

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.0 Introduction

The study was carried out among eight Form One students in a residential school in Ipoh. The subjects were divided into two groups, namely, the high achievers and the low achievers. All the subjects who participated in the research were very co-operative and completed all the tasks required of them. Great care and consideration were taken during the study to avoid biasedness and fatigue among the subjects. The behaviour and the way the subjects responded to the required tasks were also observed and noted by the researcher.

#### 4.1 The Relationship between the High Achiever's and Low Achiever's Self-perception and His Reading Ability

##### 4.1.1 Determining Reading Ability Based on Results of School Subjects

The high achievers and low achievers were selected based on their scores obtained from eight subjects tested in school. The scores shown in TABLE 4.1 were actually average scores taken from a series of tests for each subject.

TABLE 4.1

Subject Scores of High Achievers and Low Achievers

	Students	Subjects							
		BM	BI	MAT	SAIN	GEO	SEJ	K.H	P.I
High Achievers	1	88	85	92	86	90	87	88	98
	2	95	90	98	92	89	95	94	98
	3	89	83	90	85	86	88	96	90
	4	87	78	88	83	89	93	85	93
Low Achievers	5	65	55	45	58	63	66	69	68
	6	47	58	60	44	48	50	72	75
	7	52	60	47	41	57	58	78	78
	8	49	58	45	65	60	56	75	68

Note : The following is the description of subjects represented by the abbreviations above. BM= Malay Language, BI= English, MAT=Mathematics , SAIN=Science, GEO= Geography, SEJ=History, K.H. = Living Skills, P.I. = Islamic Studies

The mean scores of each of the eight subjects for the high achievers and the low achievers were calculated to see if there was any significant difference between the two groups. The results was as shown in TABLE 4.2

TABLE 4.2

Mean for Subjects Scores of High Achievers and Low Achievers

Subjects	High Achievers	Low Achievers
	N = 4 Mean	N = 4 Mean
BM	89.75	53.25
BI	84.00	57.75
MAT	92.00	49.25
SAIN	86.50	52.00
GEO	88.50	57.00
SEJ	90.75	57.50
K.H.	90.75	73.50
P.I.	94.75	72.25

As the mean scores for the high achievers were very much higher than the low achievers for all the subjects, it could be interpreted that the high achievers were able to comprehend reading materials provided for their reading level better than low achievers. This implied that high achievers are better readers and thus have a higher reading ability than low achievers.

#### 4.1.2 Assessment of Relationship Between High Achiever's and Low Achiever's

##### Self-Perception and His Reading Ability

To assess the relationship between the reader's self-perception and his reading ability, the Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS) was used. Items found in the instrument is listed in Appendix B .

In this instrument (RSPS), there were four factors or categories to be taken into consideration. They were Progress, Observational Comparison, Social Feedback and lastly, Physiological States. The Progress category was defined as how one's perception of his present reading performance as compared with his past performance. The Observational Comparison checked on how one perceived her or his reading performance as compared with the performance of her/his classmates and peers. The third category, Social Feedback consisted of direct or indirect input from teachers, classmates and people in the child's family. The fourth category, Physiological States, referred to internal feelings that the child experienced during reading. TABLE 4.3 showed the items from RSPS placed in their respective categories.



TABLE 4.3

## RSPS Items in Their Respective Categories.

## Category : Progress

- 
- 10. When I read, I don't have to try as hard as I used to.
  - 13. I am getting better at reading everyday.
  - 15. When I read, I need less help than I used to.
  - 18. Reading is easier for me than it used to be.
  - 19. I read faster than I could before.
  - 23. I understand what I read better than I could before.
  - 24. I can figure words better than I could before.
  - 27. I read better now than I could before.
  - 28. When I read, I recognise more words than I used to.
- 

## Category : Observational Comparison

- 
- 4. I read faster than other kids.
  - 6. When I read, I can figure out words better than other kids.
  - 11. I seem to know more words than other kids when I read.
  - 14. I understand what I read as well as other kids do.
  - 20. I read better than other kids in my class.
  - 22. I read more than other kids.
- 

## Category : Social Feedback

- 
- 2. I can tell that my teacher likes to listen to me read.
  - 3. My teacher thinks that my reading is fine.
  - 7. My classmates like to listen to me read.
  - 9. My classmates thinks that I read pretty well.
  - 12. People in my family think I am a good reader.
  - 17. My teacher thinks I am a good reader.
  - 30. Other kids think I'm a good reader.
  - 31. People in my family think I read pretty well.
  - 33. People in my family like to listen to me read.
- 

## Category : Physiological States

- 
- 5. I like to read aloud.
  - 8. I feel good inside when I read.
  - 16. Reading makes me feel happy inside.
  - 21. I feel calm when I read.
  - 25. I feel comfortable when I read.
  - 26. I think reading is relaxing.
  - 29. Reading makes me feel good.
- 

Scoring : Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Undecided = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Research has shown that there is a close relationship between a reader's self-perception and his reading ability (Henk, & Melnick, 1995; Kanoy, Johnson and Kanoy, 1980; Ames, 1978; Yee, 1992; Yeoh, 1990; Ng, 1985). The way a reader perceived his reading ability would greatly influence his association with all reading tasks.

TABLE 4.4 showed the mean scores from all the four categories for the high achievers and low achievers.

TABLE 4.4

Mean for RSPS Scores of High Achievers and Low Achievers

Categories in RSPS	High Achievers	Low Achievers
	N = 4 Mean	N = 4 Mean
Progress	42.50	37.00
Observational Comparison	22.75	18.75
Social Feedback	36.00	29.00
Physiological States	38.25	32.25
Overall Scores	141.66	117.00

#### 4.1.2.1 Progress Category of RSPS

In the Progress category, the mean scores for high achievers (42.50) was higher by about five points as compared to low achievers (37.00). This implied that the high achievers perceived that their progress in reading showed great improvement, compared to before. The high achievers had high mean scores in all the subjects tested, ranging from 84.00 marks for English to 94.75 marks for Islamic Studies. Their mean scores,

which was in the high range, showed that students from this group were high in their reading ability.

The low achievers showed a lower mean score in their subjects. Their mean scores ranged from 49.25 marks for Mathematics to 72.25 marks for Islamic Studies. As the subject mean scores for the low achievers were lower than the high achievers, this implied that their reading ability was lower than the high achievers.

Successful students show excellent progress in their reading and this progress is reflected in their high scores in their subjects. Since Progress focused on how one's perception of his present reading performance as compared to the past, it can be concluded that there is a strong relationship between the scores in the Progress category and the scores in the school subjects (Table 4.2) between the two groups.

The high achievers perceived that their present progress showed improvement as compared to before and they had responded 'Strongly Agree' and 'Agree' to most of the items in the Progress Category. Items of interest which they had given such responses were 'I am getting better at reading everyday.', 'Reading is easier for me than it used to be.', 'I understand what I read better than I could before.', 'I read better now than I could before.' and 'I can figure words better than I could before.'

The low achievers found that their reading was not progressing at the rate that they felt it should be. They had responded mostly 'Agree' and a few 'Undecided' to the items in the Progress Category. It could be interpreted that the low achievers felt

that they lacked the ability to improve on their progress pace. During the reading sessions, the low achievers perceived that understanding what they read and figuring out words was not getting any easier for them as compared to before.

#### 4.1.2.2 Observational Comparison Category of RSPS

The Observational Comparison checked on how one perceived her or his reading performance as compared with the performance of her/his classmates and peers. The mean score for the high achievers group (22.75) was about four points higher as compared to low achievers (18.75). The findings were as per the findings by Chapman and Lambourne (1990) where they found that comparison with others on academic performance was one of the important factors that contributed to the development of academic self-concept. High achievers usually perceive that their reading performance is better than their classmates or friends and this lead to a higher self-perception.

- The students, from both the high achievers and low achievers group, had given mixed responses ranging from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Disagree' to items from the Observational Comparison category. Six of them, (two from the high achievers group and all of the low achievers students), were not sure how they fared as compared to their peers. This was shown in 'Undecided ' responses for items asked from this category . Items that received such responses were ' I read faster than other kids.',

‘ When I read, I can figure out words better than other kids.,’ ‘I read better than other kids in my class.’, ‘ I understand what I read as well as other kids do.’ The other two subjects from the high achievers group had responded mostly ‘Strongly Agree’ and ‘Agree’ to the items asked in this category. They were aware how good their ability in reading was as compared to their classmates and peer group. These two students from the high achievers group showed the same pattern as found from research where high achievers perceive their reading ability is better than their peers.

#### 4.1.2.3 Social Feedback Category of RSPS

The third category, Social Feedback showed a difference of seven points between the mean of the two groups. The high achievers scored a mean of 36.00 while the low achievers group scored a mean of 29.00. In this category, two of the high achievers answered mostly ‘Strongly Agree’ and ‘Agree’ to items asked. The other two from the same group and all of the low achievers had responded mostly 'Undecided' . This indicated that this six students were not aware how their teachers, classmates or family members feel about their reading ability.

In the Malaysian school system, students are seldom given positive feedback on their performance by their teachers and friends in terms of praises and encouragement. Schunk’s (1983a) study showed that providing attributional feedback to children in the context of competency development constituted an effective means of promoting rapid

problem solving, self-efficacy and achievement. When children received no attributional feedback, they might wonder how efficacious they were despite their progress. Some of the interesting items asked in this category that received 'Undecided' responses were 'I can tell that my teacher likes to listen to me read.', 'My teacher thinks my reading is fine.', 'My teacher thinks that I am a good reader.' and 'My classmates thinks that I read pretty well.'

The two high achievers who had mostly responded 'Strongly Agree' and 'Agree', knew that they were good in reading based on feedback from various sources. These positive feedback enhanced their overall self-perception in reading as found in Schunk's (1983a) study.

#### 4.1.2.4 Physiological States Category of RSPS

In the fourth category, Physiological States, the high achievers group scored a mean of 37.00 while the low achievers scored a mean of 32.25. The high achievers had responded mostly 'Strongly Agree' to items asked. This showed that high achievers experienced more positive feelings than low achievers during reading. Sample items that showed high positive feelings experienced by high achievers during reading were 'I feel good inside when I read.', 'Reading makes me feel happy inside.', 'I feel calm when I read.', 'I think reading is relaxing.', 'I feel comfortable when I read.' Low achievers had responded mostly 'Agree' and some 'Undecided' to items in

this category. This implied that low achievers did not experience much positive feelings when reading.

Overall, the high achievers scored a mean of 141.66, which was about 25 points higher than the low achievers (117.00). It can be concluded that high achievers have higher self-perception as a reader as compared to low achievers. The results obtained were as the findings reported by Purkey (1970), Ames (1978), Chapman and Lambourne (1990), Yee (1992), Yeoh (1990) and Daulath (1985).

In summary , a reader's self -perception was closely related to his reading ability. A high achiever who has high reading ability would have a high self-perception as a reader. A low achiever, on the other hand, whose reading ability is low would tend to have a low self-perception as a reader. One who has high self-perception as a reader will tend to have more positive associations with reading whereas one who has low self-perception as a reader would try to avoid reading as much as possible.

#### 4.2 The High Achiever's and Low Achiever's Perception of How the Textbook Is Used In the Classroom

In order to investigate the students' perceptions of how the textbook was used in the classroom, the subjects were asked to respond to open-ended questions from The Text Awareness and Performance Profile (TAPP). Please refer to Appendix E for the

items. The following were several observations of interest concerning students' responses to the questions.

When the students were asked what they used this book for, there was no difference between the high achievers and low achievers in responding to this question. Both groups used the book as a source of reference during the science lessons. The book was used both in class and in the science laboratory.

On the question of whether the students enjoyed using the book and why, three students from the high achievers group replied that they enjoyed using the textbook as compared to only two students from the low achievers group. The book helped them to understand facts better and provided them with information on conducting experiments. Those who responded that they did not enjoy using the book found the facts presented was incomplete and confusing.

In terms of frequency of book usage, two students from the high achievers reported that they used the book often as compared to three students from the low achievers group. The rest of the other students seldom used the book for reference.

When they were queried what their teacher did with the book, both the high achievers and low achievers gave a variety of answers. Examples of responses received were ; the teacher showed them information, gave them assignments and read out loud to them.



In terms of assignments and activities, there was not much difference between the responses from the high achievers and the low achievers. Both groups had to carry out fieldwork, make scrap books, complete drilling exercises, conduct experiments and write reports on them and read for details and facts.

When asked what their teacher wanted them to do with the textbook, both the high achievers and low achievers responded that the teacher wanted them to read out loud, answer questions at the end and read for a test.

In response to the question whether the book was used in class or for homework or as a supplement to other books, both the high achievers and low achievers replied that the book was only used in class and as a supplement to other books. In terms of receiving guidance on how the text was used, three of the students from the high achievers group replied that they did not receive guidance as compared to all the students from the low achievers group.

Both groups were then asked how they were tested on the text and whether they were allowed to look back to the text during a test. There was no difference between the high achievers and the low achievers in responding to this question. All the students from both groups replied that they were tested in the form of multiple choice and short answers. They were not allowed to look back to the text during a test.

On the question of whether they preferred to read the textbook silently or out loud and why, three of the students from the high achievers group preferred to read the textbook silently as compared to only one from the low achievers group. On the other hand, three students from the low achievers group preferred to read aloud as compared to only one from the high achievers group. All of the students responded that their preferred study styles enabled them to understand facts better.

When the students were asked what they would do when they come across facts that they did not know or did not understand, three of the high achievers and three of the low achievers replied that they would refer the matter to friends, teachers or reference books. The fourth student from the high achievers group responded that he would try to read out loud repetitively and try to understand the facts. On the other hand, the fourth student from the low achievers group said that he would skip the parts which he did not understand. All the students from both the high achievers group and the low achievers group would reread facts that were confusing or difficult to understand when reading the first time.

On the question of using illustrations to help them in their reading, three of the high achievers answered that they frequently used illustrations to help them to understand facts better as compared to only two low achievers.

When asked the strategies used to remember information, each of the student gave different answers. For example, one student said that he would try to summarise

the important facts by using acronyms; while another one said that he would read the facts repetitively and do drilling exercises. The third one said that he would summarise facts and try to build a connection between them. The fourth one just mentioned that he would try to understand facts by reading more. On the other hand, two of the low achievers group said that they would read repetitively to remember facts; one would try to read slowly and carefully to understand facts and the last one said that he would memorise facts and do drilling exercises.

To prepare for a test three of the high achievers said that they would read a few books and do drilling exercises and the other one mentioned that he would only read for clarification or as reference as he felt that the most important part was paying attention in class. All the four subjects from the low achievers group gave a variable of responses such as he would only read facts that he thought would probably come out in the test, or would read reference books and do drilling exercises, asking the teacher to help him, while the last one replied that he would write notes.

The final question asked was on how well they thought that they could read the text. Two of the high achievers said that they could read the text very well. One of them mentioned that he could read the text moderately well while the last one said that he was not able to read the text very well. As for the low achievers group, three of them responded that they could read the text moderately and only one of them mentioned that he could not read the text very well.

To summarise the above, both the high achievers and low achievers were aware and able to relate how the textbook was being used in class. They could also tell activities and tasks carried out in class based on the textbook. Each of the subjects interviewed also had their own learning styles and ways to cope with confusing texts or remembering facts. High achievers make use of pictures and graphics to help them to locate information more often than low achievers.

#### 4.3 Awareness of Different Learning Strategies Between High Achievers and Low Achievers

The awareness of different learning strategies between the two groups (high achievers and low achievers) was being tested by using the Metacognitive Reading Awareness Inventory (MRAI) (Appendix Q). The question types attempted to be consistent with the four specific domains presented by Jacobs and Paris (1987) : regulations , i.e., monitoring and redirecting one's efforts during the course of reading to reach desired goals; conditional knowledge of strategy applications; planning the cognitive event; and evaluation of one's processes. Appendix R showed the items in their respective domains .

The results from the Metacognitive Reading Awareness Inventory is shown in TABLE 4.5.

TABLE 4.5

Mean for Metacognitive Reading Awareness Inventory Score of High Achievers and Low Achievers

	High Achievers (N= 4) Mean	Low Achievers (N= 4) Mean
MRAI Scores	17.75	17.25

The mean scores for both the high achievers and low achievers were almost similar. It could be interpreted that both groups were equally aware of the different strategies available.

The following are some observations of interest on the students' responses to the items asked.

When the groups were asked what strategies they used when they encountered a word and didn't know its meaning, there was not much difference between the responses from the high achievers and low achievers. Both groups used the words around it to figure it out and used an outside source, such as a dictionary or an expert. One of the students from the high achievers group would temporarily ignore the word and wait for clarification in addition to the strategies mentioned above.

In terms of seeking the meaning of a sentence, both high achievers and low achievers would read it again and think about the other sentences in the paragraph. In addition, one of the students from the high achievers group would sound out all the difficult words as compared to two students from the low achievers group.

On the question of remembering important information that they had read, both groups used a variety of methods. All the students from the high achievers group would relate it to prior knowledge, question themselves about the important ideas and rank the points presented in order of importance as compared to three students from the low achievers group. The other low achiever would relate it to prior knowledge only.

Both groups were then queried on their planning prior reading. Two of the students from the high achievers group would think about what they knew about the subject and why they were reading as compared to three students from the low achievers group. The other two high achievers would make sure the entire reading could be finished in as short a period of time as possible while one of the students from the low achievers group didn't make any specific plan. He just started reading towards completion of the assignment.

In terms of why and when text backtracking should be done, both groups gave a variety of reasons. Examples of responses received were ; they didn't understand the

passage, to clarify a specific or supporting idea, to remember important facts and to underline or summarise for study.

Both groups were then questioned on strategies they used as they read a textbook. Three students from the high achievers group would adjust their pace depending on the difficulty of the material and continually make predictions about what they were reading as compared to only one student from the low achievers group. Two of the low achievers would only adjust their pace depending on the difficulty of the materials as compared to only one of the high achievers. The last low achiever would only make predictions continually during reading.

When asked about important points to remember while reading, there were no difference between the responses from the students of high achievers group and low achievers group. Examples of responses received were; being aware when they know and didn't know key ideas, know what it was that they know in relation to what was being read and realised that different strategies could be used to aid understanding.

In terms of dealing with confusing text, students from the high achievers group and low achievers group gave similar responses. They would keep on reading until the text was clarified, read ahead and then looked back if the text was still unclear and lastly checked to see if the ideas expressed were consistent with each other.

Lastly, both groups were asked on the selection of important sentences in a chapter. All the high achievers responded that important sentences were sentences that contained the important details or facts and these facts were directly related to the main idea as compared to only two students from the low achievers group. One of the low achievers responded that almost all of the sentences were important; otherwise, they wouldn't be there. The remaining one from the low achievers group mentioned that important sentences were the ones that contained the most details.

From the above findings, it could be summarised that both the high achievers and low achievers were equally aware of the different strategies involved during the reading process. It should be understood that simple awareness did not mean that the subjects from both groups could apply those strategies during reading. The results obtained supported the findings by Kletzien (1991) who investigated the strategy use and awareness by both the good and poor comprehenders. Kletzien (1991) found that both the good and poor readers were aware of the different reading strategies available but only the good readers could make use of the strategies efficiently.



#### 4.4 The Differences between the High Achievers and Low Achievers in the Ability to Apply the Different Learning Strategies

To investigate the difference in the ability to apply learning strategies between the high achievers and the low achievers, the students were tested on several reading skills. The study strategies tested were : Making summaries, note taking, underlining, scanning, usage of headings and graphics to locate information, finding out the meaning of words placed in isolation and from context and lastly, the ability to use the table of contents and indexes to locate information (Appendix E). The scores obtained by each student in the various study strategies was shown in TABLE 4.6. TABLE 4.7 showed the mean of group scores for all the study strategies.

**TABLE 4.6**  
**Individual Scores for all the Reading Strategies Tested**

Study Strategies	Students							
	High Achievers				Low Achievers			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>								
Provided main ideas	5	4	5	5	1	2	3	2
Provided relevant details	5	5	5	5	1	2	3	2
Provided well-organised summary	5	5	5	5	1	2	3	2
<b>Note taking</b>								
Provided main ideas	4	5	5	4	2	2	2	2
Provided relevant details	5	5	5	4	1	2	2	2
Provided well-organised notes	5	5	5	5	1	3	1	1
Provided complete notes	4	5	5	5	1	3	1	1
Was efficient with note taking	5	5	5	5	2	2	1	1
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>								
Provided main ideas	5	5	4	5	2	2	2	2
Provided relevant details	5	5	4	4	2	1	2	2
Provided well-organised summary	5	5	5	4	1	2	2	2
Silent reading rate	5	4	4	4	1	2	3	2
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	5	5	5	5	4	1	2	3
Provided correct responses	5	4	5	5	4	1	2	3
<b>Underlining</b>								
Underlined key information	5	5	5	5	1	4	3	2
Underlined relevant details	5	5	5	5	1	4	3	2
<b>Vocabulary</b>								
Give complete meanings to words in isolation								
Word 1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Word 2	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	2
Word 3	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5
Word 4	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5
Give complete meanings of words from contexts								
Word 1	5	5	5	5	4	1	5	5
Word 2	5	5	4	3	5	5	1	3
Word 3	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5
Word 4	5	5	5	5	1	5	4	5
<b>Scanning</b>								
Used a scanning strategy	3	1	1	3	2	1	1	1
Scanned accurately	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	1
Scanned effectively	3	1	1	3	2	1	2	1
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>								
Used headings to locate	5	5	5	5	2	4	4	3
Used graphics to locate	5	5	5	5	2	4	5	3
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>								
Used table of contents efficiently	5	5	5	5	1	1	4	1
Used index efficiently	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

TABLE 4.7

Mean for All the Reading Strategies Tested of High Achievers and Low Achievers

Study Strategies	High Achievers (N = 4) Mean	Low Achievers (N = 4) Mean
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	4.75	2.00
Provided relevant details	5.00	2.00
Provided well-organised summary	5.00	2.00
<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	4.50	2.00
Provided relevant details	4.75	1.75
Provided well-organised notes	5.00	1.50
Provided complete notes	4.75	1.50
Was efficient with note taking	5.00	1.50
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	4.75	2.00
Provided relevant details	4.50	1.75
Provided well-organised summary	4.57	1.75
Silent reading rate	4.25	2.00
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	5.00	2.50
Provided correct responses	4.75	2.50
<b>Underlining</b>		
Underlined key information	5.00	2.50
Underlined relevant details	5.00	2.50
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	4.44	3.88
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	4.63	4.00
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	2.00	1.25
Scanned accurately	5.00	2.50
Scanned effectively	2.00	1.50
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	5.00	3.25
Used graphics to locate	5.00	3.25
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	5.00	1.75
Used index efficiently	2.00	1.00

#### 4.4.1 Making summary based on listening evaluation.

The two groups, both the high achievers and low achievers, were required to provide a summary after listening to a passage (Appendix H). The passage consisted of five main points and five relevant details. Each main idea or relevant detail provided by the student in the summary would score a mark. The ability to provide a well-organised summary was based on the sequence of the main ideas presented and how the ideas were connected to each other.

With reference to TABLE 4.7, the mean scores of the high achievers showed a higher mean as compared to the low achievers. The high achievers had the ability to pick out most of the main ideas presented in the passage. When they were being asked on how they knew where to locate for main ideas or key ideas, they gave several responses. They mentioned that topic sentences, which contained the main idea, was usually the first sentence in a paragraph or headings. Other signals that they had picked up relating to main ideas were the amount of space the author gave to an idea or repetition.

The high achievers could give a well-organised summary as the ideas presented were in sequence and well-elaborated. The researcher also noted that they were very confident when they were asked to provide the summary. They did not include in unnecessary details and prompting was not needed.

Poor achievers, on the other hand, had poor recall of important information from text even though it was just read out to them. They could only pick up an average of two out of the five main ideas presented in the passage. When they were being questioned about the rest of the other main ideas, they responded that they could not recall anymore. They were unsure and had to be prompted frequently by the researcher to carry on. The summary that they gave was unorganized and incomplete. Other interesting areas noted were lack of eye contact with the researcher and interest in the tasks required of them throughout the interview duration. When they were prompted more, the low achievers became withdrawn and refused to answer anymore.

#### 4.4.2 Note taking

In this exercise, the subjects were once again required to listen to a passage (Appendix I) and take notes. They were required to tell the researcher what the passage was mostly about based on the notes. Their ability to provide main ideas, relevant details, well-organised and complete notes were evaluated. As in the previous exercise, the passage also contained five key ideas and two relevant details. Each main idea or key point mentioned by the subject would score a mark.

The results collected for the note taking strategy was shown in TABLE 4.6 and TABLE 4.7. From research, it is known that note taking is one of the study strategies that requires greater cognitive effort and a deeper level of processing as compared to other strategies such as rereading or underlining. Note taking seemed to be the primary area that clearly distinguished the successful students from the unsuccessful students (Loranger, 1994). In this task, the mean scores of high achievers were higher than the low achievers. All of the high achievers were able to take detailed and well-organised notes to help them in recalling important details and main ideas when they were asked to provide a summary. The high achievers scored an average of between 4.50 to 5.00 marks for each of the areas tested.

The low achievers could only score a mean score of between 1.50 to 2.00 in each of the areas tested. Their notes were incomplete and unorganized and this reflected their low efficiency in note taking. Unlike the high achievers, their notes did not show a flow among the main ideas presented. They frequently missed out some of the main ideas or key points presented as these were not found in their notes.

The high achievers and low achievers were then asked whether they had been shown how to take notes. Two out of the four students from the high achievers group responded that they had been shown how to take notes from

books or workshops. The other two students from the same group replied that they had not been shown how to take notes before. Three out of the four students from the low achievers group responded that they had been shown how to do so by motivation workshops, teachers or their parents.

All the students from both the high achievers and low achievers groups responded that they found taking notes helpful and they did take notes in class when the teacher was teaching. All of them replied that they knew the reason why they should take notes. Taking notes helped them to remember facts better and easier when they had to do revision.

#### 4.4.3 Making Summary Based on Silent Reading

The students were then asked to read the chosen passage (Appendix J) silently and required to provide a summary on what they read. The summary given by the students was evaluated in terms of organizational patterns, ability to identify main points and recall of supporting details. The passage chosen contained five main ideas and five relevant details. Each main idea or relevant detail mentioned in the summary would be given a mark.

The results collected for the summary task was shown in TABLE 4.6 and TABLE 4.7. The findings showed that there a difference between the mean scores of high achievers and low achievers. The high achievers group scored a mean score of between 4.25 to 4.75 in each area tested for the summary. They were able to provide a well-organised and complete summary.

Three out of the four students from the low achievers group were still unable to read silently and automatically. When they were asked to read silently, they still mumbled silently and followed with their finger as they went from one word to the next. The summary that they gave was incomplete and unorganized giving a mean score of between 1.75 to 2.00 for each area tested. Their reading rate was much lower than the high achievers.

After providing a summary, the students were then asked questions based on the passage just read. The students were allowed to make use of the textbook to locate for answers to the questions. There were five questions being asked and these questions were constructed based on Bloom's Taxonomy (Appendix J). There were two questions from the Knowledge Level, two from the Understanding Level and one from the Synthesis Level. Each correct response would be given a mark. In this exercise, the students were evaluated in terms of locating strategies. The results for answering questions by each student was shown



in TABLE 4.8. Each correct response would be marked as / and incorrect responses as X.

**TABLE 4.8**  
**Responses to Questions by Each Student**

Question No	Student							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(K) 1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
(K) 2	/	/	/	/	/	X	X	/
(S) 3	/	/	/	/	/	X	X	/
(K) 4	/	/	/	/	/	X	/	X
(U) 5	/	X	/	/	X	X	X	X

Note : The alphabet beside the question number represents the level in the Bloom's Taxonomy. K = Knowledge , U = Understanding, S = Synthesis.

The scores obtained by each student and group in the locating for information strategy was as shown in TABLE 4.6 and TABLE 4.7. The high achievers scored a mean of 4.75 as compared with the low achievers (2.50) in providing correct responses. This indicated that the high achievers were proficient in locating answers to questions asked . As some of the questions asked were based on information from the text and prior knowledge, the high achievers were still able to answer them correctly. This showed that high achievers had the ability to integrate information in the text with prior knowledge in answering questions. They were quick in giving responses and this showed how efficient they were in using the textbook to locate for information.

The low achievers were slow in the location of answers for the questions asked. The researcher had to wait between five to seven minutes before getting a response . This implied that low achievers displayed a low proficiency in the usage of text to locate information.

#### 4.4.4 Underlining

The students were then required to continue on reading silently. As they read, they were asked to underline important information found in the passage (Appendix K). The students were evaluated based on the areas shown in Appendix E. The results obtained by each student and group in the underlining exercise were as shown in TABLE 4.6 and TABLE 4.7. The high achievers showed a higher mean score (5.00) as compared to the low achievers (2.50).

Although underlining is a study strategy that required less cognitive effort as compared to note taking and summary (Loranger, 1994), the low achievers could only score a mean of 2.50 only. High achievers scored a maximum of five marks each as all of them underlined all the key information and relevant details in the passage. The low achievers were not able to underline all the main ideas in the passage. Two of the students from the group underlined unnecessary details and

too much while the third one underlined too little. All this indicated that the students did not know how to differentiate the main points and relevant details from unnecessary details.

#### 4.4.5 Vocabulary

The students were shown four key vocabulary words found in the text on index cards. They were required to provide a complete meaning of each word. The subjects were then asked to read the word as it appeared in context in the text (Appendix L). They were required to tell what they could about the selected word based on what they read. Their knowledge of words meanings in isolation and from context were then evaluated. The four words selected for this exercise were i) *Fotosintesis* (Photosynthesis) ii) *Respirasi* (Respiration) iii) *Oksigen* (Oxygen) iv) *Kitar* (Cycle). The scores of words in isolation and from context was shown in TABLE 4.6 and the summary of the scores of words in isolation and from context by the two groups was shown in TABLE 4.7. There was not much difference between the mean scores of the high achievers and low achievers in this reading strategy.

The mean scores for both the high achievers and the low achievers group were higher when they were required to provide complete meaning of words from context as compared to providing meaning to words placed in isolation. These

students were good in their vocabulary as indicated by their high mean score.

Both groups could provide the meanings of words from the context more correctly than when the words were placed in isolation. They made use of the context clues to guess the meanings of the words. Students found it more difficult when they were asked to provide the complete meanings of words in isolation. When they were given a word which they had not learned before, they had no means to guess the meaning of the word. This situation applied to both the high achievers and the low achievers.

#### 4.4.6 Scanning

The students were asked to locate a chosen word on a page (Appendix M). The chosen word was *Kitar Karbon Dioksida* (Carbon Dioxide Cycle). They were then evaluated in terms of ability to scan for specific details.

The scores for each student and group was as shown in TABLE 4.6 and TABLE 4.7. There was no difference between the mean scores of both groups in this reading strategy. Both groups, the high achievers and low achievers scored a low mean for the ability to apply the scanning strategy. Two out of the four students from the low achievers group thought that scanning meant locating words by running their forefinger along the sentences. The other students did not know how to apply the scanning strategy. They took a long time to locate the required

word. One of the students from the low achievers group did not locate the required word but instead gave another word as the answer.

The findings was similar to the findings by Kobasigawa, Ransom and Holland (1980). Students between 10 - 14 years of age, may be able to describe skimming / scanning well but only students who had reached about 14 years of age could use skimming / scanning as a strategy. The subjects in the study were not able to apply the scanning strategy proficiently.

#### 4.4.7 Headings and other Graphics

The students were required to locate for a specific information and also to describe what other information that can be extracted from the diagram (Appendix N). The diagram given was entitled *Kitar Oksigen* or Oxygen Cycle. The students were required to describe processes that used or contributed oxygen to the environment based on the diagram.

The scores for each student and group in the usage of headings and other graphics to locate information was found in TABLE 4.6 and TABLE 4.7. The mean scores of high achievers (5.00) was much higher than the low achievers (3.25).

With reference to TABLE 4.7, the high achievers group showed high proficiency in making use of headings and graphics to locate for information. Their description of the processes from the diagram was detailed and well-organised. The low achievers, were not able to make full use of the diagrams and graphics to locate for information. They could not see the connection between the ideas in the diagram. Their description of information from the diagram was incomplete and unorganized.

#### 4.4.8 Awareness of Textbook Parts

The students were asked to locate for specific information in the Table of Contents and in the Indexes. The students were allowed to use the book however they wished. The information needed from the Table of Contents was *Haba dan Cara-cara Pemindahan Haba* (Heat and Ways of Heat Transmission). The students were asked to describe what they could expect to learn about it. To test whether the students had knowledge of using the indexes, they were required to locate for the word *tetraklorometana* (tetrachlorometane). The results obtained by each student and group for this task was shown in TABLE 4.6 and TABLE 4.7. The mean scores for high achievers was 5.00 as compared to the low achievers (1.75) for the usage of Table of Contents.

All the students from the high achievers group showed ability in making use of the Table of Contents to locate for information. Only one out of the four students from the low achievers group could use the Table of Contents. The other three were not aware of the existence of the Table of Contents. They kept flipping the pages to look for the required information. However, there was not much differences between the mean scores of the two groups in the usage of Indexes.

Only one out of the four students from the high achievers group was able to make use of the Indexes. All the students from the low achievers group were not able to do so. TABLE 4.9 showed the summary of all the study strategies and whether there were any differences or not between the mean scores of the high achievers and low achievers.

TABLE 4.9

Study Strategies and Differences Between the Mean Scores of High Achievers and Low Achievers.

Study Strategies	Yes/No
Summary (Listening)	Yes
Note taking	Yes
Summary (Silent Reading)	Yes
Underlining	Yes
Vocabulary	No
Scanning	No
Headings and Graphics	Yes
Usage of Table of Contents	Yes
Usage of Indexes	No

#### 4.5 The Personal Needs and Strengths of Students Based on Self-Perception, Awareness of Different Learning Strategies and Proficiency of Using the Textbook

##### 4.5.1 Profile of Student 1 (High Achievers Group)

The results obtained from his subjects tested in school, RSPS, MRAI and TAPP was summarised in TABLE 4.10. His results would be compared with the mean scores of his group.

TABLE 4.10  
Profile of Student 1

	Marks obtained	High Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	88	89.75
BI	85	84.00
MAT	92	92.00
SAINS	86	86.50
GEO	90	88.50
SEJ	87	90.75
K.H.	88	90.75
PI	98	94.75
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	41	42.50
Observational Comparison	29	22.75
Social Feedback	45	36.00
Physiological States	37	38.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	10	
Conditional Knowledge of Strategy Application	2	
Planning the Cognitive Event	1	
Evaluation of One's Processes	3	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.75
Provided relevant details	5	5.00
Provided well-organised summary	5	5.00



TABLE 4.10 (Continued)

<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	4	4.50
Provided relevant details	5	4.75
Provided well-organised notes	5	5.00
Provided complete notes	4	4.75
Was efficient with note taking	5	5.00
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.75
Provided relevant details	5	4.50
Provided well-organised summary	5	4.57
Silent reading rate	5	4.25
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	5	5.00
Provided correct responses	5	4.75
<b>Underlining.</b>		
Underlined key information	5	5.00
Underlined relevant details	5	5.00
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	5	4.44
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	5	4.63
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	3	2.00
Scanned accurately	5	5.00
Scanned effectively	3	2.00
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	5	5.00
Used graphics to locate	5	5.00
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	5	5.00
Used index efficiently	5	2.00

With reference to TABLE 4.10, it was clear that student 1 was an excellent student as his scores for all the subjects tested in school was very close to the mean

scores of the high achievers. His above average scores in all the subjects indicated that his reading proficiency was very good. Based on the RSPS results, his scores in the Progress and Physiological States categories were close to the mean score of the high achievers group. However, his scores in the Observational Comparison and Social Feedback category was higher than the mean scores of the high achievers. This showed that, based on his own observation, his reading ability was better than his classmates or peers. He also received a lot of positive feedback from his friends, teachers and parents about his reading ability. On the whole, his score for the RSPS indicated that he had a high self-perception as a reader. His scores in the MRAI was almost close to the mean scores of the high achievers group. This implied that he was very much aware of all the reading strategies available.

His scores in all the study strategies tested in the TAPP was in the excellent range. He scored maximum marks in providing summary, note taking, using textbook to answer questions, underlining, providing meanings of words in isolation and from context, usage of headings and diagrams to locate details and lastly, usage of table of contents and index efficiently. The only reading strategy he needed to improve on was the scanning strategy. Although he could scan accurately, he was not able to use the scanning strategy effectively.

#### 4.5.2 Profile of Student 2 (High Achievers Group)

The summary of his results for school subjects , RSPS, MRAI and TAPP was shown in TABLE 4.11. The scores obtained by Student 2 in each task were placed beside the mean scores from the high achievers group for comparison.

TABLE 4.11

##### Profile of Student 2

	Marks obtained	High Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	95	89.75
BI	90	84.00
MAT	98	92.00
SAINS	92	86.50
GEO	89	88.50
SEJ	95	90.75
K.H.	94	90.75
PI	98	94.75
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	43	42.50
Observational Comparison	24	22.75
Social Feedback	38	36.00
Physiological States	38	38.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	11	
Conditional Knowledge of Strategy Application	2	
Planning the Cognitive Event	2	
Evaluation of One's Processes	4	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	4	4.75
Provided relevant details	5	5.00
Provided well-organised summary	5	5.00

TABLE 4.11 (Continued)

<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.50
Provided relevant details	5	4.75
Provided well-organised notes	5	5.00
Provided complete notes	5	4.75
Was efficient with note taking	5	5.00
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.75
Provided relevant details	5	4.50
Provided well-organised summary	5	4.57
Silent reading rate	4	4.25
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	5	5.00
Provided correct responses	4	4.75
<b>Underlining</b>		
Underlined key information	5	5.00
Underlined relevant details	5	5.00
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	5	4.44
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	5	4.63
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	1	2.00
Scanned accurately	5	5.00
Scanned effectively	1	2.00
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	5	5.00
Used graphics to locate	5	5.00
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	5	5.00
Used index efficiently	1	2.00

Student 2 showed excellent results based on the marks obtained from each school subject. All the marks obtained for each subject were higher than the mean

score for the high achievers group. This implied that his reading ability was very good even within his own group. Based on his RSPS scores, his scores in the Observational Comparison and Social Feedback categories were higher than the mean scores of his group. The scores obtained for both categories were in the high range. His scores for the Progress and Physiological States categories were close to the mean scores of his group. Both his Progress and Physiological States scores were in the high range. Similar to Student 1, he knew that his reading ability was better than his peers based on his own observation. He also received a lot of positive feedback from various sources on his reading ability. He experienced positive feelings such as calmness, relaxation and happiness while reading. Student 2 perceived that his progress in reading showed great improvement as compared to his past reading performance. Overall, he had a high self-perception for his reading ability. His scores in the MRAI indicated that he was aware of all the reading strategies available and their usage.

In the application of different learning strategies, Student 2 was able to apply all the tested reading strategies excellently except for the scanning strategy and usage of indexes.

#### 4.5.3 Profile of Student 3 (High Achievers Group)

TABLE 4.12 showed the summary of student 3's results obtained from school subjects, RSPS, MRAI and TAPP.

TABLE 4.12

##### Profile of Student 3

	Marks obtained	High Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	89	89.75
BI	83	84.00
MAT	90	92.00
SAINS	85	86.50
GEO	86	88.50
SEJ	88	90.75
K.H.	96	90.75
PI	90	94.75
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	42	42.50
Observational Comparison	21	22.75
Social Feedback	29	36.00
Physiological States	38	38.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	12	
Conditional Knowledge of Strategy Application	2	
Planning the Cognitive Event	0	
Evaluation of One's Processes	4	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.75
Provided relevant details	5	5.00
Provided well-organised summary	5	5.00
<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.50
Provided relevant details	5	4.75
Provided well-organised notes	5	5.00
Provided complete notes	5	4.75

TABLE 4.12 (Continued)

---

Was efficient with note taking	5	5.00
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	4	4.75
Provided relevant details	4	4.50
Provided well-organised summary	5	4.57
Silent reading rate	4	4.25
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	5	5.00
Provided correct responses	5	4.75
<b>Underlining.</b>		
Underlined key information	5	5.00
Underlined relevant details	5	5.00
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	4	4.44
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	4	4.63
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	1	2.00
Scanned accurately	5	5.00
Scanned effectively	1	2.00
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	5	5.00
Used graphics to locate	5	5.00
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	5	5.00
Used index efficiently	1	2.00

---

Based on his school subjects results, seven out of eight of his school subjects showed scores lower than the mean scores of his group. Living skills was the only subject which had a score that was higher than the mean of his group. This implied

that Student 3's reading ability was in the low end as compared to the reading ability of the high achievers group.

His RSPS scores in the Progress, Observational Comparison and Physiological States categories were close to the mean score of his group. Based on the RSPS score interpretation, his scores in the Progress and Physiological States categories were in the high range while his scores in the Observational Comparison category was in the average range. His scores for the Social Feedback category was close to the low range. Student 3 perceived that his present progress was excellent as compared to his past performance in reading. He observed that he was not as good as others in his group. He did not receive much praises or feedback to let him know how good he was at reading resulting in a low score for the Social Feedback category. However, he experienced positive feelings during reading as shown in his high scores in the Physiological States category. Overall, his self-perception as a reader was in the average range. The MRAI results showed that he was aware of the different strategies needed during reading.

His scores in the study strategies tested in the TAPP was in the excellent or near excellent range. He scored maximum marks or near maximum marks in providing summaries, note taking, usage of textbook to answer questions, underlining, providing meanings of words in isolation and from context, usage of headings and diagrams to locate details and usage of table of contents. He was not able to apply the scanning strategy and the usage of indexes.



#### 4.5.4 Profile of Student 4 (High Achievers Group)

TABLE 4.13

##### Profile of Student 4

	Marks obtained	High Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	87	89.75
BI	78	84.00
MAT	88	92.00
SAINS	83	86.50
GEO	89	88.50
SEJ	93	90.75
K.H.	85	90.75
PI	93	94.75
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	44	42.50
Observational Comparison	17	22.75
Social Feedback	32	36.00
Physiological States	40	38.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	11	
Conditional Knowledge of	2	
Strategy Application		
Planning the Cognitive Event	2	
Evaluation of One's Processes	3	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.75
Provided relevant details	5	5.00
Provided well-organised summary	5	5.00
<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	4	4.50
Provided relevant details	4	4.75
Provided well-organised notes	5	5.00
Provided complete notes	5	4.75
Was efficient with note taking	5	5.00

TABLE 4.13 (Continued)

<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	5	4.75
Provided relevant details	4	4.50
Provided well-organised summary	4	4.57
Silent reading rate	4	4.25
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	5	5.00
Provided correct responses	5	4.75
<b>Underlining.</b>		
Underlined key information	5	5.00
Underlined relevant details	5	5.00
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	3.75	4.44
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	4.50	4.63
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	3	2.00
Scanned accurately	5	5.00
Scanned effectively	3	2.00
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	5	5.00
Used graphics to locate	5	5.00
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	5	5.00
Used index efficiently	1	2.00

With reference to TABLE 4.13, Student 4's scores for six out of the eight subjects tested were below the mean scores of the high achievers group. This implied that his reading ability was in the low range as compared to the reading ability of others in the same group. He scored higher than the mean score of his group in Geography and History.

Based on the RSPS results , his scores in the Progress and Physiological States categories had higher scores than the mean score of his group. Scores for both categories were in the high range. Student 4 perceived that his progress in reading was doing well as compared to his past performances. He also experienced strong positive feeling while he was reading. His scores in the Observational Comparison and Social Feedback were lower than the mean scores of his group. Based on RSPS score interpretation, his Observational Comparison scores was in the low range while his Social Feedback scores was in the average range. From his own observation, he perceived that he was not as good as others in the same group. He also did not receive enough praises and feedback on his reading ability. Overall, his scores indicated that his self-perception as a reader was average. His scores in the MRAI showed that he was aware of the different strategies needed for reading.

He showed strength in the application of learning strategies such as providing summary, note taking, underlining, locating for information from headings and graphics and usage of table of contents. Areas of need that was observed from Student 4 were usage of the scanning strategy efficiently, indexes and in the vocabulary tasks. He was not able to give complete meanings to all the words asked when they were placed in isolation and from context.

#### 4.5.5 Profile of Student 5 (Low Achievers Group)

The summary of his results from subjects tested in school, RSPS, MRAI and TAPP was shown in TABLE 4.14.

TABLE 4.14

##### Profile of Student 5

	Marks obtained	Low Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	65	53.25
BI	55	57.75
MAT	45	49.25
SAINS	58	52.00
GEO	63	57.00
SEJ	66	57.50
K.H.	69	73.50
PI	68	72.25
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	36	37.00
Observational Comparison	17	18.75
Social Feedback	29	29.00
Physiological States	33	33.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	12	
Conditional Knowledge of Strategy Application	3	
Planning the Cognitive Event	2	
Evaluation of One's Processes	4	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	1	2.00
Provided relevant details	1	2.00
Provided well-organised summary	1	2.00

TABLE 4.14 (Continued)

<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	1	1.75
Provided well-organised notes	1	1.50
Provided complete notes	1	1.50
Was efficient with note taking	2	1.50
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	1.75
Provided well-organised summary	1	1.75
Silent reading rate	1	2.00
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	4	2.50
Provided correct responses	4	2.50
<b>Underlining</b>		
Underlined key information	1	2.50
Underlined relevant details	1	2.50
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	3.75	3.88
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	3.75	4.00
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	2	1.25
Scanned accurately	3	2.50
Scanned effectively	2	1.50
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	2	3.25
Used graphics to locate	2	3.25
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	1	1.75
Used index efficiently	1	1.00

Based on TABLE 4.14, Student 5's scores in four out of the eight subjects (Malay Studies, Science, Geography and History ) were higher than the mean scores of the respective subjects in the low achievers group. As his scores ranged from 45 marks to 69 marks, it implied that Student 5 did not display a good reading ability.

Based on the RSPS results, he scored lower than the group mean scores in the categories of Progress, Observational Comparison and Social Feedback. His scores in the Progress, Observational Comparison and Social Feedback categories were in the low range. He perceived that his progress was slow and did not improve much as compared to his past performances. From his observation, he knew that he was not as good as others even within his own group. He did not receive much praises and may have received negative feedback resulting in a low score in the Social Feedback category. His scores in the Physiological States category was only average. The total scores from all the four categories mentioned above resulted in a low overall score. This implied that Student 5 had a low reader self-perception. He had not much self-confidence and knew that he was weak in his studies as compared with his friends.

Based on the MRAI, his scores indicated that he was aware of all the reading strategies available and it also showed that he knew about reading strategies as well as the high achievers. Student 5's overall results in the TAPP indicated that he was weak in all the reading strategies tested. His needs was observed in the areas of providing summaries, note taking, underlining, giving complete meanings of words in isolation and from context, scanning, usage of headings and graphics to locate details and lastly usage of table of contents and indexes. His scores in the above mentioned strategies

were either lower or equivalent to the mean scores of his group. The only area which he displayed strength was able to make use of the textbook to answer questions more efficiently than his group members.

#### 4.5.6 Profile of Student 6 (Low Achievers Group)

The summary of his results from subjects tested in school, RSPS, MRAI and TAPP was shown in TABLE 4.15.

TABLE 4.15

##### Profile of Student 6

	Marks obtained	Low Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	47	53.25
BI	58	57.75
MAT	60	49.25
SAINS	44	52.00
GEO	48	57.00
SEJ	50	57.50
K.H.	72	73.50
PI	75	72.25
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	36	37.00
Observational Comparison	19	18.75
Social Feedback	27	29.00
Physiological States	32	33.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	12	
Conditional Knowledge of Strategy Application	2	
Planning the Cognitive Event	2	
Evaluation of One's Processes	2	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	2.00
Provided well-organised summary	2	2.00



TABLE 4.15 (Continued)

<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	1.75
Provided well-organised notes	3	1.50
Provided complete notes	3	1.50
Was efficient with note taking	2	1.50
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	1	1.75
Provided well-organised summary	2	1.75
Silent reading rate	2	2.00
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	1	2.50
Provided correct responses	1	2.50
<b>Underlining.</b>		
Underlined key information	4	2.50
Underlined relevant details	4	2.50
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	3.75	3.88
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	4.00	4.00
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	1	1.25
Scanned accurately	3	2.50
Scanned effectively	1	1.50
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	4	3.25
Used graphics to locate	4	3.25
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	1	1.75
Used index efficiently	1	1.00

With reference to TABLE 4.15, Student 6 managed to have only two out of eight school subjects showing scores higher than the mean scores of his group. The

two school subjects were Mathematics and Islamic Studies. Four out of the eight subjects showed scores which were far below the mean scores of his group. This showed that his reading ability was weak even measured within his own group.

His RSPS results also indicated that Student 6 had a low self-perception as a reader. Similar to Student 5, his scores in the Progress, Observational Comparison and Social Feedback were in the low range. However, his score in the Physiological States category was average. He sometimes experienced positive feelings when he was reading such as happiness and calmness. His scores in the MRAI showed that he was also aware of the different strategies needed during the reading process.

From the TAPP results, Student 6 displayed a few strengths in the reading strategies. He was able to provide a better organised notes as compared to his group although he was not able to provide some of the main ideas. He performed well in the underlining exercise, getting scores in the excellent range. He could give a good account of information that could be extracted out from diagrams and graphics.

However, Student 6 was lacking in ability in a number of the study strategies tested. He needed guidance in making summary, note taking, using the textbook efficiently to answer questions and providing correct responses, vocabulary, scanning and usage of table of contents and index efficiently.

#### 4.5.7 Profile of Student 7 ( Low Achievers Group)

The summary for the profile of Student 7 in the various aspects such as his school subjects scores, RSPS, MRAI and TAPP was shown in TABLE 4.16.

TABLE 4.16

##### Profile of Student 7

	Marks obtained	Low Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	52	53.25
BI	60	57.75
MAT	47	49.25
SAINS	41	52.00
GEO	57	57.00
SEJ	58	57.50
K.H.	78	73.50
PI	78	72.25
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	39	37.00
Observational Comparison	19	18.75
Social Feedback	30	29.00
Physiological States	35	33.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	10	
Conditional Knowledge of Strategy Application	1	
Planning the Cognitive Event	2	
Evaluation of One's Processes	2	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	3	2.00
Provided relevant details	3	2.00
Provided well-organised summary	3	2.00

TABLE 4.16 (Continued)

<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	1.75
Provided well-organised notes	1	1.50
Provided complete notes	1	1.50
Was efficient with note taking	1	1.50
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	1.75
Provided well-organised summary	2	1.75
Silent reading rate	3	2.00
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	2	2.50
Provided correct responses	2	2.50
<b>Underlining.</b>		
Underlined key information	3	2.50
Underlined relevant details	3	2.50
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	3.75	3.88
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	3.75	4.00
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	1	1.25
Scanned accurately	3	2.50
Scanned effectively	2	1.50
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	4	3.25
Used graphics to locate	5	3.25
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	4	1.75
Used index efficiently	1	1.00

Based on his school subjects results, Student 7 was considered a better student than others in his group. Most of the subjects tested had scores higher than the mean score of his group. Only three of his school subjects, Malay Studies, Mathematics and

Science, obtained scores lower than the mean score of his group. He was very weak in Science. This indicated that he had better reading ability than his group members.

His RSPS results showed that his scores were in the low range for the Observational Comparison and Social Feedback categories. His scores in the Progress category was average and was near the high range for the Physiological States category. He perceived that his present progress was average as compared to his past performance. He knew that he was not as good as his friends through his own observation comparison. He responded 'Undecided' to a number of questions asked under the Social Feedback category. This indicated that he did not receive enough feedback on his performance from friends, teachers or parents and unsure how they felt about his reading. However, from his RSPS results, he experienced a lot of positive feelings while he was engaged in reading. On the whole, his self-perception as a reader was average. Scores from the MRAI also indicated that student 7 was also aware of the different reading strategies needed.

With reference to his TAPP results in Table 4.15, Student 7 was able to perform better in making summary (Listening Evaluation), underlining, usage of headings and graphics to locate for information and lastly usage of table of contents as compared to his group. The strategies listed above showed scores higher than the mean scores of the low achievers group. He needed guidance in note taking, using textbook efficiently to answer questions, vocabulary, scanning and usage of indexes efficiently to locate for specific detail. He performed better in making summary based on listening evaluation as compared to making summary based on silent reading.

#### 4.5.8 Profile of Student 8 (Low Achievers Group)

The summary of his school subjects , RSPS, MRAI and TAPP was shown in

TABLE 4.17.

TABLE 4.17

Profile of Student 8

	Marks obtained	Low Achievers Mean
<b>Subjects in school</b>		
BM	49	53.25
BI	58	57.75
MAT	45	49.25
SAINS	65	52.00
GEO	60	57.00
SEJ	56	57.50
K.H.	75	73.50
PI	68	72.25
<b>RSPS</b>		
Progress	37	37.00
Observational Comparison	20	18.75
Social Feedback	30	29.00
Physiological States	29	33.25
<b>MRAI</b>		
Regulation	8	
Conditional Knowledge of Strategy Application	2	
Planning the Cognitive Event	1	
Evaluation of One's Processes	4	
<b>Study Strategies</b>		
<b>Summary (Listening)</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	2.00
Provided well-organised summary	2	2.00

TABLE 4.17 (Continued)

---

<b>Note taking</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	1.75
Provided well-organised notes	1	1.50
Provided complete notes	1	1.50
Was efficient with note taking	1	1.50
<b>Summary (Silent Reading)</b>		
Provided main ideas	2	2.00
Provided relevant details	2	1.75
Provided well-organised summary	2	1.75
Silent reading rate	2	2.00
Used textbook efficiently to answer questions	3	2.50
Provided correct responses	3	2.75
<b>Underlining.</b>		
Underlined key information	2	2.50
Underlined relevant details	2	2.50
<b>Vocabulary</b>		
Give complete meanings to words in isolation	4.25	3.88
Give complete meanings of words from contexts	4.50	4.00
<b>Scanning</b>		
Used a scanning strategy	1	1.25
Scanned accurately	1	2.50
Scanned effectively	1	1.50
<b>Headings and other graphics</b>		
Used headings to locate	3	3.25
Used graphics to locate	3	3.25
<b>Awareness of textbook parts</b>		
Used table of contents efficiently	1	1.75
Used index efficiently	1	1.00

---

From the results of his school subjects, three of his school subjects had scores higher than the mean of his group. The score of the other five subjects were near or lower than the mean scores of his group. This implied that his reading ability was below average as compared to the reading ability of his own group.

Based on his RSPS, his scores for all the four categories were near to the scores in the average range. Both the scores from the Observational Comparison and Social Feedback were higher than the mean scores of his group. He perceived that his progress was only moving at an average pace and did not improve much as compared to his past performances. He responded most of the items in the Observational Comparison and Social Feedback category as 'Undecided'. This indicated that he was not sure how he fared as compared to his peers and didn't know what his parents, friends and teachers think about his reading ability. He also did not receive much praises or feedback on his reading performance. On the whole, his Reader Self-Perception Scale was in the average range. His scores in the MRAI also indicated that he was very much aware of the different strategies used during reading.

Results observed from his TAPP was as followed. He showed strength in the usage of textbook efficiently to answer questions and vocabulary. He could give complete meanings of words both in isolation and from context. This showed that he was able to make use of the context clues to guess the meanings of words well. His areas of need included making summary, note taking, underlining, scanning, usage of headings and other graphics to locate details and lastly usage of table of contents and indexes efficiently.