A Comparative Study On Strategies Of The Children For L1 And L2 Reading Comprehension In K12

Ş. Dilek Belet, (Email: sdbelet@anadolu.edu.tr), Anadolu University, Turkey
Esim Gursoy, (Email: esim@uludag.edu.tr), Uludag University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

In today's world it has long become a necessity to learn and communicate in another language other than one's mother tongue (L1). When the world is walking on the path of globalization people try to learn a second/foreign language (L2). In this study it's critically aimed to explore strategy use in L1 and L2 reading at K12 level. Subjects involved in the study are the fourth and fifth grade students in two private primary schools in Eskisehir province, Turkey. In this study triangulation method was used. The study was carried out in two steps. In the first step quantitative data were collected from the 86 students by a questionnaire developed by researchers depending on literature review. In the second step, qualitative data were collected from the 3 foreign language teachers and 3 mother tongue teachers by semi-structured interviews. Qualitative data were gathered to describe the situations in depth as supplementary data. The results obtained from the study indicates that although students' strategy use in L1 and L2 reading and strategy groups they engaged such as cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive and social strategies have similarities, percentage of the reading strategy they use differ Besides, opinions of foreign language teachers and mother tongue obtained from qualitative data support the findings.

Keywords: Mother tongue, foreign language, reading comprehension, learning strategies

INTRODUCTION

*R*eading, as one of the receptive skills, is the focus of current study. Internal processes in reading are often the concern of researchers, to develop reading comprehension. It is no doubt that reading is not only a physical activity done with eye movements but also and most importantly it is a mental process. It is now agreed upon that the description of the fluent reading should involve several notions that is "rapid, purposeful, interactive, comprehending, flexible, and gradually developing" (Grabe, 1991, p.378).

Reading comprehension is of great importance both in L1 and L2 acquisition and learning. Although L1 and L2 reading has some common basic elements, it is argued that the processes differ (Singhal, 2000). No matter in which language it is done, the reading is a process that involves the interaction of the reader with the text. When investigating L1 and L2 reading it is frequently questioned "whether there are processing strategies that accommodate both first and second languages" (Singhal, 2000, p.1).

It is no doubt that even the inefficient and unsuccessful students use strategies. At this point, current study investigates L1 and L2 reading strategies of children at fourth and fifth grades. Differences of strategy use will be identified to understand how children view reading in L1 and L2.

Reading In L1

Reading is a very complex process, which involves physiological, cognitive, and affective elements in analyzing and evaluating an emotion and/ or an idea. It could be said that reading is a process of interaction,

perception, and comprehension, involving seeing, remembering, vocalizing, evaluating, and comprehending. The fact that the majority of learning materials that are used in the teaching-learning process in schools are language-based resources, gives priority to reading comprehension. Considering that all courses require reading, the students who cannot read or understand well should not be expected to be successful. The idea is also supported by Tekin (1980), who argues that the probability of becoming successful is high for a student who could comprehend a text quickly and exactly, and who could write about is/her ideas and emotions in a clear and understandable way.

Development of reading comprehension starting from primary school is seen as a necessity to increase learning effectiveness. For that matter, student-centered approaches are needed to develop reading comprehension. One of these student-centered teaching that also leads to autonomous learners is strategy learning and training. Before discussing reading strategies it is better to look at L2 reading and differences in L1 and L2 reading.

Reading In L2 And Differences In L1 And L2 Reading

Grabe (1991) argues that L2 reading and improving L2 reading instruction has become the focus of many researchers especially for the last 20 years. It is further claimed that the fact that reading has a major importance for second/foreign language learners especially in academic contexts triggered research in this area (Carrell, 1989 (a); Lynch and Hudson, 1991 cited in Grabe (1991). L2 reading research focused on identification of some variables that play an important role in L2 reading process such as strategy choices (Barnett, 1988; Block, 1986; Kern, 1989 cited in Upton & Lee-Thompson (2001).

By looking at the literature Upton & Lee-Thompson (2001) argue that L2 reading is not a monolingual event. In other words, it is claimed that L2 learners use their L1 as a resource to understand an L2 reading text. According to Grabe (1991), L1 reading research has influenced researchers working on L2 readers, because L1 research goes far back than L2, L1 subjects are more stable and cognitive psychology, seeing comprehension research as their domain, supported L1 reading research. He further claims that understanding what efficient L1 readers do and how to aid L2 readers in that direction is the major goal for L2 reading theory and instruction.

The factors that influenced L2 reading are not the main concern of L1 reading research. Grabe (1991) lists these factors as "L2 acquisition and training background differences, language processing differences, and social context differences" (p.386). The first of these factors is related to L1 readers' superiority in starting reading instruction. Normally, L1 students start reading with a knowledge of 5,000 to 7,000 words. Moreover, their intuitive grammar knowledge makes these learners advantageous. In contrast to these disadvantages of L2 reader they also have some superiorities. Most ESL/EFL learners are older than L1 readers and thus, cognitively more developed. Due to the age differences L2 readers are supposed to use more metacognitive strategies than younger L1 readers. In addition, integrative and instrumental motivations are other advantages of ESL/EFL learners.

The second of these factors related to language processing differences seem to work against ESL/EFL students. Transfer from L1 to L2 can cause difficulties. For instance, vocabulary recognition can be influenced negatively by "faux amis", in other words, false cognates. Moreover, at the syntactic level, structural dissimilarities can cause negative interference. Direction of reading related to orthographic differences might also affect beginning learners. On the discourse level, differences in the organization of written texts depending on different cultures might slow down or at extreme cases, block the comprehension process.

Finally, students' literacy skills and use in their L1, related to the social contexts, can be an additional difficulty for ESL/EFL readers. At this point Grabe (1991) claims that literacy skills of L2 readers in their mother tongue is rarely investigated. L1 literacy skills in this sense might play a negative or a positive effect in student's L2 reading skill. In addition, if the community, that L2 reader is coming from, has limited literacy it is highly possible that student does little extensive reading or if the learner has limited access to libraries and/or other sources such social contexts might have a negative effect on their reading skill in the second/foreign language.

When looking at these differences between L1 and L2 readers it would be wrong to apply L1 reading research results to L2 contexts. For that matter it is essential to conduct research on L2 readers, in addition to research that investigates possible similarities and differences in L1 and L2 reading. One of such comparative studies can be reading strategies of learners both in their L1 and L2. This kind of studies will enable teachers and educators to become aware of possible differences, cause them to shift their expectations to more realistic ones, help them teach strategies that are effective, and finally aid them become more autonomous learners. Seeing this need for such comparative studies current study investigates EFL learners' reading strategies in their L1 and L2.

The Purpose Of The Study

The study aims to explore the possible similarities and differences of strategy use in L1 and L2 reading comprehension. The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies and strategy groups of children in primary school?
2. Do primary school children tend to use similar reading strategies that they use in L1 and L2?
3. What are the L1 and L2 teachers' ideas about their students' L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies?
4. Can students differentiate between effective and ineffective strategies?

METHODS

In the study quantitative and qualitative research methods has been used for data triangulation and to determine primary school children's L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies. Quantitative data is gathered via a questionnaire that was prepared by the researchers through a wide literature review and qualitative data was gathered via interviews with L1 and L2 teachers of the participants.

Participants

Few years ago the age of learning a foreign language in Turkey decreased to third grade. Yet, private schools in Turkey start as early as the first grade and some even in kindergarten. Since reading is a complex skill that requires a certain degree of foreign language knowledge including vocabulary, syntax etc. fourth and fifth grade students in private schools have more developed foreign language skills than those in government schools. Besides, foreign language instruction in government schools is two hours a week, whereas, it is around 10 hours a week in private schools. Since strategy use requires a certain degree of language knowledge and when the age for the use of L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies is considered, it was decided to conduct the research with 4th and 5th graders. Thus, two private schools in Eskişehir were randomly selected. The subjects who contributed to the quantitative data in this study are 86 fourth and fifth grade students in these two private primary schools in Eskisehir, Turkey.

In addition to identification of L1 and L2 reading comprehension use of children, qualitative data was also gathered via semi-structured interviews with six teachers to provide more in depth explanation to the results gathered from students by a structured questionnaire.

Instruments

Two instruments were developed by researchers to identify the L1 and L2 reading strategies of children. For the quantitative data two questionnaires were used. The first one aimed to identify the L1 reading comprehension strategies and the second one aimed to identify L2 reading comprehension strategies of children. Items in the questionnaires were written as a result of extensive literature review, student interviews and classroom observations. Qualitative data, on the other hand, was gathered via L1 and L2 teacher interviews.

After the identification of reading strategies two forms of questionnaires were prepared to be used in L1 and L2 reading. Most of the items in the questionnaire were the same except a few. The differences were due to the nature of learning a foreign language. In addition, as a result of student interviews it was identified that students sometimes use ineffective strategies. One of these strategies (Item 32) were included in the questionnaire to see how much these students are conscious about and aware of effective strategy use.

The questionnaire were designed as a three-point likert scale indicating if certain behaviors done always, sometimes, or never. Since the age of the subject group was young, to increase validity and decrease comprehension difficulties due to the number of choices, which show slight differences, the choices had been limited to three rather than five or seven. For validity, the instruments were also piloted on a similar group in another private school. The items in the questionnaires are organized so that items through 1-17 refer to cognitive, 18-23 compensation, 24-33 and 38-39 metacognitive and 34-37 social reading comprehension strategies.

To conduct teacher-interviews a "Teacher Interview Form" was developed. All the interviews were made by one of the researchers.

Data Collection

Prior to the collection of the quantitative data, to test if there are any incomprehensibilities in the items of the questionnaire and to determine the time to complete the questionnaire it was piloted on a similar group of students in another private school. During the pilot study the researchers asked students to raise their hands any time they do not understand something, or not sure how to interpret the items. They were also informed that this was not a test and there were no right or wrong answers. Therefore, to mark the box that is most appropriate for them. All the instructions were given in the native language. The time was also kept during the pilot study while the students were completing the questionnaire to see if the questionnaire was at appropriate length for this age group (10 and 11) and their concentration and attention span.

Moreover, since both of the questionnaires were almost identical each form was given by a different researcher at different times. So that students were made sure that the purpose to fill in the questionnaire is different each time. Thus, the differences in the two forms (that one of them is for L1 reading and the other one is for L2 reading) were not only pointed out by the instructions on the forms, but also visually, with the use of two different researchers at two different times.

After the instruments were corrected with the help of the feedback received during the pilot study the final forms were given to 86 fourth and fifth grade students each form by a different researcher at two different times. The students were also informed that this was not a test and that there were no right or wrong answers and mark the choice that best suits them.
Prior to the teacher interviews a pilot interview was made with the teachers of students that the questionnaire was piloted on. After the transcription of these pilot interviews were made necessary changes have been made on the interview items and the final form was established. Later, interviews were conducted between June 27-29, 2006 All interviews were tape-recorded and took 15 to 25 minutes.

Data Analysis

Frequency analysis were made on the quantitative data gathered by the questionnaires and inductive analysis were made on the qualitative data gathered by interviews. Inductive analysis was made as follows: First of all, all tape-recordings were transcribed and transferred to the interview forms. The interview form consists of contextual knowledge such as place, date, interviewer, interviewee, interview number, and page number and descriptive index, line number, descriptive data, comments of the interviewer and page comments. Teachers' conceptions in the tapes were transferred to the descriptive data section without any change. Secondly, to provide the reliability of the study the transcriptions were examined by an expert to eliminate any mismatch in the tapes and transcriptions, to make necessary corrections if there were any. Thirdly, the information was coded, code files were

created in the computer, related codes were transferred to the computer files, themes and sub-themes were generated and themes and codes were matched. Finally, research results are presented under related themes.

Findings

Findings of the study has been given under two sections. The first section involves quantitative results gathered from students via a questionnaire and the second section involves qualitative results gathered from the teachers via semi-structured interviews.

Section One: Quantitative Findings

The results of the quantitative data that aims to determine the use of reading comprehension strategies of primary school students in L1 and L2 is given in table 1.

As seen in table 1 related to the comprehension of a text 65% of L2 learners and 48% of the L1 learners indicated that they use resources such as dictionary, textbook and notebook. In this case it can be said that learners benefit more from resources in L2 when compared to L1.

"Translating the text into Turkish" is a behavior that could be present only in L2 learning. According to the results more than half of the students (57%) translate for comprehension when they read in the target language.

"Looking up the dictionary to find the meaning of unknown words" is a behavior that 54% of L2 and 59% of L1 learners use. Thus, it can be said that approximately half of the L1 and L2 learners use dictionary for comprehension.

38% of the L2 and 27% of L1 learners stated that they write the meaning of an unknown word right underneath the text. By looking at the percentages it can be said that this strategy is rarely used both for L1 and L2 reading comprehension. 26% of L2 and 47% of L1 learners indicated that they try to understand the text by separating prefix and/or suffixes from the root. As it can be seen, the percentages are rather low for this strategy as well, L1 students using more of it. This might be because L2 learners are at the early stages of their language learning and therefore not yet totally aware of the morphological structure of the L2 language.

63% of L2 and 57% of L1 students said that they "Examine the sentence structure" for comprehension. Students use this behavior almost in equal frequency in both languages.

Only a small amount of students (28%-15%; 20%-17%) indicated that they "Exactly copy the important parts of the text" and they "Take notes of the text by using their own words". Similarly, even less students (17% L2 and 10% L1) "Draw figures, graphics, or tables to understand the text". It can be inferred that children are not very much interested in activities that involve writing skill and related activities like drawing. However, further research should be conducted to test this inference.

Little more than half of the students (53% L2 and 58% L1) stated that they "Underline the important parts". Since underlining is a more basic tactic, which doesn't involve a complex skill such as writing or drawing the percentages are a little higher in this strategy.

66% L2 and 72% L1 students claimed that they "Read the text again" to understand it. 35% of L2 learners and 23% of L1 learners indicated that they "Retell the reading text" for comprehension. The percentages here indicate that students prefer strategies that involves reading or speaking more than the ones that involve writing. Only 15% of L2 and 9 % of L1 learners claimed to "Summarize the text". Half of the students in both groups said no for this strategy. Similarly 6% L2 and 3% L1 learners indicated that they rewrite the passage. The results of these two items again support the researchers' previous claim that primary school children belonging to this age group (10-11) are not fond of writing.

More than half of the L2 learners (59%) said that they "Memorize the new vocabulary" when they find their meaning and almost half (49%) of L1 learners said that they do the same. One reason for this result might be that foreign language is a new system to be learned that students have limited vocabulary and structural knowledge. To compensate with this there might be a stronger need to memorize new words in L2.

According to table 1 majority of L1 and L2 learners use strategies such as "Answering the reading comprehension questions, looking at the title, and looking at the Picture of the text. "Guessing" is a strategy used almost half of the L1 and little more than the half of L2 learners. A minority of students (16% L2 and 13% L1) indicated that they never use guessing. 67% of L2 learners said that they try to "guess the meaning of a word if it has a cognate in Turkish". "Skipping the unknown word and continuing reading" is a strategy preferred by the half of L1 and L2 learners. "By using what I understand I try to guess the meaning of the whole passage" is a strategy used by 48% of L2 and 39% of L1 learners.

¾ th of all students claimed to "Read the text carefully" both in the mother tongue and the foreign language. Results also show that L1 and L2 learners prefer silent reading (58% in L1 and L2) to reading aloud (23% in L2, 21% in L1) for comprehension. Very few students (21% L2 and 11% L1) claimed to "make up questions related to the passage". More than half of the students (61% L2 and 58% L1) answered "yes" when they were asked if they "used their previous knowledge (schema)" for comprehension. 2/3rd of L1 and L2 students indicated that they "check the use of new vocabulary in the text".

Majority of L1 and L2 students "tried to understand the passage as a whole". A remarkable difference can be seen between L1 and L2 learners in a metacognitive strategy, which require the understanding of how the text was structured (introduction, development and conclusion). Very few L2 learners (32%) use this strategy, whereas, more than half of L1 learners prefer it in comprehending a passage. This might be because L2 learners are at an early stage of language development and as stated by their teachers most of them are working on the sentence and paragraph level. Due to the limited exposure to longer texts this strategy might be used less in L2.

More than half of the L2 learners (65%-60%) and L1 (59%-59%) "Try to understand each word in the text" and "Try to build a connection between the sentences". Since the former is not considered as a good reading strategy answers indicate that strategy training is necessary for child L1 and L2 learners. 61% L2 and 52% L1 learners prefer asking the meaning of an unknown word rather than asking what is told in the passage (35% L2 - 22% L1). Almost none of the L2 (5%) and L1 (6%) learners "Recite the passage to their friends". Very few children both learning L1 and L2 (38% - 39%) "Ask from their teacher or someone knowledgeable to explain the events in the passage" 53% of L1 learners indicated that they "Think about the cause and effect relationship in the text" less than half of them (42%) claimed they "Guess what is going to happen next by looking at what is told in the text

When we look at table 1 in order to find common uses of the same strategy both for L1 and L2 we see that from a total of 17 items 6 cognitive strategies were claimed to be used both for L1 and L2. These are items 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 17. Two compensation strategies (items 18 and 19) out of five were used for both languages. Among 10 metacognitive strategies 7 of them were used for L1 and L2. These items are 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, and 33. Finally one out of four social strategies is common for English and Turkish.

For English from a total of 39 strategy items students claimed that they used 21 of them, whereas, this number is even fewer in Turkish. Students indicated that they use 18 of these strategies. 17 of their strategies are common for L1 and L2. This means that except one item, which was specific just for L1 strategy use all L1 strategies are used and/or transferred to L2 context. Two of the four strategies that are only used in L2 is also specific for reading in the English language. The other two, which are not used common with L1 strategies or specific to L2 strategies are items 1 and 20.

Table 1: The Use Of Reading Comprehension Strategies Of Primary School Students In L1 And L2

To understand a reading text;	English Yes f	%	Sometimes f	%	No f	%	Total f	%	Turkish Yes f	%	Sometimes f	%	No f	%	Total f	%
1. I use resources such as my dictionary, textbook or notebook.	56	65	20	23	10	11	86	100	41	48	34	39	11	13	86	100
2. I translate the text into Turkish.	49	57	27	31	10	11	86	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. I find the meanings of unknown vocabulary from the dictionary.	47	54	31	36	8	9	86	100	51	59	23	26	11	13	86	100
4. I write the meaning of an unknown word right underneath.	33	38	27	31	24	28	84	98	23	27	31	36	32	37	86	100
5. I look at the root of the word by separating the suffix and prefixes.	14	16	26	30	46	53	86	100	41	47	24	28	20	23	85	99
6. I examine the structure of the sentence. (Ex: Is it affirmative or negative?)	54	63	18	21	14	16	86	100	49	57	27	31	10	11	86	100
7. I skim the text	45	52	28	32	13	15	86	100	53	61	26	30	7	8	86	100
8.I copy the important parts of the text exactly.	24	28	22	25	39	45	85	99	13	15	32	37	41	47	86	100
9.I take notes of the text by using my own words.	17	20	31	36	37	43	85	99	15	17	26	30	42	49	83	96
10.I draw figures, graphics or tables.	17	20	26	30	43	50	86	100	10	11	27	31	48	56	85	99
11. I underline the important parts of the text.	46	53	26	30	14	16	86	100	50	58	26	30	10	11	86	100
12. I read it again.	57	66	23	26	4	5	84	98	62	72	24	28	-	-	86	100
13. I recite the text.	30	35	29	34	27	31	86	100	20	23	41	48	25	29	86	100
14. I summarize the text.	15	17	28	32	43	50	86	100	9	10	33	38	44	51	86	100
15. I rewrite the passage.	6	7	16	18	64	74	86	100	3	3	4	5	77	89	84	98
16. After finding their meanings, I memorize the new vocabulary.	51	59	29	33	6	7	86	100	40	46	35	41	11	13	86	100
17. If there are any I answer the reading comprehension questions.	64	74	15	17	7	8	86	100	75	87	7	8	4	5	86	100
18. I look at its picture if there is any	61	71	18	21	6	7	85	99	64	74	15	17	7	8	86	100
19. I look at its title.	54	62	21	24	11	13	86	100	61	71	21	24	4	5	86	100
20. I try to guess the meanings of unknown vocabulary by using the ones I know.	46	53	26	30	14	16	86	100	38	44	37	43	11	13	86	100
21. I try to guess the meanings of unknown words that has cognates in Turkish (Ex; Radyo/Radio; Leopar/Leopard).	58	67	18	21	10	11	86	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. I skip the unknown word and keep on reading.	22	26	19	22	44	51	85	99	15	17	30	35	41	48	86	100
23. By using what I understand I try to guess the meaning of the whole text.	41	48	31	35	14	16	86	100	34	39	35	40	17	19	86	100
24.I read the text very carefully.	60	70	19	22	7	8	86	100	68	79	14	16	4	5	86	100
25. I read the text aloud.	20	23	40	46	26	30	86	100	18	21	47	54	19	22	84	98
26. I read the text silently.	50	58	30	35	6	7	86	100	50	58	29	33	6	7	85	99
27. I write questions related to the text.	18	21	29	33	39	45	86	100	10	11	27	31	47	55	84	98
28. I use my background knowledge.	50	58	27	31	9	10	86	100	53	61	22	25	10	11	85	99
29. I check the use of the new words in the text.	56	65	24	28	6	7	86	100	55	64	22	25	9	10	86	100
30. I try to understand the text as a whole.	55	64	25	29	6	7	86	100	65	75	18	21	1	1	84	98
31. I ty to understand the structure of the text (introduction, supporting ideas, conclusion etc).	28	32	35	40	23	27	86	100	52	60	26	30	8	9	86	100
32. I try to understand each and every word.	56	65	19	22	11	13	86	100	51	59	24	28	11	13	86	100
33. I try to make connections between the sentences.	52	60	23	27	11	13	86	100	51	59	25	29	10	11	86	100
34. I ask the meanings of **unknown vocabulary** to my teacher or someone who might know.	53	61	28	32	5	6	86	100	45	52	33	38	8	9	86	100
35. I ask the **theme** of the text to my teacher, friends or someone who might know.	30	35	36	42	20	23	86	100	19	22	40	46	27	31	86	100
36. I recite the text to my friends.	4	5	24	28	58	67	86	100	5	6	16	18	65	76	86	100
37. I ask my teacher or someone who is knowledgeable to explain me the events in the text.	22	25	38	44	26	30	86	100	10	12	39	45	37	43	86	100
38. I try to understand the cause and effect relationships in the text.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46	53	32	37	8	9	86	100
39. I try to guess what will happen next by looking at what is told in the text.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	42	36	42	11	13	83	96

When we look at the frequency of the number of students who use strategy groups, the results are interesting (table 3). Accordingly, L2 students (47%) use compensation strategies more, 45% of these students prefer metacognitive strategies. These are followed by Cognitive strategies with 37% and social strategies 27%. On the other hand, L1 learners (47%) use metacognitive strategies more and 42% use compensation strategies. Similar to the L2 learners third and forth strategy groups that are used by less number of students are cognitive (35%) and social (20%). The result might be due to L2 learners limited English knowledge and their need to compensate for it.

Table 3: Number Of Students Who Use Strategy Groups

Strategy Group	L1	L2
Cognitive	35%	37%
Metacognitive	47%	45%
Compensation	42%	47%
Social	20%	27%.

The results also indicates that not only students use only a few reading comprehension strategies but also they are not aware of effective strategies as well. Item 32, in metacognitive strategies, is a bad strategy that is used by children. Trying to understand every single word is not something that is advised by teachers, rather students are usually advised to guess the meaning from context and not to waste time on individual words if they have secondary importance for the meaning. Yet, students mentioned that they used this strategy both in L1 and L2.

Section Two: Qualitative Findings

This section contains findings gathered from teacher opinions related to their students' reading comprehension strategies in L1 and L2. Research results are presented under themes and sub-themes with direct quotations from teacher interviews. These themes are categorized as:

1. General conceptions of teachers about primary school children's use of L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies,
   a. Teachers's conceptions about students' use of L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies,
   b. Teachers' conceptions about contribution of L1 and L2 strategy use to students reading comprehension,
2. Teachers' conceptions about primary school students' tendency to use L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies,
   a. Teachers' conceptions about primary school students' tendency to use reading comprehension strategies in both languages,
   b. Teachers' conceptions about primary school students' preferences to use L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies,
   c. Teachers' conceptions about primary school students' use of L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies,

1. **General Conceptions of Teachers about Primary School Children's Use of L1 and L2 Reading Comprehension Strategies**

   This theme has two sub-themes as it is identified above.

   a) **Teachers's conceptions about students' use of L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies:** All six teachers who participated in the research indicated that in reading comprehension activities learners are using L1 and L2 learning strategies.

   İrem (ELT teacher) for instance, stated that "*Of course, they are using, it is more apparent in our branch (ELT) since the students has a product related to reading comprehension*". Mehmet also agreed by saying "*Yes, they are using*", and similarly Deniz claimed that "*Yes, they are using. For example, there are*

students who comprehend a reading text immediately as well as others who underline different words, or take notes next to the passage."

b) **Teachers' conceptions about contribution of L1 and L2 strategy use to students' reading comprehension:** L1 and L2 teachers' conceptions vary in terms of contribution of reading comprehension strategies to students learning. 5 of the teachers stated that learning becomes more permanent, 3 said that learning is facilitated, 3 indicated that students' who use strategies and who don't, vary in their levels of comprehension, 1 claimed that strategy use affect reading speed, and 1 said that strategy use not only affects comprehension but also explication.

Related to the benefits of strategy use in L1, Deniz said that "*By choosing the appropriate strategy for them, they easily understand and learning becomes permanent*". When stating her idea about strategy use in L2, Seda mentioned that "*Students who use strategies learn and understand better when compared to those who do not use. There is a huge difference between those who use strategies and those who do not, for one thing strategy users do not forget*". Zeynep when talking about her opinions about strategy use in L2 claimed that "*Students who use strategy read faster. We try to compensate students' comprehension by question and answer technique, if they do not use strategies.*"

Although teacher opinions vary in terms of the contribution of strategy use to students' learning, they focus on how learning becomes permanent by the use of reading comprehension strategies

2. **Teachers' Conceptions About Primary School Students' Tendency To Use L1 And L2 Reading Comprehension Strategies**

This theme is considered under three sub-themes, which are related to teachers' opinions about students' tendencies to use strategies, their strategy preferences, and their actual use of strategies

a) **Teachers' conceptions about primary school students' tendency to use reading comprehension strategies in both languages:** Although teachers were not asked whether students use similar strategies in L1 and L2, during the interview they mentioned about their assumptions about the issue. Accordingly, **t**eachers' conceptions about students' tendencies to use reading comprehension strategies in L1 and L2 vary. Relatedly, 2 teachers said that students' use of strategies in both languages are different since the materials are different; 2 teachers claimed that it is not the language but the child's characteristics which determine the strategy use, 1 teacher indicated that L1 and L2 strategy use is a little different but also there are some similarities, and 1 teacher stated that there are no differences between L1 and L2 strategy use.

About students' tendencies on the use of strategies, Zeynep (L1 teacher) said that: "*I think, there are no differences in the use of strategies in L1 and L2, and I think there shouldn't be.*" Another L1 teacher Arda mentioned: "*I think they are different, because the main aim in ELT is vocabulary teaching, whereas in L1 language is acquired within a natural context. I think reading in daily language and strategies for comprehension are different. Another reason for this is the materials.* " An ELT teacher İrem said that: "*They are a little different, I mean, in general there are some similar things (uses), but also there are different things (uses).*" Mehmet, on the other hand, claimed that: "*Strategy use in both languages do not depend on the language but on the child's characteristics*."

b) **Teachers' conceptions about primary school students' preferences to use L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies:** Teachers' opinions about students' preferences in strategy use in their own lessons indicate some differences. On this topic 5 teachers mentioned the effects of individual differences, 3 mentioned that students do not prefer a certain strategy for frequent use, and 1 claimed that students prefer strategies that require reading skill not writing skill.

On this topic Seda said: "*Each student has a strategy that s/he uses easily according to his/her individual characteristics. Some like to take notes, some like to write exactly etc., in other words students use different*

reading comprehension strategies in my lesson." Zeynep stated that: "*In my classroom, I cannot tell that all my students use a specific strategy. It changes according to the situation, but generally, they don' like strategies that involve writing skill. They use underlining or reading more often*."

c) **Teachers' conceptions about primary school students' use of L1 and L2 reading comprehension strategies:** Students' reading comprehension strategies are grouped as cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social strategies and given in table 4. As it is seen in table 4, according to the teachers' conceptions cognitive strategies that their students' prefer in L1 are; underlining, reciting and summarizing, whereas in L2 it is using the dictionary. Compensation strategies that are preferred by L1 students are looking at the picture or the title of the text. Reading aloud is the most frequently mentioned metacognitive strategy by the teachers. Only one L1 and one L2 teacher mentioned about students use of social strategies.

Table 4: Teachers Conceptions About Students L1 And L2 Reading Comprehension Strategies

	L1	L2
Cognitive strategies that students use in L1 and L2		
Underlining the unkown word	2	2
Finding antonyms and synonyms	2	2
Using the unknown word within a sentence	2	2
Writing the new vocabulary	-	1
Playing word games	-	1
Using a dictionary	2	3
Using other resources	1	-
Rereading the text	2	1
Underlining the incomprehensible parts	3	2
Creating a concept map	2	2
Retelling the topic	2	-
Underlining	3	2
Taking notes	1	2
Summarizing	3	2
Rewriting	1	1
Reading and Translating the text	-	1
Skimming to find the gist of the text	1	1
Compensation strategies that students use in L1 and L2		
Completing the text.	1	-
Guessing by looking at the picture	3	2
Guessing by looking at the title	3	2
Guessing the answers of the questions related to the text. (What would you do ? Why did you like the passage ? etc)	2	1
Guessing the word by looking at the sentence as a whole.	2	1
Metacognitive strategies that students use in L1 and L2		
Silent reading	2	1
Reading aloud	3	3
Finding the characters of the story	2	1
Adding and subtracting the heroes to the story	-	1
Creating a story with the given vocabulary	2	1
Expressing the story in different ways	1	-
Social strategies that students use in L1 and L2		
Working as a group	-	1
Asking what they haven't understood	1	-

Related to the strategies that students use in L2 Mehmet said that: "*Students use finding out new vocabulary, using them in sentences, reading aloud or silently, taking notes, finding words and making puzzles, writing new words exactly, using new structures, and summarizing*". Deniz indicated that: " *…(they use) finding the meaning of unknown vocabulary, asking what they don't understand, Creating a concept map, creating a story from*

the new words, relating the picture to the text, guessing from the picture, underlining, summarizing, saying in a different way, making a picture of the passage, taking notes, these are the ones that comes into my mind ...".

CONCLUSIONS

When we look at the research results there are several conclusions that we can draw upon: First of all, almost all the strategies, except for two strategies, are common for both L1 and L2 reading comprehension. This might be because subjects are at an early stage of their education and their L2 language development. Their knowledge of strategies might be limited to those that they use for their mother tongue, therefore, the results might be an indication of such transfer. This result indicates that the use of L2 reading comprehension strategies of these students, mostly depend on L1 strategy use.

Secondly, as mentioned in the results section the strategy group that is used by more students among the ELT (English Language Teaching) learners is the compensation strategies. Possible reason why more L2 learners use compensation strategies might be because that they started to learn English at a later age in a formal learning environment when compared to acquisition environment. In addition, the learning environment is an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context where the time, input and exposure is limited to the classroom. With limited English knowledge learners need to compensate to what they have not learned by using some strategies. Due to this need to communicate in the foreign language more students might have preferred compensation strategies.

Thirdly, quantitative results that indicate that primary school children are not into using strategies that involves writing is supported by one of the teachers in the interview. Se indicated that "*….but generally, they don' like strategies that involve writing skill. They use underlining or reading more often.*" In addition to students' answers, teachers' observation of their students showed that any strategy use, which involve long excerpts are less favored.

Fourthly, as it is supported by teacher interviews primary school children use reading comprehension strategies. However, when we look at the results in general we see that this strategy use is very limited. Almost half of the strategies listed in the questionnaire are used by these students. Students do not differ in their choices of strategies in L1 and L2. This indicates and some teachers claim that, to improve reading comprehension in language learning students need strategy training. Without any conscious teaching and learning of these strategies reading comprehension cannot be improved and facilitated both in L1 and L2. Teacher interviews also support this conclusion. All of the teachers mentioned several benefits of strategy use such as making learning permanent, facilitating learning, improving comprehension, and increasing reading speed. When all these benefits are considered strategy training seems compulsory and should be given either separately or integrated within the lesson. The benefits of these either technique could be the topic of an other research, therefore, the choice would be up to the teachers and should be made by considering time spared for L1 and L2 reading comprehension within the school curriculum, specific needs of students, and or decisions of the school management.

Finally, not only students are limited in their knowledge of reading comprehension strategies, but also their use of effective strategies. The results showed that students are not aware of effective and ineffective strategies. This also indicates the importance of strategy training. One item that is inserted as a deceptive item as a result of student interviews during the process of the development of the instrument has exhibited that students are trying out different strategies some effective and some ineffective to improve their comprehension. With the help of strategy training, not only the number of strategies that are used by students would be increased but also ineffective ones could be replaced by effective ones.

IMPLICATIONS

There are several implications of this study:

- Strategy training is necessary and should be implemented to improve comprehension, to facilitate learning, and to raise students' awareness about strategies and strategy use.

- Learners' use of strategies and knowledge of strategies are highly effected by teachers' knowledge and teaching of strategies and strategy use, therefore, teachers' awareness about strategy training should be investigated.
- Students should not only be made aware of effective strategies but also ineffective ones.
- Learners' need for different strategies should be identified and training should be conducted accordingly, such as L2 learners need for compensation strategies.
- To consolidate the findings similar research should be conducted after students are given strategy training.

REFERENCES

1. Barnett, M. (1998) Reading through context: How real and perceived strategy use affects L2 comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal, 83,* 150-162.
2. Carrell, P. L. (1984). SLA and classroom instruction: Reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 1988,9,* pp.233-242.
3. Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly, 25,* pp.375-406.
4. Kern, R. G. (1989). Second language reading strategy instruction: Its effects on comprehension and word inference ability. *Modern Language Journal, 73*, 135-149.
5. Lynch, B., & Hudson, T. (1991). EST Reading. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language (2ⁿᵈ ed., pp. 216-232)*. New York: Newbury House.
6. Singhal, M. (1998). A comparison of L1 and L2 reading: Cultural differences and schema. *The Internet TESL Journal, IV, no. 10.* (http://www.aitech.ac.jp/-iteslj/)
7. Tekin, H. (1980). *Okuduğunu Anlama Gücü ile Yazılı Anlatım Becerisini Geliştirme Yönünden Okullarımızdaki Türkçe Öğretimi*. Ankara.
8. Upton, T. A. (2001). The role of the first language in second language reading. *SSLA, 23*, 469-495.