



Effect Of Bottom-Up Approach Of English Language Teaching On Metacognitive Reading Awareness

Dr. Anjali Puri

Assistant Professor, Govt. College of Education, Chandigarh, India

Sukhpreet Kaur

M.Ed. Research Student , Govt. College of Education, Chandigarh, India

Abstract:

This study aims to see the effect of bottom up approach of English language teaching on metacognitive reading awareness of high school students. Experimental design consisting of controlled and experimental group was used in this study. Pre-test was given to the IX class students regarding Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSII) by Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard developed in 2002. They were further divided into two groups – Experimental group and Control group. Self made lesson plans were taught to the experimental group for twenty days and ordinary teaching capsule was given to the control group during these twenty days. At the end of the experiment post-test was given to verify the learning outcomes among the students of both the groups. The study demonstrates the positive influence of bottom-up approach on the awareness of metacognitive reading strategies and the ability of students to regulate their own reading processes,

Keywords: *Metacognitive, bottom-up, reading strategies, learning outcomes*

1.Introducation

The English language teaching tradition has been subjected to a tremendous change. There is a lot of talk about communication and developing communicative skills. Unfortunately, however, even this has not solved the language problem of many learners in different parts of the world. Different groups of learners have individual needs and different types of learning require specific instructional approaches.

Traditionally, English was taught by the grammar translation method. In the late 1950s, structurally graded syllabi were introduced as a major innovation into the state systems for teaching English. The Direct Method became very popular at the beginning of the twentieth century, but it started to decline for its being difficult to use. Then exploring the vast array of functions of language, and relentless need for communication led to the emergence of the Communicative Language Teaching Method in the late twentieth century. Despite its great appeal, Communicative Language Teaching has not overcome the psychological barriers which cripple learners and hinder the learning process. There comes a point at which understanding and studying language from a top-down perspective is just about impossible without a good understanding of the details . In this way, a bottom-up approach to foreign language study is necessary. The most important aim of any approach of teaching English is to improve the instructional effectiveness in an interactive atmosphere and to improve and shape the curriculum.

Taking a bottom-up approach to English learning and teaching can help unravel some of the complexities involved in becoming a proficient speaker and listener of English as a second or foreign language. Language can be complex and full of subtleties. Bottom-up is the way forward if one is to reach a high level of proficiency as a speaker, listener, writer and reader of English. Bottom-up approach is a process where readers focus on letters, sounds, syllables, words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs. The process of constructing the meaning begins with the written words. In other words, readers with this approach begin by focusing on smaller parts of the texts. In order to go beyond the high-intermediate level, bottom-up approach to learning and teaching is absolutely necessary. Laberge & Samuels (1974) opine that Bottom-up approach starts with the printed stimuli and works its way up to the higher level stages. The sequence of processing proceeds from the incoming data to higher level encodings. Mackay (1995) observed that in Bottom-up approach, the grammar is constructed to manipulate the reader into the desired reading position and response to the text. Such knowledge is often vital to unpacking and understanding a text.

Metacognition refers to one's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes or anything related to them. Metacognition is essential to successful learning because it enables individuals to better manage their cognitive skills and to determine weaknesses that can be corrected by constructing new cognitive skills. **Garner (1987)** defines metacognition as a relatively new label for a body of theory and research that addresses learners' knowledge and use of their own cognitive resources.

- Flavell (1979) further describes the importance of metacognition in communication, reading comprehension, language acquisition, social cognition, attention, self-control, memory, self-instruction, writing, problem solving, and personality development.

The importance of metacognition in reading has increasingly been recognized and undoubtedly contributes to the expertise of learning in different domains.

- Anderson (2002) and Cohen (2003) have shown that the strategies that mark the true difference between effective and ineffective learners are the metacognitive strategies. That is, the more a student knows about how s/he learns, the better learner s/he will be.
- Cubukcu (2008) states that unskilled readers can become skilled readers and learners of whole text if they are given instruction in effective strategies and taught to monitor and check their comprehension while reading. Teachers can help learners use different metacognitive strategies to facilitate their vocabulary learning. This study provides further evidence for the benefits of metacognitive strategy training. Reading comprehension could be developed through systematic instruction in metacognitive language learning strategies. Systematic explicit instruction about the concept of metacognition and learning strategies helps students to better comprehend this new approach and how to apply it to different learning tasks on reading.
- Pressley (2000), Pressley, Brown, El-Dinary & Afflerbach (1995) describe that the reader must purposefully or intentionally or willfully invoke strategies and regulate and enhance learning from text. Through metacognitive strategies, a reader allocates significant attention to controlling, monitoring, and evaluating the reading process. Iwai (2010) is of the view that English language learners, who use at least two languages for processing, struggle with developing English reading comprehension skills. They have culturally different schemata and

limited English vocabulary knowledge. The use of bottom-up approach exclusively helps them improve in reading.

- Lieungnapar and Todd (2011) consider bottom-up approach as an improved technique of imparting language skills in the classroom teaching and bottom-up process views genre as content and function. This process which is more objective allows us to isolate and reveal linguistic features associated with each rhetorical structure and let us investigate text within text.

So when the students are taught using bottom up approach, the ability to recognize, identify, speak and draw the meaning quickly is enhanced and the students tend to make more improvement in reading comprehension. More extensive use of vocabulary improvement and pronunciation can also be seen in the students.

2.DESIGN

Experimental design consisting of controlled and experimental group was used in this study. The purpose of the present investigation was to study the effect of bottom-up approach of English language teaching on metacognitive reading awareness. For this purpose pre-test was given to the IX class students regarding Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSİ) by Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard developed in 2002. They were further divided into two groups – Experimental group and Control group. Self made lesson plans were taught to the experimental group for twenty days and ordinary teaching capsule was given to the control group during these twenty days.

At the end of the experimental post-test was given Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSİ) by Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard (2002) to verify the learning outcomes among the students of both the groups.

3.SAMPLING

A representative sample of 110 students was drawn at the initial stage from class IX of Government Model Senior Secondary Schools, Sector 27 and Sector 19, Chandigarh, based on stratified random sampling technique. A pre-test was administered to this sample of 110 students. The pre-test consisted of a metacognitive reading awareness inventory. A sample of 90 students was selected out of the initial sample. The students constituting sample were nearly equated on the basis of their Metacognitive reading

awareness scores. This sample of 90 students was further divided into two groups of 45 each forming control and experimental group.

4.DATA COLLECTION

The data was collected in three stages.

4.1.Pre-test

At this stage, pre-test was administered to 110 students in Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSİ) by Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard (2002). A sample of 90 students was selected out of this sample on the basis of purposive sampling. The students constituting sample nearly equated on the basis of their Metacognitive reading awareness scores.

4.2.Teaching sessions

At this stage, ordinary teaching was resorted to the control group for twenty days in English prose lessons as prescribed in the CBSE syllabus for class IX. During those twenty days, self made lesson plans of Bottom –Up approach were followed for teaching the same chapters to the students of Experimental group.

4.3.Post-test

The same test of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSİ) by Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard (2002) was administered to the students of both the groups as was done at the pre-test stage.

The testing conditions for all the students were kept as constant and uniform as possible before the teaching session. It was ensured that the subject was seated comfortably and there was no disturbance.

The study was confined to twenty working days. On the first day pre-test was given about Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSİ) by Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard (2002) and the next twenty days witnessed the teaching of the prose lessons to control and experimental groups. On the last day the post-test was administered to all the both the control and experimental group to measure the areas of Metacognitive Reading Awareness.

5. Analysis Of Results

Pre-test scores and the post-test scores of Metacognitive Reading Awareness have been gathered to assess the trends. The data has been organized and described to yield the statistical namely mean, standard deviation, standard error of difference between means and t-values. After the completion of the study, the following results were achieved.

Test	Type Of Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Pre- test	Control	103.42	11.393	1.698
	Experimental	104.53	10.067	1.501
Post-test	Control	102.62	11.252	1.677
	Experimental	129.18	8.932	1.332

Table 1

The above table shows that when pre-test was administered to the control group the mean score was 103.42, standard deviation 11.393 and the standard error turned out to be 1.698. For the experimental group the mean score was 104.53, standard deviation 10.067 and the standard error was 1.501. The mean score for the control group in the post-test was 102.62. standard deviation 11.252 and the standard error 1.677. For the experimental group the mean score was 129.18, standard deviation 8.932 and the standard error was 1.332.

5.1. Significance Of Difference Between Mean Scores Of Metacognitive Reading Awareness (Pre-Test)

The difference between pre-test mean scores on metacognitive reading awareness between control and experimental group was found to be 1.11 in favour of experimental group.

Test	Mean scores		t-value
	Control group	Experimental group	
pre-test	103.42	104.53	0.49
post-test	102.62	129.18	12.40**

Table 2: Significance of difference between Metacognitive Reading Awareness

*** Significant at 0.01 level*

The t-value for the pre-test was found to be 0.49 which was not significant at any level of confidence. Thus the two groups shared equal metacognitive reading awareness level. Thus creating a perfect condition for the study to take off.

5.2. Significance Of Difference Between Mean Scores Of Metacognitive Reading Awareness (Post-Test)

The difference between post-test mean scores on metacognitive reading awareness between control and experimental group was found to be 26.56 in favour of the experimental group.

On the post-test, the control group depicted the mean score of 102.62 whereas the experimental group had the mean score of 129.18 having the advantage of 26.56 points in the favour of experimental group.

The t-value for the post-test was 12.40 which was significant at 0.01 level of confidence thus exhibiting a pronounced improvement in the metacognitive reading awareness score of the experimental group.

6. Discussion Of The Results

The results showed a positive linear relationship indicating that the students taught through bottom-up approach were more aware of reading strategies than those who were taught through bilingual method. The results which showed significant difference between the mean scores of control group and experimental group are evident enough to prove the same. The study demonstrates the positive influence of bottom-up approach on the metacognitive reading awareness.

The results highlight the importance of incorporating the bottom-up approach in English language teaching, as it helps in creating metacognitive awareness, which is, in turn, in need of more research to gain better pedagogical insights. The more learners regulate their own learning, the more metacognitively cognizant they are of their reading process, which helps them recognize their strengths and weaknesses. In other words the students' more enhanced knowledge allowed them to be more self-regulated readers. Lieungnapar and Todd (2011) consider bottom-up approach as an improved technique of imparting language skills in the classroom teaching and bottom-up process views genre as content and function. This process which is more objective allows us to isolate and reveal linguistic features associated with each rhetorical structure and let us investigate text within text.

Moreover, monitoring and checking one's own cognitive activities to verify whether comprehension is taking place is one of the metacognitive strategies the readers employ to enhance their text comprehension. Thus the learners can be encouraged to keep a journal of the metacognitive strategies they use when they engage in extensive reading outside the classroom and use the strategies taught in the class and to keep a record of what they do when the failure of comprehension occurs or how they resolve the problems in comprehension.

If readers possess higher language knowledge, his/her comprehension monitoring operates at a higher level leading to a higher level text comprehension. Therefore, future research need to include data triangulation using different methods such as use of interviews, students' journals, think aloud protocols in order to have more broader outlook of this study.

7.Reference

1. Anderson, N. (2002) Using Telescopes, Microscopes, and Kaleidoscopes to Put Metacognition Into Perspective, TESOL Matters 12, 4.
2. Cohen, A.D. (2003) Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language, London :Longman.
3. Cubukcu, F. (2008) How To Enhance Reading Comprehension Through Metacognitive Strategies. The Journal Of International Social Research, Volume ½, 83-93.
4. Flavell, J. H. (1979) Metacognition and cognitive monitoring, American Psychologist, 34(10), 906-911
5. Garner, R. (1987) Metacognition and reading comprehension. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
6. Iwai, Y. (2010) Re-envisioning Reading Comprehension for English Language Learners. Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XVI, No. 4 . Retrieved from: iteslj.org/Articles/Iwai-Reading.html
7. Laberge, D & Samuels, S. J (1974) Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 1974.
8. Lieungnapar, A & Todd, R.W. (2011) Top-down versus Bottom-up Approaches toward Move Analysis in ES. Retrieved from: arts.kmutt.ac.th/.../1-10_Top-down_versus_Bottom-up_Approaches.
9. Mackay, S. (1995) Using a genre approach in the EFL reading classroom. EA Journal, 13(1).
10. Mokhtari, K & Reichard, C. (2002) Assessing students' metacognitive awareness of reading strategies. Journal of Educational Psychology, 94(2), 249-259.
11. Pressley, M., Brown, R., El-Dinary, P., & Afflerbach, P. (1995) The comprehension instruction that students need: Instruction fostering constructively responsive reading. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 10(4).
12. Pressley, M. (2000) What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of ?In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Reasearch, Volume III . Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.