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ABSTRACT

In today’s reading education, the importance of explicit instruction of specific cognitive literacy strategy that promotes reader’s active participation in the reading process is highly recognized. This active participation is synonymous with reader’s interaction with the text, the context, and himself/herself. Hence, this study was conducted to investigate the relative effect of glossing instruction on first year college students’ reading comprehension.

The study made use of quasi-experimental research design using mixed method. The quantitative method was utilized by subjecting 15 students to an intervention, the glossing instruction, while 15 students were taught using the usual teaching instruction. Pre- and post-tests including the reading comprehension test and the writing of a summary were administered to both groups, the experimental and the control groups. Qualitative data from the students’ glosses described the students’ interaction with the text, the context, and themselves.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This paper analyses the relative effect of glossing instruction on college students’ reading comprehension. Reading is said to be “the skill of skills” (Anderson, 1984). It is not surprising then that an enormous amount of time, money, and effort is spent teaching reading in elementary and secondary schools around the world. In fact, it is probably true to say that more time is spent teaching reading than any other skill. Unlike speaking, reading is not something that every individual learns to do (Nunan, 1999). One has to spend a great amount of effort to learning how to read especially today that almost all information can be acquired from printed materials. Therefore, it is understandable that one of the primary concerns of educators today is to train the students to become better readers and language users to be able to survive in the academic world, in the industry, and in the society as well. Such training is imperative since the struggle of the Philippines is not only to produce globally competitive skilled workers but also to be able to establish industries that can compete in the world market. To address this concern, the thrust of education is to produce graduates who are globally competitive, and one of the determinants of competitiveness is proficiency in the English language (Morales, 2009). Reading is one of the macroskills of language. It plays a significant role in one’s life as without this, one can never survive in the academic and highly competitive world.

However, the proficiency of Filipino students in English remains a challenge for educators. The result of the National Achievement Test for Academic Year 2011-2012 revealed a Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of 51.80% for English, 23.20% far from the target MPS of 75%; on the other hand, the MPS for Critical Thinking Skills Test is 48.57%, which is 26.43% far from the target MPS of 75% (retrieved from http://depedqc.ph/announcement s/ 2013 NAT GUIDELINES/ 2013%20NAT%20Overview%20-%20QC.pdf).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Educators today recognize the importance of having a learner-centered classroom. Interest has shifted somewhat from the study of skills to the study of knowledge about skills (Brown, 1984); therefore
activities that allow students to think of their own processes are growing in number. It is important to teach students explicit instructions on how to monitor their own process especially on how to try to make sense of any reading material – how they interact or converse with the text. With this, educators need to offer students specific techniques, i.e. reading-to-learn skills, to navigate and draw conclusions from content-area texts, one example of which is annotation (Gomez, L., & Gomez, K., 2007) (n.b.: In this study, annotation will be termed glossing). Zywica and Gomez (2008) believe that annotation as a cognitive literacy approach helps students recognize how words and phrases and their definitions can be embedded skillfully in text yet in ways that are difficult to recognize, extract, and use to make meaning. It helps students to analytically approach texts by looking for structures and patterns that are used to convey information. Pressley (2000) and Pressley and Wharton-McDonald (1997), as cited in Zywica and Gomez, 2008 explicitly stated that expert readers have, and apply a toolkit of strategies during the reading process; that meaning is constructed during reading and is an interactive process between learner, text, and context; and that expert readers monitor and self-regulate their learning with the text. Less expert readers lack these strategies and often fail to gain information from the text.

In a study conducted by Zywica and Gomez (2008), they found that many annotation elements were correlated with science achievement. That is, students annotated science text results, as evaluated by expert teachers, indicated that identification of main ideas, science vocabulary, and transition words was correlated with measures of achievement in science. These results suggested that students did benefit from their use of specific text strategies. They are encouraged by the students’ growth in reading comprehension and specifically the relationship between reading comprehension and annotation and science achievement and annotation.

Another significant theory that underpins this study is that of Walter Kintsch’s theory of comprehension. Kintsch’s (1986) model of comprehension makes use of elements of schema theory and linguistic theory and has practical implications for classroom teachers. Kintsch’s earlier (1988) model for story comprehension depends upon a somewhat different chunking strategy and upon a different kind of schema. Readers first determine the "macrostructure" of a story, chunking it so that it conforms to a story schema (with the elements exposition, complications, and resolution). The next step is a process of inferring with the purpose of summarizing. Readers label the chunks produced in the first step. In more recent work, Kintsch (1992) again emphasizes the top-down influence of schemata, this time text-type schemata. The reader must identify the type of text (e.g., whether it is a story or an expository text, or more specifically, a text that presents an argument, a definition, or a functional analysis) and then can use strategies which are specialized for that text type (and not tied to specific content) (Richgels, n.d.).

W. Kintsch’s (1988, 1992) construction-integration (CI) model of text comprehension distinguishes several different levels in the mental representation of a text that readers construct. The two levels of understanding that are relevant here are the text base and the situation model.

McNamara, et al. (1996) delineates text base and situation model. The text base contains the information that is directly expressed in the text, organized and structured in the way that the author had organized the material. It has a local structure (the microstructure) as well as a global structure (the macrostructure). The construction of the text base involves the extraction of semantic information from a text. On the basis of the text base, readers can verify statements they have read, they can answer questions about the text, they can recall the text, or they can summarize it. Knowing the text at the level of the text base, however, does not necessarily ensure that the reader understands it at a deeper level. Especially in the case of a demanding scientific text, more is required for understanding than just the ability to reproduce the text itself. It is usually the case that the reader must contribute information that was not stated explicitly in the text from his or her own store of knowledge about the domain in question. Furthermore, considerable active inferencing may be required to link the text with the reader’s prior knowledge. The result of such inferencing is the situation model. The situation model integrates the information provided by the text with prior knowledge, often reorganizing and restructuring it in terms of the reader’s understanding of the knowledge domain as a whole rather than the particular text just read. The new knowledge is therefore usable in novel environments and for unanticipated problem-solving tasks.
Doane, et al. (2000) provided a list of research that made use of Kintsch’s theory of comprehension. It included narrative story comprehension (Kintsch, 1988), algebra story problem comprehension (Kintsch, 1988), the solution of simple computing tasks (Mannes & Kintsch, 1987), and completing the Tower of Hanoi task (Schmalhofer & Tschaitschian, 1993). This approach has also proved fruitful for understanding human-computer interaction skills (e.g., Doane, McNamara, Kintsch, Polson, & Clawson, 1992; Kitajima & Polson, 1995; Mannes & Doane, 1991). The breadth of application suggests that the comprehension processes described in Kintsch’s model play a central role in many tasks, and as such may be considered a general architecture of cognition (Newell, 1990).

The theory of Kintsch is an offshoot of the studies on metacognition; although, more than 30 years have passed since research on metacognition first got underway, with the onset of interest marked by the publication of the 1975 metamemory interview study of Kreutzer, Leonard, and Flavell and the seminal theoretical work of John Flavell (1976) and Ann Brown (1978). Much recognition should be given to John H. Flavell as his book on Cognitive Development (1977) was highly influential as it promoted the word “metacognition”, here he means thinking about other psychological processes such as language, perception, and memory. He said that during the adolescent years, especially, people are likely to develop a heightened consciousness of their own and other people’s psychological processes (metacognition – “thinking about thinking”). These processes gradually become “objects of contemplation” – things to think about rather than merely things to do. Accordingly, the individual becomes more introspective, much is given to scrutinizing his thoughts, feelings, and values. He also spends more time wondering about those of significant others (1977, p.123).

Given the importance of proficient reading to education, it is perhaps not surprising that some of the first work on metacognition was conducted in the domain of reading (Dunlosky & Metcalfe, 2009). Brown (1978) and her colleagues adapted (and developed) rather novel methods for exploring and improving students’ monitoring of their comprehension while learning classroom content from text. Brown and Smiley (1977) investigated whether students - from 8-18 years old – had critical knowledge about the structure of text materials; namely, that some ideas were more important to the meaning of the text rather than were others. Students read the text and were later told that the ideas differed in their importance; some of them were so unimportant that they could be deleted without compromising the main theme of the text. They then had the participants judge the importance of the ideas by units by first removing the least important quarter of the ideas, then by removing the next least important quarter of the ideas, and so forth. The youngest participants (8- and 10-year-olds) did not distinguish between what were not normatively the most (versus least) important ideas in the text, whereas older participants did. An implication of this development trend is that the younger students would be unable to strategically focus on the most important ideas when reading. This study supports what Flavell (1977) argues that children are not wholly capable of “metathinking” and other forms of metacognition. They are not as able and disposed to engage in it as adolescents and adults.

Self-regulated learning emerges from the studies on metacognition. The term self-regulated learning (SRL) became popular in the 1980’s because it emphasized the emerging autonomy and responsibility of students to take charge of their own learning. As a general term, it subsumed research on cognitive strategies, metacognition, and motivation in one coherent construct that emphasized the interplay among these forces. It was regarded as a valuable term because it emphasized how the “self” was the agent in establishing learning goals and tactics and how each individual’s perceptions of the self and task influenced the quality of learning that ensued. The term “self-regulation” is often used by educational psychologists to refer to the use of skills included within the regulatory component of metacognition such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Baker & Beall, in Handbook of Research on Reading Comprehension, 2009). Research on SRL has evolved as a result of developments in theoretical paradigms and methodologies (Boekaerts, Pintrich, & Zeidner, 2000; Zimmerman& Schunk, 1989,2001). During the 1970s and 1980s, researchers such as Ann Brown, Joel Levin, Donald Meichenbaum, Michael Pressley, Dale Schunk, and others focused on the impact of individual self-regulatory processes, such as strategy use, goal setting, imagery, or self-instruction. Typically, a student was trained to use a strategy, such as imagery, during subsequent efforts to learn. These studies showed that these strategies
were usually effective in producing superior learning—even with young children (Zimmerman, 2008).

Paris and Winegard (n.d.) listed three characteristics of self-regulated learning. First, awareness of thinking which involves awareness of effective thinking and analyses of one’s own thinking and analyses of one’s own thinking habits. In the studies of Flavell (1977) and Brown (1978), they showed that children from 5-16 years of age become increasingly aware of their own personal knowledge states, the characteristics of tasks that influence learning and their own strategies for monitoring learning (as cited in Paris & Winegard, n.d.) Second characteristic is the use of strategies. This involves a person’s growing repertoire of strategies—for learning, studying, controlling emotions, pursuing goals, and so forth. Paris and Winegard emphasizes, however, that their concern is with “being strategic” rather than “having a strategy”. There are three important metacognitive aspects of strategies, often referred to as declarative knowledge (what the strategy is), procedural knowledge (how the strategy operates), and conditional knowledge (when and why a strategy should be applied) (Paris, Lipson, & Wixson, 1983). Knowing these characteristics of strategies can help students to discriminate productive from counterproductive tactics and then to apply appropriate strategies. When students are strategic, they consider options before choosing tactics to solve problems and then they invest effort in using the strategy. These choices embody SRL because they are the result of cognitive analyses of alternative routes to problem-solving. The last characteristic of SRL is the sustained motivation. The third aspect of SRL is motivation because learning requires effort and choices. Paris and Cross (1983) argued that ordinary learning fuses skill and will together in self-directed actions. SRL involves motivational decisions about the goal of an activity, the perceived difficulty and value of the task, the self-perceptions of the learner’s ability to accomplish the task, and the potential benefit of success or liability of failure.

Research Procedures

To find out the relative effect of glossing instruction to the reading comprehension and written summary of the students, a teacher-made reading comprehension test with content area texts in Hospitality Industry was given before and after the treatment. Texts in the Hospitality Industry were used because the students are specializing in Hotel and Restaurant Management. The same reading texts were given to both the experimental and control groups.

Six sessions were spent on teacher modelling of annotation skills. This is to get the students familiar with the rudiments of glossing. In the experimental group, glossing was applied during reading sessions; however, the control group had the teacher’s usual approach to teaching Reading.

An identical expository text with content area texts in Hospitality Industry was used in this study. Both pre- and post- teacher–made reading comprehension tests were validated by two English professors and one HRM professor. Also, the teacher-made rubric was also validated by four English professors including the researcher, and it was subjected to inter-rater reliability. The result of the inter-rater reliability yields a reliability coefficient of 0.787. This means that there is high agreement among raters.

Results and Discussion

This research made use of quasi-experimental research design using mixed method. The quantitative method was utilized by subjecting 15 students to an intervention, the glossing instruction, while 15 students were taught using the usual teaching instruction. Pre- and post- tests including the reading comprehension test and the writing of a summary were administered to both groups, the experimental and the control groups. Qualitative data from the students’ glosses described the students’ interaction with the text, the context, and themselves.

1. Performance of the students before and after glossing instruction in reading comprehension

The control group was not given instructions on glossing: on the other side, the experimental group was given instructions on how to make sense, interact with the author and the text, and himself/herself during reading through the use of glossing. Both groups were given the same pre-test and post-test before and after the treatment period.

Table 1 shows the pre-test and post-test mean scores of the students in reading comprehension. It can be observed that there is a decrease in the reading comprehension score from pre-test to post-test of the control group. This implies that reading comprehension of the students in the
control group did not improve after instruction. However, there is a marked increase in the reading comprehension score from pre-test to post-test of the experimental group. This implies that reading comprehension of the students in the experimental group improved after glossing instruction.

Table 1. Pretest and Posttest Mean Scores of the Students in Reading Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest Mean Score</th>
<th>Posttest Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (N = 15)</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N = 15)</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>15.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the Control group’s summary of equivalent qualitative remarks in reading comprehension for pre-test and post-test. It can be seen that most of the students in the control group fall under “proficient” which is also reflective of the control group’s pre-test mean score of 15.13. However, post-test scores reveal that most of the students also fall under “proficient”; however, looking at the post-test mean score of 12.60, it reveals that there is no improvement with regard to the students’ performance in the reading comprehension after the instruction.

Table 2. Control Groups’ Summary of Equivalent Qualitative Remarks in Reading Comprehension for Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Pre-test N=15</th>
<th>Post-test N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Approaching Proficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Beginning/Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the Experimental group’s summary of equivalent qualitative remarks in reading comprehension for pre-test and post-test. It can be seen that most of the students in the control group fall under “proficient” which is also reflective of the control group’s pre-test mean score of 11.60. After the instruction, it can be seen that five students moved a notch higher, giving the post-test mean score of 15.07. This implies that after glossing instruction, students’ performance in the reading comprehension increased significantly.

Table 3. Experimental Groups’ Summary of Equivalent Qualitative Remarks in Reading Comprehension for Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Pre-test N=15</th>
<th>Post-test N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Approaching Proficiency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Beginning/Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant increase of the performance of the experimental group in the reading comprehension could be attributed to the explicit instruction of glossing. Glossing had helped students see reading as a process and that applying the ways of responding to texts through glossing changes comprehension (Porter-O’Donnell, 2004). Glossing allows the students to activate their own previously acquired information, allowing them to relate better with the text they are reading. As Anderson(1984, as cited in Pearson, p.13) pointed out: Schemata facilitate the selective allocation of attention. Schemata guide reader’s search for what is important in a text, allowing the readers to separate the wheat from the chaff.

Glossing also allows the students to practice the two levels of understanding the text based on Walter Kintsch’s construction-integration model of text comprehension. These two levels are text base and the situation model. Text base contains information that is directly expressed in the text. It allows readers to extract semantic information from a text.

2. Performance of the students before and after glossing instruction in summary output

Table 4 shows the pre-test and post-test mean scores of the students in summary output. Although it can be observed that both the control and experimental groups have increased post-test mean score in the summary output, it can be noted that the experimental group has higher mean gain score.

Table 4. Pre-test and Post-test Mean Scores of the Students in Summary Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean Score</th>
<th>Post-test Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (N = 15)</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N = 15)</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows the control group’s summary of equivalent qualitative remarks in the summary output for pre-test and post-test. As can be seen, most students fall under “proficient” for both the pre-test and the post-test. This is consistent with the pre-test mean score of 12.11 and post-test mean score of 13.50.

Table 5. Control Group’s Summary of Equivalent Qualitative Remarks in Summary Output for Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Pre-test N=15</th>
<th>Post-test N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Approaching Proficiency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Beginning/Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the experimental group’s summary of equivalent qualitative remarks in the summary output for pre-test and post-test. It is interesting to note that in the pre-test seven students fall under “proficient”, while 8 fall under “approaching proficiency”. The pre-test mean score is 10.21. For the post-test, there are 5 students with “advanced”; 8, under “proficient”, and 2 under approaching proficiency. The post-test mean score is 13.25.

Table 6. Experimental Group’s Summary of Equivalent Qualitative Remarks in Summary Output for Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Pre-test N=15</th>
<th>Post-test N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Approaching Proficiency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Beginning/Developing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the Pre-test Mean Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups in Reading Comprehension and Summary Output

Table 7 shows results of the t-test for the Comparison of the Control and Experimental Groups Terms of the Pre-test Scores in Reading Comprehension and Summary Output. It can be seen from the table that there is a significant difference between the control and experimental groups in terms of reading comprehension and summary output in terms of the pre-test scores. It can be noted that the control group has higher pre-test scores than the experimental group both in the reading comprehension and summary output. This implies that the t-test of independent samples is not appropriate to use in the comparison of their post-test scores because an initial difference was found in their pre-test scores.

Table 7. Results of the t-test for the Comparison of the Control and Experimental Groups Terms of the Pre-test Scores in Reading Comprehension and Summary Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Output</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents the ANCOVA Results for the Comparison of the Control and Experimental Groups in Terms of Post-test Scores in the Reading Comprehension. Since an initial difference was found in the pre-test scores, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was utilized to adjust for the initial difference. As can be seen from the table the difference between the post-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups is significant as shown by the p-value in the corrected model. This implies that glossing instruction is effective in improving the reading comprehension of the students.


Table 8. ANCOVA Results for the Comparison of the Control and Experimental Groups in Terms of Post-test Scores in the Reading Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>46.949</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>78.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.83</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-reading comprehension Group</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>31.422</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>51.218</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5839.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>98.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glossing instruction as mentioned by Conley, 2008 and Pressley, 2006 (as cited in Zywica & Gomez, 2008) is one of several cognitive literacy strategies that are used to help students see structure, analyze ideas, derive meaning, and communicate understandings.

Table 9. ANCOVA Results for the Comparison of the Control and Experimental Groups in Terms of Post-test Scores in the Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8.831</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.416</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>107.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107.04</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-summary</td>
<td>8.362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.362</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>136.138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.067</td>
<td>5.042</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5511.688</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>144.969</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.484</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS’ GLOSSING

CATEGORIES OF GLOSSING

While statistical analyses were considered vital in this study, a detailed description of students’ glossing was also highlighted. This study found that students’ glosses were primarily composed of giving examples, expressing opinions, expressing agreements and disagreements, conveying realizations and confusions. Some also corrected the typographical errors found in the text. There are glosses that reflect students’ personal experiences and how these personal experiences were used to be able to relate themselves with the text. Some glosses are reflections of students adding details aside from what is revealed by the text and how they express conclusions. Interestingly, the students also made use of highlighting, underlining, drawing, and other punctuation marks all throughout the text. These glosses were categorized into two: Verbal and Non-verbal Glosses. Each category is further split into three levels.

Category 1: Verbal Glosses. Verbal Glosses include glosses that reflect how a student makes sense of the
text based on the literal, personal, and critical understanding of the text.

**Three Levels:**

**Level I: Literal Level** – this level includes students’ basic level of understanding of the concepts stated in the text. It is reflective of students’ straightforward approach of the text.

**Level 2: Personal Level.** The Personal Level are glosses that reflect how the students relate their personal experiences with the text, this is where a student finds meaning in something based on his/her own experiences and encounter on a given concept, this could be an association of their past experience, that allowed them to give further details that are not mentioned in the text. Furthermore, this level is also reflective of students’ agreement or disagreement with the text as well as how the students’ relate their personal question with themselves and of the text such as unfamiliar word and confusing concepts present in the text.. This level is highly reflective of students’ interaction with the text.

**Level III: Critical Level.** This level reflects glosses that are beyond the literal interpretation of the text. It reflects students’ ability to see the information that is yet to be unveiled by the text. This happens when the student seems to argue with himself/herself and the author and finally making his own realizations and conclusions.

**Category II: Non-Verbal Gloss.** Non-verbal gloss constitutes highlighting, underlining, boxing, bracketing, using other shapes like circle, triangle, arrow, using punctuation marks like question mark, exclamation point. This also includes student’s creative way of reflecting his/her idea through other figures and drawings.

Non-verbal gloss is further split into two levels:

**Level 1. Knowledge level.** This level includes glosses that may facilitate the student’s memory of the text such as highlighting, underlining, and encircling concepts which he/she may think important. This also includes punctuation marks that reflect students’ having difficulty understanding a new concept.

**Level II. Creative Level.** This level reflects student’s creative way of representing the text in his/her own style. This may be in the form of illustrations, sketches, drawings, etc. This can be regarded as mental images formed by the student while making sense of the text but made visual using his/her glosses.

The analysis of glosses revealed that the students who have applied the Literal, Personal, and Critical Levels for the Verbal Gloss and the Knowledge and Creative Levels for the Non-verbal gloss have better outputs in the post-tests, both reading comprehension test and the written summary. After the glossing instruction, all learners had an improved performance in the reading comprehension test. Moreover, it is interesting to note that students who have significant glosses revealed higher performance in the written summary. This implies that glossing may have influenced their performance in the written summary.

**Conclusion and Suggestions**

Glossing instruction was effective in improving the experimental group’s reading comprehension, specifically, in the reading comprehension test because of the emphasis on the deeper level of interaction of the reader and the text. This interaction is not only limited to the reader and the text, but also the active interaction of the reader to the reader himself/herself. Aside from the interaction, the students became more aware of their own processes of learning; this paved a way to better understand the content of the text and the relationship of the text to the students’ personal lives.

Glossing instruction was not effective in improving the students’ ability to write a summary. While it was found out that glossing instruction is not effective to enhance the ability to write a summary, the student’s qualitative analysis of glossing revealed that the more glosses the students used, the better performance in the summary output can be observed. This implies that the glosses revealed the kind of interaction the student made during reading, and this interaction could enhance not only the the students’ learning of the text, but of their ability to write a summary.

It is therefore highly suggested that language teachers introduce glossing instructions to the students. Since glossing encourages a more interactive way to make sense of the text, the students will be able to understand not only the text but their own unique learning process as well. Moreover, the students will become more active participant in the reading process. Glossing instruction opens up opportunities for students to assess and evaluate meaning from the text, confirm with others predictions and
assumptions, and share background knowledge with each other.

It is also important that the purpose and strategy relationship in reading be emphasized. The purpose of reading dictates the kind of strategies to be used, so students should be exposed with different reading purposes as well as tasks, and identify the appropriate strategies for the specific task and purpose.

Second language reading education should not only emphasize on general reading abilities such as getting the main idea of the text and the like but must also prepare students for real-life tasks in the future. For example, giving them an exposure to texts that they encounter in their area of specialization would not only help them acquire more knowledge that they need but also help them be familiar with the language of their profession. In this way, the students will be better equipped not only of the language of their profession but the skills needed in this highly-competitive world.

Having found that explicit instruction of a particular learning skill is proven to be effective in enhancing one’s cognitive ability, Reading teachers should then explicitly teach students strategic skills such as glossing so that students will be more aware not only of the processes involved in understanding the text but more importantly, the student’s unique processes of understanding how they learn.

For future undertakings in second language reading, a replication of this study must be done to find out if glossing instruction does not really enhance the students’ ability to write a summary. Furthermore, the relation of glossing instruction and other reading-to-learn strategies can be tested qualitatively if they correlate with the students’ reading performance.
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