Content Analysis of Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) Techniques in Action Pack 10 Student's Book

Khaldoun Ali Al-Janaydeh
Ministry of Education, khaldonjanaydeh@gmail.com

Dina Abdl Hameed Al-Jamal
Yarmouk Univerisity, deena.j@yu.edu.jo

أساليب استراتيجية التفكير الموجه من خلال القراءة: تحليل محتوى

خلدون علي الجنايده[1]* دينا عبد الحميد الجمل[2]

[1] طالب دكتوراه / وزارة التربية والتعليم/ الأردن
[2] قسم المناهج و التدريس، جامعة اليرموك، الأردن

*بريد إلكتروني: khaldonjanaydeh@gmail.com   تلفون: 0788029565

الملخص

تهدف الدراسة تحليل محتوى الفصل الأول من كتاب الطالب ''الأكشن باك''، الذي يدرس في الأردن، للصف العاشر، فيما يتعلق بأنشطة القراءة. وتبحث تحديدا عن مدى استخدام هذا الكتاب لأساليب إستراتيجية نشاط التفكير الموجه في القراءة(التنبؤ ، القراءة، التأكد، التبرير). اتبعت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي في تحليل محتوى أنشطة القراءة. وأظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن أساليب إستراتيجية نشاط التفكير الموجه في القراءة متضمنة في كتاب الطالب. وأظهرت النتائج كذلك أن مستويات الفهم المقروء في أنشطة القراءة موزعة منطقياً بما يتلاءم مع النتاجات العامة و الأهداف الخاصة.

الكلمات المفتاحية

أكشن باك للصف العاشر، الاستيعاب، تحليل المحتوى، إستراتيجية التفكير الموجه في القراءة، أنشطة القراءة، وزارة التربية والتعليم.

Content Analysis of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) Techniques in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10

Khaldoun Ali Al-Janaydeh *1   Dina Abdl Hameed Al-Jamal 2

1 Ph.D. Graduate Student / Yarmouk Univeristy / EFL Teacher / the Ministry of Education / Jordan
2 Department of Curriculum and Instruction / Yarmouk University / Jordan

* khaldonjanaydeh@gmail.com   Mobile: 0788029565

Abstract

This study aims at analyzing the content of the Student's Book of Action Pack 10 in the Jordanian context in terms of the reading activities. This study explores exactly to what extent the techniques of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy (prediction, reading, confirmation and justification) are included and presented in Action Pack 10. The study used the descriptive methodology in analyzing the content of the reading activities. The findings showed that the techniques of the DRTA strategy are presented implicitly and explicitly in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10. The study also showed that the levels of reading comprehension are distributed in reading activities in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10 in order to achieve the General Outcomes and Specific Outcomes

Key words

Action Pack 10, Comprehension, Content Analysis, Directed Reading Thinking Activity (the DRTA) Strategy, Reading Activities, The Ministry of Education.

Background of the Study

The English language is the most widely used language for communication among people worldwide. It is one of the main requirements in the field of education. The Jordanian Ministry of Education (MOE) emphasizes the importance of teaching English as early as the first grade. According to Bernhardt (1983), Lyon (1997), Agustiani (2017) and Al-Sakal (2020), reading is one of the essential skills that students seek knowledge in varied disciplines such as science, nature, technology, and so on.

The General Guidelines and General and Specific Outcomes of the English Language Curricula (2006) capitalized learners' comprehension of written English in a variety of simple authentic informational and literary texts. Most of what is learned comes from reading, whether the material read is printed or on screen (Balqees, 2003). Perhaps, it is the most required linguistic skill by learners for their further career and education in the future (Almanza, 1997; Erliana, 2011; Nassir, 2014). Additionally, it leads to enjoyment, pleasure, and information search (Grellet, 1981). In addition, it is an excellent source for language exposure (Hedgcock and Ferris, 2009).

Definitions of Reading

Goodman (1970, p.5) defined reading as "a complex process which a reader reconstructs, to some degree, a message encoded by a writer in graphic language." Students have to understand or comprehend the language to construct or derive the meaning in that text (Carnine, Silbert, & Kameenui, 1990; Goldman and Rakestraw, 2000; Kompyang, 2017). Reading is similar to an infectious disease, it is caught not taught; this means that reading and comprehending written texts are heavily dependent on readers and thus they have an essential role in comprehending the text (Nuttall, 1996). Hence, reading is an important skill, which enables readers to understand what is happening around them and acquire experience and knowledge. Furthermore, reading is essential since it broadens readers' minds and helps to develop their imagination (Welson, Abdel-Haq & Kamil, 2020).

Reading Comprehension

Harp and Brewer (1991) defined comprehension as a process by which readers predict the text, confirm their predictions and make the subsequent predictions of that text. Such process leads to the creation of meaning. Richards and Schmidt (2010) also define it as identifying the intended meaning of a text whether it is written or spoken. There are two main requirements that should be taken into account to achieve comprehension: mastering vocabulary items and knowing the basic structure of the written texts (Grellet, 1981; Cohen, 1994; Megawati, 2019).

Levels of Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension occurs at different levels. Barrett (1972) identified four types of reading comprehension, namely, literal, recognition (recall), inferential and appreciative levels. Shastri (2010) stated five reading comprehension levels: the global, the local, the referential, the inferential, and the evaluative. At the same time, Richards and Schmidt (2010) introduced four types of reading comprehension levels- the literal, the inferential, the critical (evaluative), and the appreciative. In this study, literal, inferential, and critical levels are the focus levels of investigation.

The literal comprehension - called the 'local comprehension.' At this level, the reader can understand and identify the individual points of the stated information of the text explicitly. In other words, information, which has been explicitly stated by the writer contained, is directly available in text (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). This level is divided into two sub-levels recognition and recall. In recognition, the readers can find the ideas mentioned in the text directly; they are straightforward. While in the recall, the explicit ideas mentioned in the text are produced from memory (Barrett, 1972). Hence, the questions begin with who, what, why, where, and alike require readers to recognize or recall specific information stated directly in the text (Day & Park, 2005; Muayanah, 2014). In this case, readers do not need to go in-depth and read between the lines to answer the questions because the meaning is on the surface and direct.

Inferential comprehension is the second level of reading comprehension. The ideas mentioned in the text are stated implicitly. Hence, the readers have to comprehend these ideas, which are not directly stated in the text. It is a higher skill that needs more thinking from readers (Shastri, 2010). This type of level goes beyond literal understanding, and the questions are more difficult since the answers are not on the surface; it needs to link the literal level with readers' knowledge and their intuitions (Day and Park, 2005). In other words, the reader must understand what has been said in the text and what has been chosen to leave unsaid.

Critical comprehension is the third level of reading comprehension. At this level, the reader makes a judgment on the truth, or a value indicated in the text to find out what the author is trying to say and to what extent he/she was successful in saying it. Nuttall (1996) and Day and Park (2005) stated that this level requires both literal understanding and readers' knowledge about the topic of the text. In addition, readers might show their point of view about the text in terms of agreeing and disagreeing with the author's attitude and his / her statements (Shastri, 2010). Moreover, critical reading aims to compare the information contained in the text with the reader's values and knowledge (Richards and Schmidt, 2010).

These three levels, described as reading the lines, reading between the lines, and reading beyond the lines, respectively. Teachers must be aware of these levels to achieve the purpose of teaching reading comprehension- uttering the words, constructing meaning, and solving problems and analysis. This can be achieved by developing the learners' skills and critical abilities, as these skills cannot develop spontaneously without instruction (Robinson & Good, 1987).

The DRTA Strategy

Rubin (1987) stated that reading strategies include operations, steps, plans and habits that are utilized by learners to make information obtained, stored and retrieve easier. While Duffy (1993, p. 232) defined reading strategies as "plans for solving problems encountered to constructing meaning." The most common reading strategies used in

EFL or ESL contexts are identifying the purpose of reading, skimming the text for main ideas, scanning for particular ideas, guessing, analyze vocabulary, summarizing and content prediction (Brown, 2001). Using reading strategies do improve students' reading comprehension skills (Acosta & Ferri, 2010). One example of reading strategies is the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (henceforth, the DRTA). Russell Stauffer developed it in 1969. It is based on a previous reading strategy called Direct Reading Activity (henceforth, the DRA) (Renn, 1999). The DRTA strategy is developed to improve students' reading abilities and to think critically and reflectively (Renn, 1999; Sarairah, 2006). Novendiana, Tasnim, and Wijapura (2016) stated that the DRTA is an active strategy that enables students to predict while reading a text. Song (1998), Cramer, Fate and Lueders (2010) and Megawati (2019) stated that the DRTA is a strategy that requires students to predict and think in reading comprehension. This strategy helps students to be active readers since it is one of the active learning strategies used in the teaching reading process (Nerim, 2020).

The DRTA strategy consists of four stages: before reading stage (prediction), during reading stage (reading), after reading stage (confirmation) and justification. In the before reading stage, questions are proposed about what students read. In While reading stage, students are asked to read the text silently and predict what they read. Whereas, in the after reading stage, students verify, prove, or even refute their predictions (Agustiani, 2016; Megawati, 2019). Constructing meaning from text necessitates four interdependent procedures: prediction content and text structure, sampling material, confirming predictions, and correcting inaccurate or incomplete predictions (Hudson, 2007). He stated that a purposeful, active and efficient reader needs diverse knowledge sources (e.g., content, vocabulary, linguistic and rhetorical structure) and skill sets (e.g., word recognition, sentence and discourse processing, cognitive and metacognitive strategies). According to Tankersley (2005) and El-Koumy (2006), the DRTA strategy helps students to use their higher thinking skills and provides teachers with students' ideas, values, prior knowledge, and reasoning.

Schemata

Schemata or background knowledge is very significant in the comprehension process. According to Harp and Brewer (1991), schemata refer to cognitive structures; it is the nature of people, the language, and the world or life. Schemata as a set of systematic and interconnected ideas, concepts, and prior knowledge represent abstract objects, events, and relationships in reality (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Hence, the DRTA is based on schemata or the background knowledge of the students. Their schemata need to be activated by their teachers before students are asked to read the text.

Cohen (1994) identified three major types of schemata. First, content schemata include facts, values, and traditions. Second, language schemata include language structures, inflections of grammar, spelling, punctuation marks, vocabulary, and cohesive structures. Third, textual schemata include text genres such as recipes, letters, literary texts, research, scientific books, and so on. Carrell and Eisterhold (1983), Brown (2001), and Richards and Schmidt (2010) categorized schemata into two. First, content schemata involve readers' knowledge about the world, culture, and universe. Second, formal schemata involve readers' knowledge about discourse structure. Hence, the readers with schemata will not have difficulties in reading a text in contrast with those who do not have schemata in the same text (Omaggio, 2000; McKay, 2006). Both types of schemata are very necessary for comprehension processes (Omaggio, 2000).

Reading Strategies and Teaching Reading

Strategies used by readers vary according to the text type. The most common strategies are skimming, scanning, intensive reading, and extensive reading (Shastri, 2010). Skimming refers to reading quickly to get general information about the text. The major aim is to get a general idea of the text. Scanning refers to the search for some specific information in intensive reading. Intensive reading refers to careful reading to recall the details of the text and understand every word and meaning. This type of reading is widely used and common in ESL or EFL classrooms. Extensive reading refers to reading for fun and

general meaning without understanding every word in the text (Simensen, 2007).

According to Watkins (2017), reading is taught through sequential fixed stages, these stages are the pre-reading stage, while-reading stage, and post-reading stage. In the pre-reading stage, the teacher activates students' schemata and their interests in the topic of the text. Besides, new vocabulary items are presented. In the While-reading stage, the teacher presents a task that should be completed by students, then he/she makes sure that the task is done correctly. In the post-reading stage, the teacher provides students with a task containing challenging questions, discussion, role-play, or critical thinking questions.

Teaching English in Jordan is one of the main requirements in basic and secondary schools. Thus, there is a need to adopt a comprehensive textbook to respond to the students' needs and deal with the current issues around the world in the English language. Action Pack is the main series which is taught in the Jordanian public schools. It is written in light of the English General Guidelines and Specific Outcomes Document (2006) published by the Ministry of Education. It is an official document that describes precisely and in detail the skills and knowledge that learners are expected to learn or acquire at each stage. Action Pack has been developed so that all four language skills are integrated, allowing students to practise the language in a meaningful way. Therefore, it is important to carry out a content analysis in order to investigate the inclusion and the presentation of the techniques of the DRTA strategy in reading activities in Action Pack 10.

Content Analysis

Content analysis is a research technique which is characterized as a flexible tool used widely in various disciplines such as sociology, media, literature, curricula evaluation and psychology. In general, content analysis is used as a methodology for studying communication (Al-Ghazo & Smadi, 2013). There are several attempts to define content analysis. Holsti (1969: p, 14) defined content analysis as "any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying characteristics of messages". Neuendorf (2002) defined content analysis as method

of analyzing the characteristics of a message systematically, objectively, and quantitatively. Elo and Kyngas (2007) defined content analysis as a research technique, which aims to analyze various types of different texts in many fields such as education, media and curricula. Richards and Schmidt (2010) defined content analysis as a method which is used to analyze and tabulate the frequency of occurrence of topics, ideas, opinions, and other aspects of the written and oral communication.

Content analysis aims at digging deeply in the whole required material under analysis and constructing a model for describing certain data (Elo and Kyngas, 2007). It is believed that content analysis became a significant research technique to analyze verbal, written and visual materials. In addition, it can be done quantitatively, qualitatively or in mixed ways (Al-Bzour & Smadi, 2017). Therefore, carrying out content analysis is necessary to dissect the communication message to make inferences at the end (Elo & Kyngas, 2007). In addition, these messages may be analyzed to make inferences about the characteristics of text, the causes or antecedents of messages, or the effect of communication (Holsti, 1969).

Content analysis is one of the best research techniques for analyzing school curricula and textbooks. It aims at finding out the strength and weakness points in a textbook (Taamneh & Al-Ghazo, 2017; Al-Janaydeh & Deif, 2021). In addition, content analysis is considered as an important research technique as researchers are provided with an objective for quantifying, describing and evaluating textbooks (Abbabneh, 2007). Furthermore, it helps teachers and learners to find out the degree of the appropriateness of the textbook or the material (Al-Ghazo & Smadi, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

Based on the researcher's teaching experience as an EFL teacher, reading comprehension is a challenge for EFL students at basic and secondary levels in Jordanian schools. Educational experts noticed that students have difficulties in understanding the written texts, thereby failing to answer literal, inferential, and critical reading comprehension questions. Research (i.e. Sarairah, 2006; Baniabdelrahman, 2006; Al-Ma'ani, 2008; Al Odwan, 2008;

Radaideh, 2020; Al-Ali, 2020) highlighted that teaching reading comprehension in the majority of the Jordanian classrooms implemented conventionally. Most EFL teachers ask their students to read a specific type of text, teachers present the English vocabulary in a list. Afterwards, students answer the questions related to the text individually.

Purpose of the Study

This content analysis aimed at finding out the number and percentages of the activities of reading texts in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10 in Modules (Module 1, Module 2 (units 1 and 2), Module 3 (units 3 and 4)) and the techniques of the DRTA strategy.

Questions of the Study

This content analysis more specifically aimed at answering the following questions:

1. What are the numbers and the percentages of the reading activities included in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10 in Modules (Module 1, Module 2 (units 1 and 2), Module 3 (units 3 and 4))?
2. To what extent are the levels of reading comprehension included in reading comprehension activities in Action Pack 10 in the first semester?
3. To what extent the techniques of the DRTA strategy are integrated within the analyzed reading activities in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10?

Significance of the Study

This study may be significant as it may provide evidence of the improvement of the participants' EFL students reading comprehension through using the DRTA strategy. The findings of the study may be useful for EFL teachers to teach their students and helping them to overcome comprehension difficulties. The researchers assume that the findings of the study may also be helpful for textbook designers in designing textbooks, integrating or enlisting the DRTA strategy into the textbooks' strategies. Furthermore, the findings of the study might be beneficial for the EFL supervisors since it may arouse their attention and interests

to hold regular training courses or intensive workshops for their EFL teachers to promote and enhance the use of the DRTA strategy in their classrooms. Moreover, this study is significant since no previous studies, to the best knowledge, have explored the techniques of the DRTA strategy through using content analysis in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10.

Operational Definitions of Terms

The study consists of several terms defined operationally as follows:

Directed Reading Thinking Strategy (DRTA): according to Renn (1999), the DRTA is a strategy of teaching reading which was designed to improve students' critical and reflective reading. This strategy was developed by Russell Stauffer in 1969. It includes three major sequencing stages; first, the pre-reading stage which aims at activating students' schemata and background knowledge; the text should be linked to the students' experiences, needs and interests (Shastri, 2010). It aims at encouraging students to think deeply about the questions that the teacher raises and making their predictions; these predictions should be accepted whether they are logical or not (Dobbs, 2003; Stahl, 2008). Second, guided silent-reading (While-reading stage) aims at making predictions on what students read. In addition, it aims at facilitating comprehension skills and reading strategies (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2009). Third, the post-reading stage aims at verifying or changing students' predictions based on new information. It also aims at promoting their higher thinking skills (Novendiana, Tasnim, & Wijaputra, 2016).

In this study, the researchers define the DRTA as a strategy of reading comprehension by which predictions made before, while and after reading a text. It enables students to activate their schemata and background knowledge and enables them to understand the text While-reading. This strategy passes through sequential steps. They are prediction, reading (silent reading), confirmation and justification. First, the teacher prepares a written text and gives it to the students, and then asks them to look at the text title and make their predictions about the text before reading. Next, students read silently, silent reading gives them a general idea about basic comprehension and predictions about the text. Next, the reading text is divided into small sections, and then the teacher gives the students the time to think and process their information. The teacher can check if the students understand the important vocabulary items; teachers clarify and explain them through context, as the students can answer questions While-reading the text. In after reading, the teacher presents a group of questions to ensure that the students achieved a clear comprehension. Meanwhile, predictions are verified, modified, or refuted. Finally, the predictions which are made early by the students are revisited and justified. In brief, the DRTA strategy includes four stages: predicting, reading, confirming/refuting predictions and justifying.

Reading comprehension is an active and deliberate thinking process in which the intended meaning or message is gained or constructed through interactions between readers and written texts (Harris & Hodges, 1995). In this study, reading comprehension is measured by students' scores on reading comprehension tests based on Action Pack 10 reading passages concerning the reading skills of literal, inferential, and critical comprehension.

Content analysis: according to Carney (1972), content analysis is a method that aims at making inferences of a certain text objectively and accurately whether the text or the material is oral, visual or written. Reid (1983) defined content analysis as a method of research that helps to make inferences accurately and objectively about the characteristics of a text through quantitative measures. In this study, content analysis refers to a set of procedures that aim at analyzing the content of Action Pack 10 to find out to what extent the techniques of the DRTA strategy are included in the reading activities.

Action Pack Series: is an English course designed for Jordanian EFL learners at basic and secondary levels in schools. It has been developed so that all four language skills are integrated, allowing learners to practise the language meaningfully.

Action Pack 10: is the tenth level of a twelve-level course for young Jordanian EFL learners. It consists of six thematic modules based on a carefully graded language

syllabus. It also consists of Student's Book, Activity Book, an audio CD and The Teacher's Book.

Reading activities are exercises or tasks, which ask students to answer a set of questions based on written texts. Some of them are recorded and written at the same time while some others are only written. These reading activities vary according to the purpose of the text. These reading activities help students to understand the language in the reading passage, including comprehension, vocabulary, and grammar. Action Pack 10 includes a wide variety of text types such as articles, extracts, conversations, emails, letters, advertisements, and leaflets.

Limitations of the Study

The generalization of the findings of study is limited to Student's Book of Action Pack for tenth grade.

Content Analysis of the techniques of the DRTA strategy in Action Pack 10

In order to investigate the effectiveness of the DRTA strategy in EFL male tenth grade students' reading comprehension, the researcher intends to design an instructional program in this respect. The target instructional material for this program is Action Pack 10. It is necessary for the present study to analyze the activities of the Student's Book to list the activities of reading texts, identify the presence of the DRTA strategy techniques. Afterwards, the researcher intends to design the way of teaching it to learners by carrying out the instructional program. Therefore, content analysis in this present study is essential for covering the qualitative part of this research. The purpose of this content analysis is to find out the number and the percentages of the techniques of the DRTA strategy included in the Student's Book in Action Pack 10 in the Modules (Module 1, Module 2 (units 1 and 2), Module 3 (units 3 and 4)).

Methodology

This section presents the procedures of content analysis to conduct the current analysis. It particularly describes the content under analysis, criterion, units of analysis, the

instruments and their reliability and the statistical analysis. The researchers used a content analysis sheet to find out the inclusion of the DRTA technique in reading activities presented in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10.

Criterion of the Analysis

The criterion of the analysis is the inclusion of the reading activities in the three main modules of Action Pack 10.

Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis is the reading activities in the selected three main modules of the first semester of the Student's Book in Action Pack 10.

Instrument of Analysis

The researchers used content analysis sheets to find out frequencies and percentages of the reading activities in the units of the Student's Book of Action Pack 10, the inclusion and presentation of the techniques of the DRTA strategy in reading activities as well as levels of reading comprehension in of the Student's Book of Action Pack 10.

Reliability of the Content Analysis

In order to make sure the reliability of the content analysis, the researchers repeated the analysis after one week using the same definitions, criteria, categories and units of analysis. The agreement between the two analyses was 90.5%, which indicates that they were acceptable and reliable.

Findings and Discussions

The findings and the discussion of the content under analysis are in the following tables according to the questions of the study. Thus, the researchers conducted an analysis of the content thoroughly using a content analysis sheet in order to answer the questions of the study. **Table (1)** represents the frequencies and percentages of reading activities of the Student's Book in Action Pack 10.

Table (1): Frequencies and Percentages of the Reading Activities in the Targeted Units

Module No.	Unit Title	Number of Activities	Frequencies of Reading Activities	Percentages of Reading Activities
Module One (Starting Out)				
-	A new business idea	23	10	43.47%
Module Two (The Natural World)				
Unit 1	Rainforests	24	9	37.5%
Unit 2	Treasures of Earth	25	10	40%
Module three (Science)				
Unit 3	The Nobel Prize	24	11	45.83%
Unit 4	Science and Scientists	26	12	46.15%
Total		122	52	42.622%

Table (1) shows that the percentage of the reading activities is high in each unit. On average, there are 9-12 reading activities in each unit (e.g. before you begin (before reading)), read and listen, read the text and check your answers, comprehension). The content analysis of the reading activities, according to **Table (1)**, reveals that each unit has minimally nine reading activities: module one includes 10 reading activities, unit 1 includes 9 reading activities, unit 2 includes 10 reading activities, unit 3 includes 11 reading activities and unit 4 includes 12 reading activities.

Table (2) shows the levels of reading comprehension in the first semester of Action Pack 10. According to **Table (3)**, the literal level has the highest percentage in all modules 14%, 5%, 19%, 11% and 14% respectively, followed by the critical level with the percentage of 3.5%, 2%, 3.5%, 3.5% and 7% respectively. The inferential level was the least, which took 3.5%, 3.5%, 5%, 2% and 3.5% respectively. In Module one, A new business idea: the literal and the inferential have the same percentage – 3.5%

each. While, in Module two, unit one and unit two, the inferential level is higher than the critical level. In contrast, critical level in Module three, unit three and four is higher.

Table (2): Levels of Reading Comprehension in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10

Module	Unit	Reading Level	Frequency	Percentage
Module One	A New Business Idea	Literal Level	8	14%
		Inferential Level	2	3.5%
		Critical Level	2	3.5%
Module Two	Unit One: Rainforests	Literal Level	3	5%
		Inferential Level	2	3.5%
		Critical Level	1	2%
	Unit Two: Treasures of the earth	Literal Level	11	19%
		Inferential Level	3	5%
		Critical Level	2	3.5%
Module Three	Unit Three: The Noble Prize	Literal Level	6	11%
		Inferential Level	1	2%
		Critical Level	2	3.5%
	Unit Four: Science and Scientists	Literal Level	8	14%
		Inferential Level	2	3.5%
		Critical Level	4	7%
	Total		57	100%

Table (3): The Techniques related to the DRTA strategy

No.	Reading Activities	Techniques related to the DRTA strategy			
		Prediction	**Reading**	**Confirmation**	**Justification**
1.	A new business idea	1	1	1	1
2.	A young inventor	1	1	1	1
3.	Job Advertisements	1	1	1	1
4.	A Hidden World	1	1	1	1
5.	Rainforests	-	-	-	-
6.	Julia's email	1	1	1	-
7.	The oldest tress on Earth	1	1	1	-
8.	A Quiz Show	1	1	-	-
9.	Robert Allan's Description about Amber	1	1	-	-
10.	Emeralds in Egypt	1	1	1	-
11.	The Jordan Archaeological Museum	1	1	1	1
12.	The Gold Market in Amman	1	1	1	-
13.	Super Scientists	1	1	1	1
14.	The Nobel Prize Conferences	1	1	1	-
15.	Robert's letter	1	1	1	1
16.	Science Matters	1	1	1	-
17.	Ibn Al-Haitham	-	1	-	-
18.	Jordan, a pioneer in higher education	1	1	1	1
19.	Experiment – How fast do you react?	1	1	-	-
	Total	17	18	14	8
	Percentage	29.8%	31.6%	24.6%	14%

Table (3) shows the techniques related to the DRTA strategy integrated in the reading activities in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10. Almost, each reading activity includes one or more of the DRTA techniques. The researchers noted these techniques or steps are integrated in many reading activities in the same order: prediction, reading, confirmation and justification (e.g. A New Business Idea; A Young Inventor; A Hidden World; Super Scientists). However, these techniques are not all included in the other reading activities (e.g. Julia's email: prediction, reading and confirmation; A Quiz Show: prediction and reading; Robert Allan's Description about Amber: prediction and reading). Few reading activities do not have the techniques of the DRTA strategy or have only one technique (e.g. Rainforests; Ibn Al-Haitham: reading; A Quiz Show: prediction and reading). According to Table 3, the number of prediction techniques utilized in the reading activities is 17 with a percentage of 29.8%. However, the reading technique becomes the highest with a percentage 31.6%. Then, confirmation technique has a percentage of 24.6%. Justification technique becomes the lowest with a percentage of 14%. The frequency of justification technique of the DRTA strategy utilized in the reading activities is 8. According to **Table (3)**, the DRTA strategy seems to be implied. The procedures of this strategy are used, and they followed the same order as mentioned earlier. With regard to the reading activities, which do not have the techniques of the DRTA strategy, it is important for the researchers to integrate the techniques of the DRTA strategy in these activities through the instructional program.

Students have an interactive role in the learning process by having their background knowledge stimulated. This gives the students a purpose and a focus in the reading tasks and helps them to construct the main idea faster. Starting with prediction, for example, in Module 1, page 4, Module 2, page 12, Module 3, page 26, Module 3, page 32, Before you begin, students are asked to refer to photographs, and then make predictions about the topic of the units: A New Business Idea, A Hidden World, Super Scientists and Science Matters respectively.

This is for the first technique, prediction. While, reading, the second technique is available in the majority of texts. Students are asked to read the texts either silently or orally in almost every text. For example, Module 1, page 6, exercise 2, Module 2, page 12, exercise 3, Module 2, page 16, exercise 2, Module 2, page 21, exercise 4, Module 3, page 26, exercise 3, Module 3, page 29, exercise 6. With regard to the third technique- that is confirmation, then, students confirm or verify their predictions after reading the text. For example, Module 1, exercise 2, page 6, Module 2, exercise 3 page 12 and Module 2, exercise 7, page 32. In Justification, which is the final technique, students are asked to justify if their predictions they made right or wrong. For example, Module 1, exercise 5, page 5, Module 1, exercise 5, page 7, Module 2, exercise 4 - items 4 and 6, page 13, Module 2, exercise 5 - item 6, page 21, Module 2, exercise 3 – items 5 and 6, page 22, Module 3, exercise 4 – items 4 and 5, page 27.

Conclusion

The findings of the study revealed that the DRTA techniques are presented in Action Pack 10 explicitly and implicitly and there is a strong emphasis on them. The study also revealed that Student's Book in Action Pack 10 includes 42.6 % of reading activities. There is a strong match between the percentage of reading activities and the outcomes. In addition, there is a variety of reading activities. Thus, students will not learn effectively without putting a great deal of emphasis on reading activities. In order to develop higher order thinking skills, they should be presented to the students implicitly or explicitly in reading activities. The DRTA strategy provides students with these skills and ensures that these skills are well-addressed in the activities. Furthermore, the researchers concluded that the distribution of the three levels of reading comprehension is reasonable, commensurates with the academic common sense and the fundamentals of instruction and serves the outcomes and the goals of the curriculum. The researchers recommended to integrate the techniques of the DRTA strategy in the Student's Book or Teacher's Book for EFL teachers to direct students in the reading activities, especially students with higher basic and secondary stages to help them to improve their reading comprehension and higher order thinking skills.

Recommendations

In light of the findings of the study, the researchers recommend the following:

1. The DRTA strategy should be explained and emphasized in terms of level and techniques so that it helps students to think logically and improves their higher order thinking skills.

2. Teachers should explain the DRTA strategy directly to their students.

3. The DRTA aspects should be presented through varied written genres.

Suggestions for further research

1. Further studies should be carried out in order to analyze the other textbooks of Action Pack series in light of the inclusion and presentation of Directed Listening Thinking Activity (the DLTA strategy).

2. Other studies should be conducted in order to analyze the other textbooks of Action Pack series in light of the inclusion and presentation of the DRTA strategy.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Financial support

This research did not receive financial support.

References

Ababneh, J. (2007). Analyzing the Content of Jordan Opportunities Series for basic stage Jordanian students and Investigating teachers' and Supervisors' opinions. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Arab University for Graduate studies, Amman, Jordan.

Acosta, L., & Ferri, M. (2010). Reading Strategies to Develop Higher Thinking Skills for Reading Comprehension. PROFILE. 12(1), 107-123.

Agustiani, M. (2016). The Effects of the DRTA and LC Strategies on Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement of Narrative Texts Based on English Score Levels. Journal of English Literacy Education. 3(2), 111-124.

Al-Janaydeh, K., & Deif, I. (2020). Listening Activities in EFL Textbooks: An analytical study. International Journal of Linguistics and Literature. 4(5), 219-225. Available online at: https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt/article/view/1751/1445

Al- Sakal, R. (2020). The Effect of the Flipped Classroom Instruction on EFL Female Ninth Grade Students' Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary Learning and their Attitudes towards it in UNRWA Schools. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Al-Ali, A. (2020). An Investigation of the Extent of Using Cultural Clues in EFL Reading Comprehension by Undergraduates and their Opinions towards them. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Yarmouk University.

Al-Bzour, W., & Smadi, O. (2017). A Content Analysis of the Presentation of the Jordanian National Identity Aspects in the Pupils' Book of Action Pack Series 1-6, Journal of Educational Policy and Entrepreneurial Research, 10(6): 10-22

Al-Ghazo, A., & Smadi, O. (2013). A Content Analysis of the English Reading Text's Authenticity in Student's Book of Action Pack Eleven in Jordan. European Scientific Journal. 9(29), 342-359.

Almanza, T. (1997). The Effects of the DRTA and Cooperative Learning Strategies on Reading Comprehension. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405 565).

Baniabdelrahman, A. (2006). The Effect of Using Authen-

tic English Language Materials on EFL Students' Achievement in Reading Comprehension. Journal of Educational & Psychological Sciences. 7(1), 9-21.

Barrett, T. (1972). Taxonomy of Reading Comprehension. Reading Comprehension 360. Lexington, Kentucky: MA. Monograph.

Bernhardt, E. (1983). Three Approaches to Reading Comprehension in Intermediate German. Modern Language Journal, 67, 11-115.

Brown, H. (2001). Teaching By Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Francisco: State University.

Carney, F. (1972). Content Analysis: A Technique for Systematic Inference from Communications. Winnipeg, Canada, University of Manitoba Press.

Carnine, D., Silbert, J., & Kameenui, E. (1990). Direct Instruction Reading (2nd Ed.). Columbus: Merrill.

Carrell, P., & Eisterhold, J. (1983). Schema Theory and ESL Reading Pedagogy. TESOL Quarterly. 17, 553-573.

Cohen, A. (1994). Assessing Language Ability in the Classroom. New York: Heinle & Heinle publishers.

Cramer, C., Fate, J., & Lueders, K. (2001). Improving reading achievement through the implementation of reading strategies. https://www.eric.ed.gov/ [ED454503]

Day, R., & Park, J. (2005). Developing reading comprehension questions. Reading in a Foreign Language. 17(1), 60-73.

Dobbs, O. (2003). Using Reading Strategies to Reduce the Failure Rate in the Content Area. Subject: Social Studies. Grade Level: 6-7-8. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED479208.pdf

Duffy, G. (1993). Rethinking Strategy instruction: Four teachers' development and their low achievers' understanding. The Elementary School Journal, 93, 231-247.

El-Koumy, A. (2006). The Effects of the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity on EFL Students' Referential and Inferential Comprehension. Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), USA. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2365150.

Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2007). The Qualitative Content Analysis Process. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62(1), 107-117.

Erliana, S. (2011). Improving reading comprehension through directed reading thinking activity strategy. Journal of English as Foreign Language, 1(1), 49-57.

Goldman, S., & Rakestraw, J. (2000). Structural Aspects of Constructing Meaning from Text. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and P.D. Pearson, eds., Handbook of Reading Research. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Goodman, K. (1970). Reading: Process and Program. Champaign, III: National Council of Teachers of English.

Grellet, F. (1996). Developing Reading Skill: A practice Guide to Reading Comprehension. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harp, B., & Brewer, J. (1991). Reading and Writing: Teaching for the connections. Florida, USA.

Harris, T., & Hodges, R. (Eds.). (1995). The literacy dictionary. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hedgcock, J., & Ferris, D. (2009). Teaching Readers of English Students, Texts, and Contexts (First Ed.). New York: Taylor & Francis E-Library.

Holsti, O. (1969). Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Hudson, T. (2007). Teaching Second Language Reading. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Kompyang, A. (2017). The Effect of Directed Reading Thinking Activity in Cooperative Learning Setting Toward Students' Reading Comprehension of the Eleventh Grade Students. Journal of Psychology and Instruction. 1(2), 88-96.

Lyon, R. (1997). Statement before the Committee on Education and Workforce. U.S. House of Representatives.

McKay, P. (2006). Assessing Young Language Learners. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Megawati, I. (2019). The Effect of Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) Strategy on Students' Reading Comprehension. Getsempena English Ed-

ucation Journal (GEEJ). 6(2), 172-180.

Ministry of Education. (2006). General Guidelines and General and Specific Outcomes for the English Language. Amman: Jordan.

Muayanah, M. (2014). Reading Comprehension Questions Developed by English Teachers of Senior High Schools in Surabaya. jsh Jurnal Sosial Humaniora. 7(1), 20-44.

Nassir, S. (2014). The Effectiveness of Project-based Learning Strategy on Ninth Graders' Achievement Level and Their Attitudes towards English in the Governmental Schools –North Governorate. Unpublished Thesis. The Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine.

Nerim, N. (2020). Scrutinizing directed reading thinking activity (DRTA) strategy on students reading comprehension. Journal of Language and Language Teaching. 8(2), 128-138.

Neuendorf, K. (2002). The Content Analysis Guidebook. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.

Novendiana, F., Tasnim, Z., & Wijaputra, B. (2016). The Effect of Using Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) Strategy on the Tenth Grade Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement at MA Unggulan Nuris Jember. Journal Edukasi, 3(3) : 43-46

Nuttall, C. (1996). Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language. (2nd Ed.). Oxford, UK: Heinemann.

Omaggio, A. (2001). Teaching language in context. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Radaideh, E. (2020). The Effect of Digital Storytelling on Fifth Grade Students' Reading Comprehension Skills and their Motivation towards it. Unpublished Dissertation. Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Reid, B. (1983). A Study of Historical Sources Materials on Women Topics which Appear in the United States History Textbooks: A Content Analysis. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland.

Renn, C. (1999). The Effects of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity on Second Grade Reading Comprehension. M.Ed. dissertation, Grand Valley State University, Michigan, USA.

Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2010). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. Longman Pearson: UK.

Robison, R., & Good, T. (1987). Becoming an Effective Reading Teacher. New York: Harper and Row.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning. London: Prentice-Hall International.

Sarairah, B. (2006). The Effect of the "Directed Reading-Thinking Activity" Model and the Learning Style on EFL Jordanian Eleventh Grade Students' Literal and Inferential Reading Comprehension Achievements. Mu'tah Lil-Buhuth wad-Dirasat. 21(4), 9-35.

Shastri, P. (2010). Communicative Approach to the Teaching of English as a Second Language. Himalaya Publishing House: Mumbai.

Simensen, A. (2007). Teaching a Foreign Language - Principles and Procedures. Oslo: Fagbokforlaget.

Song, M. (1998). Teaching reading strategies in ongoing EFL university reading classrooms. Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 8, 41-54.

Stahl, D., & Katherine, A. (2008). The effect of three instructional methods on the reading comprehension and content acquisition of novice readers. Journal of Literacy Research.40, 359-393.

Stauffer, G. (1969). Directing Reading Maturity as a Cognitive Process. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Taamneh, I. (2018). Analyzing the Listening Activities That Match the Listening Specific Outcomes in the Jordanian Guidelines for the Pupil's Book of Action Pack 5. International Research in Education. 6(1), 50-62. Available online at: https://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2017.0810.1035

Tankersley, K. (2005). Literacy Strategies for Grades 4-12: Reinforcing the Threads of Reading. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Novendiana, F., Tasnim, Z., & Wijaputra, B. (2016). The Effect of Using Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) Strategy on the Tenth Grade Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement at MA Unggulan Nuris Jember. Journal Edukasi, 3(3), 43-46.

Watkins, P. (2017). Teaching and Developing Reading Skills. Cambridge University Press: UK.

Welson, M., Abdel-Haq, E., & Kamil., Y. (2020). The Directed Reading Thinking Activity for Enhancing

Reading Comprehension and Metacognitive Awareness among English Department Faculty of Education Students. Journal of Faculty of Education. 121(3), 69-100. Available online at: https://search.mandumah.com/Record/1089500

Author Biographies

Khaldoun Ali Al-Janaydeh

is An EFL teacher in the Ministry of Education, Jordan. He has B.A in English Language and Literature, Diploma in Education / Methods of Teaching English) and M.A in Education / Teaching English as a Foreign Language. He worked as an EFL teacher in the State of Qatar and a translator in the UAE.

Dina Abdl Hameed Al-Jamal

is a Professor in Department of Curricula and Instruction, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan. She published many studies in international refereed journals. Her studies concentrate on language teaching and learning, language assessment and teaching through technology.