample posttests 7 (control) and 8 (experimental) in Appendix D are examples of the students’ posttests.

T-test results for the posttests between control and experimental groups related to the differences between the mean scores of Group 1 high-level are shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Mean of Reading Comprehension for Group 1 High-Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.7, the mean of the reading comprehension for Group 1 (High Level) in the control group was 4.7 and 4.95 for the experimental group ($t = 0.068$). It can be noted from Table 4.7 that the value of the true significance level is larger than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the comprehension exam, which confirms that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the post application of Group 1 students.

Table 4.8 shows the mean of reading comprehension for group 2 (middle-high) in control and experimental groups on the posttest.

Table 4.8: Mean of Reading Comprehension for Group 2 Middle High Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>t-statistical</th>
<th>t-Critical</th>
<th>Freedom degrees</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-3.71</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It presents that the mean of the reading comprehension for Group 2 (Middle High Level) in the control group was 4.5 and 4.95 for the experimental group ($t = 0.00$). It can be noted from Table 4.8 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the reading comprehension exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean
scores of the control and experimental group students in the post application in favor of the experimental group in the examination of Group 2 students.

Table 4.9 reveals the mean of reading comprehension for group 3 (middle-low) groups in control and experimental groups on the posttests.

Table 4.9: Mean of Reading Comprehension for Group 3 Middle Low Level in Control and Experimental Groups on the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis</th>
<th>Paired samples T test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It shares that the mean of the reading comprehension for Group 3 (Middle Low Level) in the control group was 4.6 and 4.86 for the experimental group ($t = 0.01$). It can be noted from Table 4.9 that the value of the true significance level is smaller than the level of assumed significance (p value <0.05) in the comprehension exam, which confirms the existence of statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control and experimental group students in the post application in favor of the experimental group in the exam for Group 3 students.

From the findings of the study, it is noticeable that the impact of applying GR on KG1 students’ reading comprehension has positive and significant effects for the majority of the students. On the other hand, the impact of applying GR on KG1 low level students’ reading comprehension was negative as the experimental group
outperformed the control group in the pretest, as was mentioned earlier in Chapter three.

4.3 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter presented the posttest results of using GR, in terms of focusing on word recognition and reading comprehension for the control and experimental groups. Generally, the findings of the posttest show positive and significant effects of GR as a successful teaching strategy that can be used in KG1 classrooms to improve word recognition and reading comprehension skills. The following chapter e findings of the study and suggest a number of recommendations for further research.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 discusses the research results and findings of the study. It discusses the findings regarding the two research questions and highlighting the implications of the current study regarding the impact of GR on kindergarten 1 students’ reading performance. Next, the chapter discusses the limitations of this study. After that, the chapter suggests some recommendations regarding the application of GR on KG1 students’ reading performance.

5.2 Discussion

This study tested the impact of GR on KG1 learners’ reading performance. The results presented positive findings based on the pre-posttests from both groups. The results showed that GR had a positive impact on most KG1 students’ reading performance as the data showed significant differences between both groups in word recognition and reading comprehension.

The first research question asked: What is the effect of GR on KG1 students’ word recognition? The results showed that the application of GR positively affects most students’ reading performance in word recognition. The statistical analysis (see Table 4.1) shows a significant effect of applying GR on improving KG1 students’ reading performance regarding word recognition. However, the effect of GR on word recognition varied among the groups, whereby the GR in word recognition positively affected the majority of the students; however, the high level students’ word recognition skills were not positively impacted by the application of GR.
Perhaps the main reason for the non-significance between high level students in both groups in word recognition is the students’ advanced proficiency level in English language performance. To explain, as the study started in the third term, the students gained and developed their language from the instruction they received at the school during the first and the second terms. Moreover, this might also be related to the parents’ support and continuous follow-up with their children, as most of these parents were communicating with the teachers for more guidance on developing their children’s English language skills and performance.

Another reason for this result might be that the students were exposed to these words in one way or another throughout the year as the students gained and developed their vocabulary, which they worked on at school during the first and the second terms.

The second research question asked: What is the effect of GR on KG1 students’ reading comprehension? The results showed that the application of GR generally has a positive effect on students’ reading performance in reading comprehension. The statistical analysis (see Table 4.6) shows a significant effect of applying GR on improving KG1 students’ reading performance regarding reading comprehension. However, the impact of GR on reading comprehension differed among the groups, whereby the effect of GR on reading comprehension positively affected the middle-high level and middle-low level students; however, the high level students were not positively affected by the application of GR on reading comprehension. Also, the low level students in the control and experimental groups were excluded from the study, as the experimental group outperformed the control group in the pretest.

Possibly the main reason for the non-significance between the high level students in both groups in reading comprehension was that the students’ ability in English was
already advanced at the start of the study. That is, the students in the control and experimental groups were able to comprehend the stories that they were given during the application of the study without needing additional intervention strategies. The high-level students most probably had already had enough time to develop and improve their English language performance in general and their reading comprehension skills specifically. The results of the high-level students in the control and experimental groups were similar during the application of the reading comprehension test, which made their results relevant in the posttest.

With regard to the application of GR to KG1 students’ reading performance in reading comprehension, the low-level students were excluded from the study because the researcher found that the experimental group outperformed the control group in the pretest, and that led the researcher to eliminate the results of the low-level students in the study.

A possible reason for the low-level students in the experimental group to have statistically significant difference in the pretest in reading comprehension was their prior English language performance. As the study was conducted in the third term, the students scaffolded their comprehension skills during the first two terms in the academic year, which helped them to comprehend the stories much better than the students in the control group. This might explain the outperformance of the experimental low-level group over the control low-level group.

5.3 Implications of the Study

Based on the findings of the study, a number of theoretical and pedagogical implications may be noted.
5.3.1 Theoretical Implications

The current research results show that GR can be applied to most KG1 students with similar results as the past research on kindergarten students aged four and five, in line with prior suggestions by Washington (2018) and Hardie (2013). The current study shows that GR generally has a significantly positive effect on KG1 (aged 4) students’ word recognition and reading comprehension.

Another theoretical implication of the study is that the study extends the use of GR from the ESL contexts to EFL contexts. Most previously mentioned researchers (e.g., Washington, 2018; Hardie, 2013) applied the application of GR to ESL contexts, yet the current study adds to the existing study by Salhyyah (2011) who applied it to the EFL context within the UAE on grade four students.

The third theoretical implication is that GR provides further support for the Socio-cultural Theory as it encourages interaction and scaffolding in the second language reading classroom, and that interaction is one of the principles of the Socio-cultural Theory. For example, interaction, especially the scaffolding of students’ reading performance, appears between the teacher and the students when the teacher interacts with his/her pupils and provides them with frequent and consistent instructions during the application of GR.

5.3.2 Pedagogical Implications

The main pedagogical implication of the study is that kindergarten teachers can apply GR in their classrooms to enhance the reading performance of the pupils, as teachers struggle with the reading errors that students make while they read their stories. As teachers apply GR, they will be able to provide the students with instructions and
guidance to scaffold their reading performance and facilitate their learning. This will help students to learn, retain, and recognize the words and to achieve a higher level of focus. Consequently, this may enhance the students’ reading performance ability and reading skill.

Also, teachers can benefit from the application of GR by improving the level of students’ reading performance in terms of word recognition and reading comprehension, not only focusing on learning new words. As the teacher applies GR to KG1 students, students will be able to remember the new words, as they go over them many times through reading the story with the teacher, storing the words in their memory. In addition, the students will be able to comprehend the story as they apply GR with the teacher and make connections between the words they read and the pictures in the story.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

The main goal of the current study was to discover the effect of using GR on KG1 learners’ reading performance in terms of word recognition and reading comprehension. However, a limitation of the present study might be that the study did not touched upon teachers’ attitudes and perceptions when they apply GR especially to students in kindergarten, but that was beyond the limits of this study.

Furthermore, a limitation for the present study might be considered the timing of the present study because the study was applied in the third term which might have influencend the results of the study. The students already had had enough time to build and scaffold their English language knowledge during the first and second terms of the
school. Future studies might consider conducting research in the first term of the school to overcome this limitation.

Moreover, this study didn’t cover the role of the parents along with the guided reading in developing the students English language proficiency in general and their reading performance in particular. Further investigations might reveal the parents role.

5.5 Recommendations

Based on the research findings of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

- Curriculum developers are encouraged to take into consideration adding GR as part of the instructions in the textbooks while preparing them for kindergarten students, as the current study shows that GR generally has a positive and significant effect on KG1 students’ reading performance.

- KG teachers are encouraged to apply GR and focus on word recognition and reading comprehension in order to improve students’ reading performance. Besides, teachers need to be well-planned and well-organized so they can use GR properly to scaffold KG students’ reading performance.

- Surprisingly, reading comprehension for low level students in this study did not reach a level of significance between the experimental and control group regarding the application of GR on KG1 students’ reading performance. Accordingly, this study recommends for further studies to be conducted regarding the application of GR in the first or the second term of school either to confirm the results of the current study or to add new and different results.
• The current study covered quantitative data regarding finding the effect of applying GR on KG1 students’ reading performance by applying pre-posttests for both groups. This study did not cover the perceptions of the teachers. A recommendation for further study is to collect data regarding the perceptions and attitudes of teachers in order to have a clearer picture of the application and usefulness of GR on preschoolers.

5.6 Conclusion

The current study sought to find the impact of GR in L2 on KG1 learners’ reading performance. The results presented positive findings based on the quantitative data which was gathered from the pre-posttests from both groups. The results showed that GR has a positive impact on L2 KG1 students’ reading performance as the data showed significant differences between both groups in word recognition and reading comprehension, yet reading comprehension did not have a significant difference between both groups for low level students only as the experimental group outperformed the control group in the pretest. Moreover, the implications of GR were presented in the current study in which GR helped KG teachers to scaffold students’ reading performance by applying GR strategies, in order to improve their KG1 students’ reading performance.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Pretest sample: Control Group (Student 1)

Word Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Frequency Words</th>
<th>List 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ big</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ is</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ no</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pretest sample: Experimental Group (Student 2)

Word Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Frequency Words</th>
<th>Student name:</th>
<th>KG1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ big</td>
<td>she</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ is</td>
<td>some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ he</td>
<td>one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ no</td>
<td>two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Pretest sample: Control Group (Student 1)

Reading Comprehension

---

1. What goes in first?
   - [X] eggs
   - [ ] flour

2. What goes in before the salt?
   - [X] sugar
   - [ ] butter

3. What might happen if the girl forgets to put something into the cookie mix?
   - [X] The girl won’t make cookies again.
   - [ ] The cookies might taste bad.

4. Why doesn’t the girl put the cookies in the oven?
   - [X] The girl doesn’t want to bake the cookies.
   - [ ] The oven is too hot for the girl to touch.

5. What is sugar?
   - [X] a white powder that comes from wheat
   - [ ] something used to make food taste sweet
Pretest sample: Experimental Group (Student 2)

Reading Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What goes in first?</td>
<td>eggs</td>
<td>The flour is needed to make the cookie mix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What goes in before the salt?</td>
<td>sugar</td>
<td>The sugar is added before the salt to avoid mixing it with the eggs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What might happen if the girl forgets to put something into the cookie mix?</td>
<td>The girl won’t make cookies again.</td>
<td>The cookies might taste bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why doesn’t the girl put the cookies in the oven?</td>
<td>The girl doesn’t want to bake the cookies.</td>
<td>The oven is too hot for the girl to touch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is sugar?</td>
<td>A white powder that comes from wheat</td>
<td>Something used to make food taste sweet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Posttest sample: Control Group (Student 1)

Word Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Frequency Words</th>
<th>KG1:__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>List 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Posttest sample: Experimental Group (Student 2)

Word Recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Frequency Words</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>List 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Posttest sample: Control Group (Student 1)

Reading Comprehension

---

**Reading A-Z**

**Quick Check**

**We Make Cookies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. What goes in first?
   - A eggs
   - B flour

2. What goes in before the salt?
   - A sugar
   - B butter

3. What might happen if the girl forgets to put something into the cookie mix?
   - A The girl won’t make cookies again.
   - B The cookies might taste bad.

4. Why doesn’t the girl put the cookies in the oven?
   - A The girl doesn’t want to bake the cookies.
   - B The oven is too hot for the girl to touch.

5. What is sugar?
   - A a white powder that comes from wheat
   - B something used to make food taste sweet
Posttest sample: Experimental Group (Student 2)

Reading Comprehension

---

We Make Cookies

**Name** ___________________________  **Date** ____________

1. **What goes in first?**
   - A) eggs
   - B) flour

2. **What goes in before the salt?**
   - A) sugar
   - B) butter

3. **What might happen if the girl forgets to put something into the cookie mix?**
   - A) The girl won’t make cookies again.
   - B) The cookies might taste bad.

4. **Why doesn’t the girl put the cookies in the oven?**
   - A) The girl doesn’t want to bake the cookies.
   - B) The oven is too hot for the girl to touch.

5. **What is sugar?**
   - A) a white powder that comes from wheat
   - B) something used to make food taste sweet
## Word Recognition Lists 1, 2, and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List 1</th>
<th>List 2</th>
<th>List 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Big</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Than</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>Said</td>
<td>We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now</td>
<td>She</td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then</td>
<td>They</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away</td>
<td>We</td>
<td>Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Have</td>
<td>See</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F

### Reading Comprehension Tests 1, 2, and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Low Achievers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Title</th>
<th>Targeted Sight Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Like</td>
<td>and, like, I, we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Go</td>
<td>Go, to, we, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can You See</td>
<td>You, all of, can, see</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Middle Achievers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Title</th>
<th>Targeted Sight Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Is Big</td>
<td>This, big, that, not, is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He Said No</td>
<td>He, said, no, she, they, we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Have</td>
<td>Some, have, one, two, of, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### High Achievers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Title</th>
<th>Targeted Sight Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Many Do You See?</td>
<td>How, when, than, many, will, there, more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Will She Go?</td>
<td>Has, now, then, away, find, three, little, with, she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Not Two</td>
<td>Four, this, is, my, funny, one, these, white, blue, red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Title</th>
<th>Targeted Sight Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Many Do You See?</td>
<td>How, when, than, many, will, there, more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Will She Go?</td>
<td>Has, now, then, away, find, three, little, with, she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Not Two</td>
<td>Four, this, is, my, funny, one, these, white, blue, red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

### Resources and Materials for Control and Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Low Achievers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story title</th>
<th>I Like</th>
<th>I Like</th>
<th>We Go</th>
<th>We Go</th>
<th>Can You See</th>
<th>Can You See</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted sight words</td>
<td>and, like, I, we</td>
<td>and, like, I, we</td>
<td>Go, to, we, the</td>
<td>Go, to, we, the</td>
<td>You, all of, can, see</td>
<td>You, all of, can, see</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle High and Middle Low Achievers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story title</th>
<th>This Is Big</th>
<th>This Is Big</th>
<th>He Said No</th>
<th>He Said No</th>
<th>Some Have</th>
<th>Some Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted sight words</td>
<td>This, big, that, not, is</td>
<td>This, big, that, not, is</td>
<td>He, said, no, she, they, we</td>
<td>He, said, no, she, they, we</td>
<td>Some, have, one, two, of, the</td>
<td>Some, have, one, two, of, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High Achievers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story title</th>
<th>How Many Do You See?</th>
<th>How Many Do You See?</th>
<th>Where Will She Go?</th>
<th>Where Will She Go?</th>
<th>One Not Two</th>
<th>One Not Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted sight words</td>
<td>How, when, than, many, will, there, more</td>
<td>How, when, than, many, will, there, more</td>
<td>Has, now, then, away, find, three, little, with, she</td>
<td>Has, now, then, away, find, three, little, with, she</td>
<td>Four, this, is, my, funny, one, these, white, blue, red</td>
<td>Four, this, is, my, funny, one, these, white, blue, red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>