

DOKTORI (PhD) DISSZERTÁCIÓ

SZÜCS ÁGOTA

READING ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES:  
THE READING PROCESSES OF FIRST-YEAR EFL  
LEARNER BA STUDENTS

ANGOL NYELVŰ TUDOMÁNYOS SZÖVEGEK  
OLVASÁSA: ELSŐ ÉVES ANGLISZTIKA  
ALAPSZAKOS HALLGATÓK OLVASÁSI  
FOLYAMATAI

2020



**Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Pedagógiai és Pszichológiai Kar**

**Neveléstudományi Doktori Iskola**

**Nyelvpedagógia Doktori Program**

Vezetője: Prof. Dr. Károly Krisztina DSc egyetemi tanár



**Reading English for Academic Purposes: The reading processes of first-year EFL learner BA students**

**Angol nyelvű tudományos szövegek olvasása: Első éves anglisztika alapszakos hallgatók olvasási folyamatai**

**DOKTORI (PhD) DISSZERTÁCIÓ**

***Szűcs Ágota***

**Témavezető:** Dr. Tankó Gyula, egyetemi adjunktus, ELTE BTK

**A bíráló bizottság elnöke:** Prof. Dr. Medgyes Péter, professor emeritus, ELTE BTK

**Belső opponens:** Dr. Albert Ágnes, egyetemi adjunktus, ELTE BTK

**Külső opponens:** Dr. Reményi Andrea, egyetemi docens, PPKE BTK

**A bizottság titkára:** Dr. Tiboldi Tímea, egyetemi adjunktus, ELTE BTK

**A bizottság további tagjai:** Dr. Sárdi Csilla, egyetemi docens, PPKE BTK

Dr. Öveges Enikő, egyetemi adjunktus, ELTE BTK

Dr. Katona László, egyetemi adjunktus, ELTE BTK

Dr. Dóczi Brigitta, egyetemi adjunktus, ELTE BTK

**2020**



## *Acknowledgements*

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, *Dr. Gyula Tankó* for encouraging me to pursue this research topic, and for his invaluable advice and support throughout my PhD studies and during the dissertation writing process. Apart from my supervisor, my greatest appreciation goes to *Dr. Dorottya Holló* for devoting her time to read the proposal and the first draft of this dissertation and to provide feedback on them. I would also like to express my gratitude to *Dr. Krisztina Károly* and *Dr. Katalin Brózik-Piniel* whose invaluable feedback on my proposal helped me improve my dissertation. I am also forever grateful to *Dr. Krisztina Károly*, as the Programme Director, and to *Dr. Dorottya Holló*, as the Director of Studies, for their advice and assistance in the administrative procedure throughout the programme. Furthermore, I would like to extend my warmest thanks to all the participants who sacrificed some of their free time to take part in the different data collection phases of this research study.

I would like to express special thanks to my partner, *Ármin*, for his academic and moral support. Words cannot express how grateful I am for his continuous help, care and encouragement over the last four years.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my parents, who have always been by my side, and who have always supported me in all of my endeavours. Without their encouragement and support, I would not have been able to accomplish this work.

## Abstract

Having appropriate reading comprehension skills is essential, especially in the academic context. For this reason, a deep understanding of the processes underlying reading comprehension and devising appropriate reading strategy training methods is important. In the Hungarian context, reassessing the way reading comprehension is taught and practiced is crucial because Hungarian students appear to continuously underperform on the reading component of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) test compared to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) average (OECD, 2015). The topic of reading strategies has already been widely researched, and it was found that receiving explicit instruction can greatly improve students' use of reading strategies (Macaro & Erler, 2008; Olson, 2003; Olson & Land, 2007; Pressley et al., 2006). According to the Oktatási Hivatal [Hungarian Educational Authority] (2017), reading strategy instruction forms part of the secondary school education in Hungary, but pilot studies leading up to the present dissertation study (Szűcs, 2017; Szűcs & Kövér, 2016) suggest that many first-year university students at the beginning of their studies lack the necessary consciousness in their reading strategy use to be able to successfully cope with the academic requirements they have to face. Therefore, the aim of the present dissertation study was to investigate the reading comprehension processes of the aforementioned population, to explore the possible reasons behind their reading comprehension related difficulties, and to make suggestions about the potential solutions to the problem. In order to do so, the present study investigated how 14 first-year English major students coming from a Hungarian secondary education background process information when reading for academic purposes. The data collection was carried out in two phases, at the beginning and the end of the students' first university semester. During both data collection sessions, the participants were asked to execute a guided summarisation task while performing the think-aloud method to guide the researcher through their task solving processes. The data collected was subjected to content analysis and propositional analysis, and the results suggest that after receiving a semester long training related to reading strategy use and other related academic skills, the participants were able to apply their task solving strategies more appropriately to the reading purpose, which was demonstrated by their improved ability to include more task-relevant propositional content into their guided summaries.

**Key words:** reading comprehension, reading strategies, propositional analysis, think-aloud, summary writing

## Table of Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>2 Theoretical background</b> .....	7
<b>2.1 Reader related factors of reading comprehension</b> .....	9
2.1.1 <i>Reading for different purposes</i> .....	11
2.1.2 <i>The processes of reading comprehension</i> .....	16
2.1.3 <i>Reading models</i> .....	22
2.1.4 <i>The role of context and background knowledge in reading comprehension</i> .....	30
2.1.5 <i>Schema theory and the role of schemata in reading comprehension</i> .....	32
2.1.6 <i>L1 and L2 reading comprehension</i> .....	35
2.1.7 <i>Reading strategies</i> .....	40
<b>2.2 The layers of meaning</b> .....	45
<b>2.3 Summary of the theoretical background</b> .....	48
<b>3 Methods</b> .....	51
<b>3.1 The research problem</b> .....	51
<b>3.2 The context of the study</b> .....	54
<b>3.3 Data collection and data analysis</b> .....	56
3.3.1 <i>Preparatory phase</i> .....	56
3.3.2 <i>First phase</i> .....	59
3.3.3 <i>Second phase</i> .....	62
3.3.4 <i>Participants in the first and second phase</i> .....	63
3.3.5 <i>Data collection instruments in the first and second phase</i> .....	69
3.3.6 <i>First and second phase data analysis</i> .....	79
<b>3.4 Ethical considerations</b> .....	86
<b>3.5 Summary of the research design</b> .....	89
<b>4 The outcomes of the dissertation study</b> .....	92
<b>4.1 The outcomes of the think-aloud analysis</b> .....	92
<b>4.2 The outcomes of the propositional analysis</b> .....	111
<b>5 The discussion of the outcomes</b> .....	217
<b>5.1 RQ1 and RQ2</b> .....	217
<b>5.2 RQ3 &amp; RQ4</b> .....	221
<b>5.3 RQ5 &amp; RQ6</b> .....	227
<b>6 Conclusions</b> .....	231
<b>7 Pedagogical implications</b> .....	233
<b>8 The limitations of the dissertation study and implications for further research</b> .....	238
<b>References</b> .....	241
<b>Appendices</b> .....	258

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1</b> Strategies Used for Comprehension Monitoring .....	43
<b>Table 2</b> Participants' Profiles .....	64
<b>Table 3</b> Readability Indices of the Texts of Task A and Task B .....	76
<b>Table 4</b> Content Points in Task A and Task B.....	77
<b>Table 5</b> Placement Test Scores and Language Proficiency Levels .....	80
<b>Table 6</b> The Data Collection Phases of the Present Study.....	90
<b>Table 7</b> Summary of the Research Questions and Data Analysis Procedures.....	91
<b>Table 8</b> The Division of the Tasks Among the Participants for Each Data Collection Phase.....	93
<b>Table 9</b> Emerging Themes and Categories .....	94
<b>Table 10</b> CPs in the 'Investigating Children's Language' Text .....	113
<b>Table 11</b> CPs in the 'Votes for Women' Text .....	115
<b>Table 12</b> Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the First Phase from the 'Investigating Children's Language' Text .....	118
<b>Table 13</b> Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the Second Phase from the 'Investigating Children's Language' Text .....	121
<b>Table 14</b> Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the First Phase from the 'Votes for Women' Text ..	124
<b>Table 15</b> Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the Second Phase from the 'Votes for Women' Text .....	127
<b>Table 16</b> The Propositions in Panni's First Phase Guided Summary .....	135
<b>Table 17</b> The Propositions in Panni's Second Phase Guided Summary.....	138
<b>Table 18</b> The Propositions in Emma's First Phase Guided Summary.....	141
<b>Table 19</b> The Propositions in Emma's Second Phase Guided Summary .....	145
<b>Table 20</b> The Propositions in Ibolya's First Phase Guided Summary .....	149
<b>Table 21</b> The Propositions in Ibolya's Second Phase Guided Summary .....	152
<b>Table 22</b> The Propositions in Ádám's First Phase Guided Summary .....	155
<b>Table 23</b> The Propositions in Ádám's Second Phase Guided Summary .....	158
<b>Table 24</b> The Propositions in Anita's First Phase Guided Summary .....	162
<b>Table 25</b> The Propositions in Anita's Second Phase Guided Summary.....	164
<b>Table 26</b> The Propositions in Dia's First Phase Guided Summary .....	167
<b>Table 27</b> The Propositions in Dia's Second Phase Guided Summary.....	169
<b>Table 28</b> The Propositions in Lilla's First Phase Guided Summary.....	173
<b>Table 29</b> The Propositions in Lilla's Second Phase Guided Summary .....	175
<b>Table 30</b> The Propositions in Johanna's First Phase Guided Summary .....	178
<b>Table 31</b> The Propositions in Johanna's Second Phase Guided Summary.....	180
<b>Table 32</b> The Propositions in Boglárka's First Phase Guided Summary .....	183
<b>Table 33</b> The Propositions in Boglárka's Second Phase Guided Summary .....	188



<b>Table 34</b> The Propositions in Pálma’s First Phase Guided Summary .....	191
<b>Table 35</b> The Propositions in Pálma’s Second Phase Guided Summary .....	193
<b>Table 36</b> The Propositions in Tamás’s First Phase Guided Summary .....	196
<b>Table 37</b> The Propositions in Tamás’s Second Phase Guided Summary .....	199
<b>Table 38</b> The Propositions in Beáta’s First Phase Guided Summary .....	202
<b>Table 39</b> The Propositions in Beáta’s Second Phase Guided Summary .....	204
<b>Table 40</b> The Propositions in Judit’s First Phase Guided Summary .....	207
<b>Table 41</b> The Propositions in Judit’s Second Phase Guided Summary .....	209
<b>Table 42</b> The Propositions in Adél’s First Phase Guided Summary .....	213
<b>Table 43</b> The Propositions in Adél’s Second Phase Guided Summary .....	215
<b>Table 44</b> Summary of the Propositional Analysis and the Language Proficiency Levels of the Participants .....	228
<b>Table 45</b> The Propositional Analysis of the ‘Investigating Children’s Language’ Text .....	268
<b>Table 46</b> The Propositional Analysis of the ‘Votes for Women’ Text .....	280

## **List of Figures**

<b>Figure 1</b> Factors Influencing Reading Ability .....	7
---	---

## **List of Appendices**

<b>Appendix A</b> – Consent form in Hungarian and in English .....	258
<b>Appendix B</b> – Think-aloud demonstration tasks .....	262
<b>Appendix C</b> – Think-aloud practice tasks .....	263
<b>Appendix D</b> – The data collection tasks .....	264
<b>Appendix E</b> – Propositional Analysis of the Text of Task A and Task B .....	268
<b>Appendix F</b> –The semi-structured interview schedules .....	291

## List of Definitions of Frequently Used Terms

**added information** – “ideas not present in the source text, such as the test taker’s personal contributions in the form of opinions, interpretations, analyses” (Tankó, 2017, p. 3)

**careful reading** – it is a reading strategy which involves the extraction of complete meanings from the text (Weir, 1993)

**content point (CP)** – the task-relevant content in a source text (Tankó, 2017)

**English for Academic Purposes** – the field which is “concerned with those communication skills in English which are required for study purposes in formal education systems” (Jordan, 1997, p. 1)

**fluent reading** – “multiple tasks being performed at the same time, such as decoding the words, comprehending the information, relating the information to prior knowledge of the subject matter, making inferences, and evaluating the information’s usefulness to a report [the reader is] writing” (Samuels & Flor, 1997, p. 107)

**generation Z** – the people born after 1995 (Strauss & Howe, 1997)

**global summary** – a type of summary which contains “all the main ideas from a source and cover[s] them in a balanced manner” (Tankó, 2019, p. 45)

**guided summary** – a type of summary which contains “only those ideas that are relevant to [the intended] purposes while ignoring the rest” (Tankó, 2019, p. 45)

**irrelevant information** – a piece of information included into the summary of a participant which is present in the source text of the summarisation task, but it is not relevant from the point of view of the task instruction (Tankó, 2017)

**proposition** – the present study defines propositions as a predicate and its arguments (Bovair & Kieras, 1985) which intend to represent the semantic relationship among word concepts

**propositional analysis** – a method which provides a “formal representation of the semantic content of a text” (Bovair & Kieras, 1985, p. 315)

**reading comprehension** – “the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language” (RAND Reading Study Group, 2002, p. 11)

**reading for academic purposes** – the present dissertation study defines reading for academic purposes as the ability to comprehend the content and the language of a text for study purposes. Study purposes include reading for knowledge acquisition, reading for academic writing (e.g., note taking, summarising, synthesizing, and essay writing), or for giving a presentation in a classroom setting. For this reason, students who are reading for academic purposes aim to gather information (e.g., facts and data), understand theories and ideas, understand the point of view of an author, and find evidence to support their own viewpoints from the text (Jordan, 1997). Therefore, the term *academic reading*, in the present dissertation, contains reading any type of text in the academic context.

**reading skills** – “linguistic processing abilities that are relatively automatic in their use and their combinations (e.g., word recognition, syntactic processing)” (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 8).

**reading strategies** – “abilities that are potentially open to conscious reflection and reflect a reader’s intention to address a problem or a specific goal while reading” (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 10).

**scanning** – it is a reading strategy which is used to identify a particular graphic form in a text (Grabe, 2009)

**skimming** – it is a reading strategy which is used to quickly understand the general idea of a text. It is also utilised when the reader is reading for quick understanding because here the aim is to be able to rapidly decide what a text is about, where its discussion is leading, and which parts are relevant for the reading purpose (Grabe, 2009)

**summary** – “a superordinate term for a number of discourse types which have in common these relationships with the original: (1) being shortened versions, (2) including only the main ideas, and (in most cases) (3) retaining the original organisation and focus” (Johns, 1988, p. 79)

**think-aloud** – the participants have to verbalise every thought emerging in their mind while executing the guided summarisation task

**think-aloud demonstration task** – the tasks used at the beginning of the think-aloud training to show the participants how to perform the think-aloud procedure

**think-aloud practice task** – the tasks used during the think-aloud training to help the participants practice the think-aloud procedure before moving on to the think-aloud performed on the actual data collection task

## **1 Introduction**

Effective reading comprehension is undeniably an indispensable skill in everyday life. Being able to successfully comprehend information is essential in every domain of modern society, from being able to read and understand the news, to fully comprehending a legally binding document. According to the RAND Reading Study Group (2002), reading comprehension can be defined as “the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language” (p. 11). This definition shows that the understanding of a text goes beyond simply recognising letters and combining them into words; it also necessitates an active meaning construction on the part of the reader. To be able to fully comprehend the layers of meaning presented in a text, the reader has to engage into deep reading processes such as activating background knowledge, making inferences, and critically assessing the content (Grabe, 2009).

Because of the constant technological development, people’s reading habits and the ways they consume written texts have substantially changed compared to the previous decades. The reading material has been gradually transferring from a paper-based platform to an on-screen platform (Baron, 2017). Research suggests (e.g., Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2011; Baron, 2017; Dyson & Haselgrove, 2000; Schugar, Schugar & Penny, 2011) that this shift has an even deeper effect on reading comprehension than it was initially hypothesised. According to Schugar, Schugar and Penny (2011), reading on a digital platform encourages the use of different strategies than a paper-based platform. Furthermore, when reading a digital document, Kaufman and Flanagan (2016) suggest that readers tend to focus more on scanning for key words and finding the desired information as fast as possible, so they are more readily able to answer concrete questions related to the reading material. Even though scanning for key terms is useful for quickly finding particular information in a text, it also results in a shallower understanding. In such a situation, the readers are able to understand

fewer details, and they can make fewer connections between the ideas presented. Without paying enough attention to a text to activate background knowledge, make inferences, and critically assess the relevance and truth-value of the presented information, the understanding of the different layers of meaning is impossible (Kaufman & Flanagan, 2016). In many reading contexts, the ability to quickly find information is essential, especially in the fast-paced society of today. However, in situations when the information content of a text has to be fully understood and learnt, deep reading is inevitable. Furthermore, because of the information overload created by the Internet and the increasing amount of print sources, being able to distinguish between pieces of information based on their relevance and credibility is essential, which necessitates the use of a wider variety of reading strategies and a more complex reading process (e.g., Ozgungor & Guthrie, 2004; Phakiti, 2003; Trabasso & Bouchard, 2002).

The problems created by the changing reading habits are especially prevalent in the case of the members of generation Z. According to the generation theory created by Strauss and Howe (1997), the members of generation Z are composed of the people born after 1995, and they are the first generation whose childhood was most probably defined by the presence of computers and the Internet. They are often contrasted with generation Y (i.e., people born between the early 1980s to the mid-1990s), who were likely exposed to mostly printed reading sources instead of digital ones during their childhood. As according to several research studies, reading on a digital platform has a negative effect on reading comprehension processes and reading strategy use (e.g., Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2011; Baron, 2017; Dyson & Haselgrove, 2000; Schugar, Schugar & Penny, 2011), these negative effects might be even more pronounced in the case of people belonging to generation Z, who are socialised into a world of digital reading from a very young age.

As the majority of the enrolling university cohort consists of members of generation Z (Felvi, 2019), the possible reading comprehension problems they face have to be addressed because the relevance of good reading comprehension skills is especially important in the domain of tertiary education. During their university studies, students are constantly exposed to integrative tasks (e.g., listening-into-writing tasks, such as note taking at lectures, or reading-into-writing tasks, such as source-based essay writing) while acquiring declarative knowledge, note taking, summarizing, and synthesizing skills are essential, and each requires excellent information processing abilities. The need for these abilities is also confirmed by high-stakes international academic examinations, such as IELTS, Pearson Academic or TOEFL, which effectively function as entrance examinations to higher education, and which all include tasks that measure the candidate's levels of information comprehension skills (IELTS, n.d.; Pearson PTE, n.d.; TOEFL iBT, n.d.). Therefore, it is of high importance to make the development of reading skills one of the priorities of first language (L1) and second language (L2) courses in all teaching contexts.

Investigating reading comprehension skills is especially relevant in the Hungarian context as Hungarian students appear to continuously underperform on the reading component of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) test compared to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) average (OECD, 2015). In the Hungarian context, learning how to read in L1 is a core part of the first-grade elementary school material. Furthermore, learning how to read effectively and receiving information on how to use reading strategies both in the L1 and L2 contexts are parts of every student's high school education.

According to the Oktatási Hivatal [Educational Authority] (2017), regarding the Hungarian Language and Communication subject, teachers in Hungary can choose between teaching a traditional and an experimental syllabus, which both have their own respective

course books and supplementary materials. Based on an analysis of the syllabi conducted by Szűcs (2017), both the experimental and the traditional syllabus place an emphasis on the development of reading and study skills, especially in the case of the 11th and 12th grade students, and testing L1 reading comprehension is part of the school leaving examination of the Hungarian Language and Communication subject.

Additionally, instruction about reading comprehension also forms part of foreign language education as every student has to take their final school leaving examination in one foreign language subject, and this contains tasks assessing their L2 reading comprehension (Oktatási Hivatal, 2017). Furthermore, previous research suggests that the ability to successfully and effectively use reading strategies transfers across L1 and L2 at a higher proficiency level (Clarke, 1979; Han, 2012; Jimenez, Garcia, & Pearson, 1996); therefore, it can be assumed that students successfully finishing their high school studies and entering tertiary education possess ample amount of skills and knowledge related to information processing available in their L1 and L2.

Nevertheless, teaching and research practice suggests that most first-year EFL learner English major BA students in Hungary struggle with tasks requiring good L1 or L2 reading comprehension skills even after they have successfully taken their final school leaving examinations. The pilot studies leading up to the present dissertation (Szűcs, 2017; Szűcs & Kövér, 2016) suggest that students at the beginning of their university studies either do not use a wide enough variety of reading strategies, or they do not use reading strategies consciously enough to be able to effectively and efficiently solve the more complex integrated tasks required regularly during their studies. Their high exposure to digital reading materials might partly explain why these students struggle with such complex tasks (Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2011; Baron, 2017; Dyson & Haselgrove, 2000; Schugar, Schugar & Penny, 2011), which clearly require a thorough understanding of the different layers of

meaning presented in a text. However, the explicit instruction they received about the conscious use of reading strategies and methods of working with a text during their high school education should counterbalance, at least to some extent, the possible negative effects arising from being used to the reading habits encouraged by the digital platform. This assumption seems to be supported by the research findings of Olson and Land (2007), who found that giving students explicit instruction about the use of reading strategies increases their efficiency of reading comprehension. They investigated the skill development of secondary school students, and their findings suggest that those students who received explicit instruction on the use of reading strategies significantly outperformed their peers from the control group on the standardized tests and writing assignments. Moreover, their increased ability to effectively process information also had a positive effect on other skills, for example, on their writing skills (Olson & Land, 2007). For this reason, the fact that first-year university students have problems with complex reading assignments despite reading strategies being part of the high school curriculum poses an issue to be addressed.

Therefore, the present dissertation explores what first-year EFL learner English major BA students do when they have to read for specific purposes in the academic context, and how they process information before and after receiving explicit instruction on reading strategy use. Even though reading comprehension and the cognitive processes underlying it are by far not under-researched areas (Goodman, 1967; Gough, 1972; Rayner & Pollatsek, 1989; Urquhart & Weir, 1998), the topic has not been widely researched in connection with L2 academic reading in the proposed context of Hungarian tertiary education.

To carry out this aim, the present dissertation examines the reading processes of 14 Hungarian L1 first-year English major BA students at the beginning and at the end of the first semester of their studies. The participants all attended the same academic skills class together at a Hungarian university, and the improvement of reading strategy use and that of



reading skills in general was a core component of the class. Data was collected from the participants with the help of the think-aloud method (Bowles, 2010), first at the beginning and again at the end of the semester. At both data collection sessions, the participants were asked to solve a guided summarisation task while trying to verbalize their emerging thoughts in order to guide the researcher through their task solving processes. The results suggest that becoming conscious about their reading strategy use helped the participants apply their task solving strategies more appropriately to the reading purpose, and that having the appropriate reading purpose aided them in including more task-relevant propositional content into their guided summaries. When investigated from the initial language proficiency's point of view, however, the findings suggest that there is no connection between the reproduction of task-relevant propositional content and the participants' language proficiency levels.

To provide a detailed and organized presentation of the research study, the present dissertation contains eight chapters. Chapter 2 (p. 7) presents the theoretical background of the study. Chapter 3 (p. 51) describes the aspects of the research methodology, such as the detailed description of the research problem itself, the context of the study, the data collection and the data analysis procedures, and the ethical considerations related to the present dissertation study. Chapter 4 (p. 92) and Chapter 5 (p. 217) present the research findings and their discussion respectively. Chapter 6 (p. 231) provides the conclusion, and Chapter 7 (p. 233) discusses the possible pedagogical implications of the present study. Finally, Chapter 8 (p. 238) provides the limitations of the study together with some possible directions for further research.

## 2 Theoretical background

The ability to read requires the contribution of several different factors. These factors are two-fold: reader related factors and material related factors (Sanford & Garrod, 1981). The most important reader related factors are properly functioning perceptive skills (i.e., the ability to see the letters or read them through touch), appropriate cognitive skills (i.e., the mental abilities to memorise information and understand analogies and inferences), being familiar with the code of writing (i.e., language knowledge), appropriate background knowledge (i.e., being familiar with the schemata necessary for understanding the topic and the situation), and a clearly defined reading purpose. The main reading material related factors are perceptibility (i.e., the clarity of the written text and the shape and style of the letters), an adequate and complete coding system, and readability (Sanford & Garrod, 1981). For an overview of the categories, see Figure 1.

Figure 1

### *Factors Influencing Reading Ability*

<b>Reader related factors</b>	<b>Material related factors</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• properly functioning perceptive skills</li><li>• appropriate cognitive skills</li><li>• being familiar with the code of writing</li><li>• appropriate background knowledge</li><li>• a clearly defined reading purpose</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• perceptibility</li><li>• an adequate and complete coding system</li><li>• readability</li></ul>

When investigating the topic of reading comprehension, the aforementioned factors are the main ones which could be taken into consideration. However, the research conducted on the topic of reading comprehension is so vast and multifaceted that covering it in its entirety would be impossible in this dissertation. The texts used for data collection purposes were selected in a way to all adhere to the criteria proposed by the material related factors (i.e., the texts were printed in a clear, easy-to-read format; they were written in grammatically correct English; and their readability indices indicated that the texts used for

data collection were approximately on college level difficulty). Nevertheless, as the dissertation focuses on the reading processes of the participants, the present theoretical overview does not discuss the reading material related factors in detail. This theoretical overview is also restricted to the reading processes of adult learners. It disregards the reading comprehension processes of young learners and how bilingual or monolingual children develop their reading processes in the L2. Research conducted on reading comprehension processes and reading skill development of visually impaired readers is also outside the scope of the present investigation. Furthermore, given that the participants of the study already managed to successfully pass their final school leaving examinations, which contain several tasks measuring their reading comprehension (Oktatási Hivatal [Educational Authority], 2017), it is presumed that they are all fluent readers both in Hungarian (i.e., their L1) and in English (i.e., their L2). It is also presupposed that these participants are all in the possession of the necessary perceptive and cognitive skills to be able to read Hungarian and English texts. Therefore, the present theoretical overview takes the fluent reader as its cornerstone for the discussion of reading comprehension, fluent reading being defined as “multiple tasks being performed at the same time, such as decoding the words, comprehending the information, relating the information to prior knowledge of the subject matter, making inferences, and evaluating the information’s usefulness to a report [the reader is] writing” (Samuels & Flor, 1997, p. 107).

The discussed topics are divided into three main sections: Section 2.1 (p. 9) discusses the reader related factors of reading comprehension, namely reading for different purposes, the processes of reading comprehension, the different reading models, the role of context and background knowledge in reading comprehension, schema theory and the role of schemata in reading comprehension, the differences between L1 and L2 reading

comprehension, and reading strategies; Section 2.2 (p. 45) discusses the different layers of meaning; and finally, Section 2.3 (p. 48) synthesises the previous sections.

## **2.1 Reader related factors of reading comprehension**

Throughout the decades of reading research, the construct of reading comprehension has been defined in several different ways. One way to define it is by stating that reading comprehension means decoding a series of symbols by recognizing the aural counterparts of the written letters and blending them together into words (Cambourne, 1979). To a certain extent, this is accurate; however, this definition restricts the reading process to searching for data in the text, without taking any other aspects of understanding into consideration. If reading comprehension is defined in this restricting way, it appears as a passive act of reciting information presented in the text. It suggests that information is readily present for the readers, and regardless of any other factors, every single reader can receive the same type and amount of information from the same text.

In contrast, reading comprehension can also be defined as a complex cognitive process of decoding symbols and deriving as well as constructing meaning from them (Rowe, Ozuru, & McNamara, 2006), or as an “ability to obtain meaning from written text for some purpose” (Vellutino, 2003, p. 51). The RAND Reading Study Group (2002) defined it as “the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language” (p. 11). An even more recent definition for reading comprehension could be the one proposed by Weir and Khalifa (2008), namely, that reading comprehension is the result of the interaction between the visual information in the text and the reader’s world knowledge. This way, instead of following the traditional approach of seeing reading as a purely passive receptive skill (Cambourne, 1979), reading could be interpreted as an active process of creating meaning through the reader’s constant interaction with the text.

The latter definitions of the construct all have one aspect in common: they consider reading to be a dynamic interaction between the reader and the text. This view suggests that several other key factors, such as the reader's background knowledge are also involved in the reading process, and that the reading process essentially has two components, namely decoding and comprehension. First, readers make sense of the written words, and then they attach meaning to them. In addition, some researchers (e.g., Casanave, 1988; Goodman, 1988; Smith, 1973) considered the existence of a third component, which Casanave (1988) called metacognition. According to Casanave (1988), this third component is responsible for the reader's ability to constantly monitor and regulate their understanding of the text. Goodman's (1988) idea of reading being a 'psycholinguistic guessing game' also suggests a similar approach, where besides decoding and comprehending the text, reading comprehension also involves the reader's attempts to make hypotheses and predictions about the text and their attempts to test these hypotheses. Smith (1973) identified the third component of the reading process as an interaction of the reader's knowledge with the text. Even though all three researchers interpret the third component of reading comprehension slightly differently, all three interpretations imply that the background knowledge of the reader is an essential component of effective reading comprehension. In addition to background knowledge, the process of reading comprehension is also influenced by the reading purpose because readers usually interpret texts with a specific aim in mind, especially in the academic reading context (Grabe, 2009).

Based on the different definitions, it can be concluded that reading comprehension is a complex process, which is influenced by several factors. However, without discussing these factors in detail, no comprehensive and exhaustive definition of reading comprehension can be provided. For this reason, the following sections of the overview examine each one of the factors in detail.

### ***2.1.1 Reading for different purposes***

People read many different texts for various types of reasons every day. For example, they read a book or a magazine for relaxation, they read the news in a newspaper or on the Internet to become informed about the current events of the world, they read advertisements, food labels, text messages, and e-mails as part of their daily activities. Besides these informal contexts, people also regularly read in more formal settings, like in an academic context as part of acquiring a skill, or learning new information, or in a professional context as part of doing their jobs.

In addition to having appropriate reading skills in their L1, people nowadays also usually need to have an appropriate level of reading comprehension in an L2. Besides professionals requiring high L2 language proficiency levels as part of their jobs, many students decide to continue their tertiary education studies in an L2. In these situations, having excellent reading comprehension skills in the L2 in question is crucial because the primary means of gaining access to information is through reading. According to Jordan (1997), in the academic context, reading and writing skills are usually linked because the students encounter tasks such as reading academic books and journals for the purpose of knowledge acquisition or essay writing. For knowledge acquisition and essay writing purposes, students need to take notes on, summarise, and paraphrase the information presented in the text. As Jordan (1997) defined English for Academic Purposes being “concerned with those communication skills in English which are required for study purposes in formal education systems” (p. 1), the present study defines reading for academic purposes as trying to comprehend the content and the language of a text for study purposes. Study purposes contain reading for knowledge acquisition, reading for academic writing purposes (e.g., note taking, summarising, synthesizing, or essay writing), or for the purpose of giving a presentation in a classroom setting. For this reason, students who are reading for

academic purposes try to gather information (e.g., facts and data), understand theories and ideas, understand the point of view of the author, and find evidence to support their own viewpoints from the text (Jordan, 1997). Therefore, the term academic reading, in the present dissertation, contains reading any type of text in the academic context.

According to Grabe (2009), in the academic context, the learning process or task execution necessitates reading with a specific purpose in mind because the information presented in a text has to be interpreted with the aim of the task in mind. Therefore, the way people read a text should be defined by the reading purpose. Grabe (2009) defined six major reading purposes: (1) reading to search for information; (2) reading for quick understanding; (3) reading to learn; (4) reading to integrate information; (5) reading to evaluate, critique, and use information; and (6) reading for general comprehension. When reading to search for information, readers use a combination of scanning and skimming to find specific information in the text. Scanning is used to identify a particular graphic form, while skimming ensures a quick understanding of the general content of the text. Skimming is also utilized when the reader is reading for quick understanding because here the aim is to be able to rapidly decide what the text is about, where its discussion is leading, and which parts are relevant for the reading purpose. Reading to learn is one of the most common reading purposes in the academic context, and it focuses on identifying the most important information in the text and memorizing the main ideas and most of the supporting ideas for future recall and use. Reading to integrate requires the readers to synthesise information from multiple sources, and for this reason they have to create their own organisational framework for structuring the information. In addition, they also have to evaluate the presented – sometimes contradictory – information, and they have to decide which pieces of information and parts of the text to prioritize in order to create a coherent web of information. Reading to evaluate, critique, and use information, similarly to reading to integrate, requires

a more complex reading process where information has to be combined from multiple different sources. The reader has to evaluate and critique information coming from multiple sources, they have to decide which parts of the text are the most important, most controversial or most persuasive, and they have to be able to intertextually relate the information to their prior knowledge. This type of reading requires excellent critical reading skills. Lastly, reading for general comprehension is the most common everyday reading purpose. A good ability to read for general comprehension serves as the foundation for other reading types, and it can be greatly improved both in L1 and L2 by continuous practice over time. This is the reading type which is usually used in the case of reading for interest or reading for entertainment (Grabe, 2009).

Another taxonomy of organising reading purposes is Carver's (2000) taxonomy, which distinguished between reading for rauding, reading for memorising, reading for studying, reading for skimming, and reading for scanning. Out of these, Carver (2000) defined rauding as the typical type of reading which is executed in a situation where the reader has no difficulty comprehending every sentence from the text. He claimed that rauding is the only type of reading where the reader intends to comprehend all the ideas communicated by the author in the text. Reading for memorising and studying are considered to be especially important in the case of difficult texts containing unknown words and they play an essential role in knowledge acquisition. The terms skimming and scanning were used with the same meaning as in Grabe's (2009) taxonomy.

Weir (1993) proposed four different types of readings based on the reading purpose: (1) expeditious reading for global comprehension, (2) expeditious reading for local comprehension, (3) careful reading for global comprehension, and (4) careful reading for local comprehension. In this taxonomy, expeditious reading refers to quick and selective reading where the aim is to locate the necessary information in the text, whereas careful



reading involves the extraction of complete meanings from the text. Both types of readings can happen on a global or a local level where the global level refers to the macrostructure of the meaning and the local level refers to the microstructure (Weir, 1993).

Weir's (1993) taxonomy has been reworked and expanded in Urquhart and Weir (1998). Here the authors distinguished between five different types of reading: (1) skimming, (2) scanning, (3) search reading, (4) careful reading, and (5) browsing. Out of these, skimming and scanning is defined in the same way as they are defined by Grabe (2009), search reading refers to the situation when the reader is looking for information to answer a specific question. It is different from skimming because the reader does not need to understand the gist of the whole text, and it is different from scanning because the reader is not looking for a certain graphic form but for particular key ideas. Careful reading was defined the same way as it was defined by Weir (1993), and its explanation is expanded with the information that in the case of careful reading, the reader follows the organisational framework imposed by the author of the text and tries to build the macrostructure of the text. Lastly, browsing is considered to be a type of reading where the reader does not have a well-defined reading purpose, does not want to build the macrostructure of the text, and may skip random parts of the text (Urquhart & Weir, 1998).

As the above overview shows, there are several different ways to categorise reading based on its purpose, and many of these taxonomies are overlapping and/or contradictory. There are several other taxonomies not presented in this dissertation (e.g., Alderson, 2000; Grabe, 2000; and Linderholm & van den Broek, 2002) because the presented ones already provide evidence for the claim that the way people read is heavily influenced by their reading purpose. As the taxonomies seem to sometimes provide contradictory definitions for the different reading purposes, the present dissertation follows Grabe's (2009) classification of six different reading purposes. This decision was made because Grabe's (2009)

classification is the one that seems to be the most compliant with reading in the academic context.

The influence of the reading purpose on the reading process is also supported by research evidence. For instance, Carver (1990, 1992) argued that readers use different processing methods when reading for different purposes. Lorch, Lorch and Kluzewitz (1993) provided empirical evidence for this. They asked college students to match different reading situations with different reading types. They subjected the data to cluster analysis and found 14 types of distinct reading situations, which students associated with different reading purposes. After this, the researchers met the participants again and asked them to rate each reading situation based on six processing-related variables. The results suggest that different reading situations require the processing variables to varying degrees (Lorch, Lorch & Kluzewitz, 1993).

Linderholm and van den Broek (2002) arrived at similar results when examining high-performing and low-performing college readers. They used the think-aloud method to examine the strategy use of students when reading for entertainment and reading for study purposes. Their findings suggest that students who were reading for study purposes were more engaged in strategy use than those who were reading for entertainment. High-performing readers were able to recall more details from texts in general than low-performing readers; however, both types of readers were able to recall more details when reading for study purposes. This shows that readers adjust their strategy use and their processing based on the reading purpose.

These results and the discussion above demonstrate that reading purpose is an important concept in research on reading comprehension. Readers who engage with a text for various purposes utilize cognitive processes in different orders and in different

combinations. For this reason, the following section discusses the different types of cognitive processes underlying reading comprehension.

### ***2.1.2 The processes of reading comprehension***

As the first step of the discussion of processes involved in reading comprehension, two terms commonly used in reading research should be clarified: reading skills and reading strategies. The two terms are often defined by the literature in many different and contradictory ways. In the advent of reading research, reading skills were defined as acquired and automatized abilities which enable the reader to extract information from the text and carry out the reading process (Olshavasky, 1977). This view suggested that the activation of reading skills happens in a mostly automatic way and it is, therefore, a subconscious process. Researchers of reading comprehension often attempted to develop lists of reading skills and subskills. One of the earliest taxonomies was Davis's (1968, as cited in Alderson, 2000, pp. 9–10) taxonomy, which claimed the existence of eight reading skills:

1. recalling word meaning
  2. drawing inferences about the meaning of a word in context
  3. finding answers to questions answered explicitly or in paraphrase
  4. weaving ideas together in the content
  5. drawing inferences from the content
  6. recognising a writer's purpose, attitude, tone and mood
  7. identifying a writer's technique
  8. following the structure of a passage
- (Davis, 1968, as cited in Alderson, 2000, pp. 9–10).

Another highly influential taxonomy of the era was Munby's taxonomy of reading microskills (1978), which had a great influence on second language education and testing (Alderson, 2000). Munby (1978, as cited in Alderson, 2000, pp. 10–11) distinguished 19 different reading skills necessary for reading comprehension:

1. recognizing the script of a language
2. deducing the meaning and use of unfamiliar lexical items
3. understanding explicitly stated information

4. understanding explicitly information when not explicitly stated
5. understanding conceptual meaning
6. understanding the communicative value (function) of sentences and utterances
7. understanding relations within sentences
8. understanding relations between the parts of a text through lexical cohesion devices
9. understanding cohesion between parts of a text through grammatical cohesion devices
10. interpreting text by going outside it
11. recognizing indicators in discourse
12. identifying the main point or important information in a piece of discourse
13. distinguishing the main idea from supporting details
14. extracting salient points to summarize (the text, main idea, etc.)
15. selective extraction or relevant points from a text
16. basic reference skills
17. skimming
18. scanning to locate specifically required information
19. transcending information to diagrammatic display  
(Munby, 1978, as cited in Alderson, 2000, pp. 10-11).

Even though both taxonomies attempted to provide a detailed account of the skills involved in reading comprehension, Matthews (1990) heavily criticised them because of their incomplete representation of the reading process. Matthews (1990) also claimed that Munby's (1978, as cited in Alderson, 2000, pp. 10–11) taxonomy did not only contain reading skills, but it also randomly included reading strategies and elements of knowledge. Taking Olshavasky's (1977) definition of reading skills into consideration, Matthews's criticism appears to be justified because several of the items in the taxonomy seem to lean more towards consciously executed strategies than towards subconscious and automatized actions.

When the term first appeared in the 1970's, strategies were introduced as the opposite of skill-based reading (Alexander & Jetton, 2000). Strategies were considered to be "the mental operations when readers approach a text effectively and make sense of what they read" (Barnett, 1988, p. 150). They were usually divided into two types: cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies. Cognitive strategies referred to the mostly subconscious, on-going mental processes and actions participants engage in so as to solve the task, using their language skills and knowledge of the world (Bachman & Palmer, 2010); and

metacognition referred to a series of conscious processes used by the participants in order to successfully accomplish cognitive goals (Phakiti, 2003). Therefore, metacognitive strategies referred to actions that were considered to be conscious, deliberate, and fully intentional, and typically used for planning and monitoring one's own task execution (Flavell, 1971).

These definitions of reading skills and reading strategies are problematic because they do not make a clear distinction between skills and strategies. They are especially problematic regarding distinguishing between cognitive strategies and skills because both of them seem to be subconscious automatized processes of text comprehension. According to Grabe and Stoller (2013), claiming that strategies are necessarily conscious actions is also erroneous because such abilities which are usually considered to be strategies, for example, dealing with unknown words in a text, are automatized processes for fluent readers. Paris, Wasik, and Turner's view (1991) also appears to support this idea. They claimed that the same actions can both be considered as skills and strategies. Whether an action is a skill or a strategy is decided by the reader's level of awareness, degree of control, and the reading situation. Furthermore, according to Grabe and Stoller (2013), many reading skills a reader has were initially acquired as reading strategies, but they became automatized.

Taking these perspectives into consideration, the present dissertation accepts the views of Paris, Wasik, and Turner (1991) and of Grabe and Stoller (2013), and uses the following definitions for the two terms in question:

1. **Reading skills:** "linguistic processing abilities that are relatively automatic in their use and their combinations (e.g., word recognition, syntactic processing)" (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 8).
2. **Reading strategies:** "abilities that are potentially open to conscious reflection and reflect a reader's intention to address a problem or a specific goal while reading" (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 10).

In the light of these definitions, the reading processes involved in reading comprehension contain those skills, strategies, and mental processes which are available for

the reader. According to Grabe and Stoller (2013), there are 10 features which characterise the processes involved in reading comprehension: (1) a rapid process, (2) an efficient process, (3) an interactive process, (4) a strategic process, (5) a flexible process, (6) an evaluating process, (7) a purposeful process, (8) a comprehending process, (9) a learning process, and (10) a linguistic process. This means that fluent readers are reading rapidly (i.e., fluent L1 readers can read 200-300 words/minute) unless they encounter a text with new information they attempt to learn. Efficient reading means that the reading comprehension processes are appropriately coordinated and some of them are automatized. Furthermore, reading is also interactive because the various reading processes happen simultaneously, and the linguistic information extracted from the text is in constant interaction with the reader's background knowledge. Reading is also a strategic process, where the reader has to recognise and account for the comprehension difficulties, mentally organise the information extracted from the text, adjust the reading goal if necessary, and monitor the comprehension process. For this reason, reading also has to be flexible because the reader has to continuously adjust the processes to keep them in an alignment with the reading purposes. Reading also always involves constant evaluation on the part of the readers because they have to assess whether the information presented in the text matches their reading purpose. Moreover, comprehension is a key notion in reading as it tends to be the central goal of reading. In addition, reading is a learning process especially in the academic context, where reading is the most basic way of learning new information. Lastly, reading should be considered as an essentially linguistic process because understanding a text necessitates possessing the knowledge of the language of the text (Grabe & Stoller, 2013).

The discussion so far has illustrated that reading comprehension is a highly complex process. The ways people read are influenced by several factors such as the reading purpose, the reader's language knowledge, or their background knowledge. However, researchers

seem to agree that there are a set of reading processes which are always activated during reading (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2013). According to Grabe (2009) and Grabe and Stoller (2013), these reading processes take place in the working memory, and they can be divided into lower-level processes and higher-level processes.

Working memory can be defined as “the network of information and related processes that are being used at a given moment” (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 13). Working memory is usually discussed in contrast with long-term memory, which can be defined as “the total set of permanent records of our experiences and our efforts to understand our environment” (Grabe, 2009, p. 32). According to Kintsch, Patel and Ericksson (1999), working memory is a system which has a limited storage capacity, and it can activate information for one or two seconds. However, if necessary, information can be reactivated or kept active longer with mental rehearsal. The lower- and higher-level processes of reading comprehension are activated in the working memory (Kintsch, Patel & Ericksson, 1999).

According to Grabe and Stoller (2013), the lower-level processes are word recognition, syntactic parsing, and semantic proposition formation; whereas higher-level processes are the text model of comprehension, the situation model of reader interpretation, background knowledge use and inferencing, and executive control processes. Researchers (e.g., Adams, 1990; Perfetti, 1999; Pressley, 2006; Stanovich, 2000) seem to agree that word recognition can provide predictions about one’s reading abilities, and it is an essential part of reading comprehension because successful reading comprehension cannot occur without the ability of quick and automatic word recognition. Word recognition involves the rapid recognition of word forms, the activation of the link between the graphic and the phonological form, the recognition of the morphological features of the word, and accessing the mental lexicon (Perfetti & Hart, 2001). Word recognition is heavily influenced by the

context of the word, especially in the cases of recognition difficulties or unknown words (Perfetti & Hart, 2001; Stanovich, 2000).

As far as syntactic parsing is concerned, according to Perfetti (1999), similarly to word recognition, it is an automatic subconscious process and it involves accessing the grammatical information in order to create close level meaning. With the help of syntactic parsing, the reader can recognise phrases, word orders, and relationships among clauses. It also helps the reader understand anaphoric and cataphoric references (Perfetti, 1999).

Another automatic subconscious process is semantic proposition formation, which occurs simultaneously with word recognition and syntactic parsing, and it is responsible for building the semantic propositions based on the words and structures extracted through word recognition and syntactic parsing (Fender, 2001). These semantic propositions contain the key information provided by the input, and they also show how these elements (i.e., word and structure) relate to each other. Textual meaning is created by understanding how the propositions are connected to each other (Perfetti & Britt, 1995). Word recognition, syntactic parsing, and semantic proposition formation are considered to be lower-level processes not because they are easier to perform than the higher-level processes, but because they are usually carried out automatically by fluent readers without requiring any conscious attention most of the time. Because of this automaticity, it is also usually difficult for readers to become conscious about these processes and to reflect on them (Grabe & Stoller, 2013).

Higher-level processes, similarly to the lower-level ones, can occur in an automatized way unless comprehension difficulties arise. These processes are more easily accessible for conscious examination, and they are more easily monitored and manipulated by the reader than the lower-level comprehension processes. According to Pressley (2006), during the text model of reading comprehension, the main ideas and the supporting ideas in a text are recognised, and this way the reader builds their understanding of a text. Essentially,



it involves the understanding of the gist of the text (Pressley, 2006). Parallely to this process, the situation model of reader interpretation is built based on the emerging text model. The role of the situation model is to integrate the information in the text with the reader's background knowledge, and to interpret the new information with respect to the reading goal, the aim of the task, and the background knowledge of the reader (Kintsch, 1998). The role of background knowledge and inferencing is that they help the reader make the meaning transition from clause-level to text level (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). Finally, executive control processing is a monitoring process, where the reader assesses and evaluates the focus of their attention and the success of their understanding (Styles, 2006).

### ***2.1.3 Reading models***

The processes presented in the previous section prove that reading comprehension is a highly intricate process, which supposedly involves the interaction of several components. In order to visualize and illustrate the reading comprehension process, reading comprehension models have been hypothesised (e.g., Coady, 1979; Goodman, 1967; Gough, 1972; Hoover & Tunmer, 1993; Kintsch, 1988; Weir & Khalifa, 2008). Most models attempting to illustrate reading comprehension can be divided into two main categories, namely componential models and process models. The following sections provide a general overview of the different types of reading models.

#### ***2.1.3.1 Componential models of reading***

Since the late 1960s, there has been an interest in exploring and defining the construct of reading comprehension for teaching and testing purposes. Attempting to describe the components that play a role in the reading process has been one of the major trends in reading research. Componential models aim to describe the components underlying reading comprehension without discussing the interaction between these components or how their interaction develops or changes over time. Such models try to describe the constituents of

the reading ability instead of the reading process (Hoover & Tunmer, 1993). Componential models can be divided into two categories: two-component models and three-component models.

Two-component models state that reading comprehension is the compound of word recognition and linguistic comprehension. One of the most notable two-component models is the Simple View of Reading by Hoover and Tunmer (1993). This model is preferred by researchers of reading comprehension because it was created based on evidence from two main sources. Firstly, Hoover and Tunmer (1993) provide evidence for their model from the data collected from disabled readers. For instance, dyslexic readers have adequate linguistic competence; however, they have problems with decoding. On the contrary, hyperlexic people usually have good decoding skills but they struggle with the linguistic comprehension component of reading. Both types of readers have problems with reading comprehension, which suggests that deficiencies in either component results in reading comprehension difficulties (Hoover & Tunmer, 1993). Secondly, statistical evidence also seems to support the Simple View of Reading comprehension because Stanovich, Cunningham and Feeman (1984) found that in the case of fifth grade students when removing the effects of non-verbal intelligence, 38% of variance in reading comprehension was accounted for by decoding and 13% by linguistic comprehension. These pieces of research evidence suggest that decoding and linguistic comprehension are indeed two separable components which contribute to reading comprehension to different degrees.

Despite the fact that the supporters of the two-component models managed to provide some indirect evidence to support their theories, these models have been criticized because of their terminological ambiguity. Urquhart and Weir (1998) argued that the definitions of the term decoding and word recognition, which are usually used interchangeably when writing about these models, are not adequately defined.

Compared to the two-component reading models, the three-component models offer a slightly different, more complex view of the reading process. The two most notable examples of three-component models are Coady's (1979) comprehension model and Bernhardt's (1991) reading model. Both models work with three variables, and they attempt to describe the comprehension of L2 speakers. However, there are slight differences between the components they propose. Coady's (1979) model divides comprehension into the following components: conceptual abilities, process strategies, and background knowledge.

In comparison, Bernhardt's (1991) reading model contains language, literacy, and world knowledge as its components. World knowledge here is almost the same as Coady's (1979) background knowledge; whereas language means the linguistic knowledge of lexis, morphology and syntax. Literacy is a new element, which was not present in the previous models, and it refers to the knowledge of how to approach a text when having a specific purpose for it. Urquhart and Weir (1998) criticized this component for not being testable. However, the ability to work with certain types of texts introduces a new dimension into componential reading models. It can be considered as the acknowledgment of the importance of having the appropriate text schema. This way, this three-component reading model becomes more suitable for accommodating one of the most important elements of successful reading for a specific purpose, namely, having the appropriate reading strategies.

Even though the three-component models offer a promising beginning for describing what reading comprehension involves both on a lower lexical and on a higher conceptual level, componential reading models still have one weakness in common: they can only describe the components of reading comprehension, but not the actual reading comprehension process.

### *2.1.3.2 Process models of reading*

In comparison with the componential models, process models of reading focus on the course of actions happening during reading. Some models present these actions as a sequence, where every single process has to finish before the next one can start, or as parallel actions, where the processes happen simultaneously. Nevertheless, all process models agree on one aspect: they want to go beyond exploring the components of reading comprehension; they want to organize these components into a series of events. When it comes to categorizing process models of reading, three different models can be defined, namely, bottom-up process models, top-down process models, and interactive process models (Urquhart & Weir, 1998).

According to bottom-up reading models, when readers encounter a text, they start processing it from the smallest parts of the text up, namely, in order of orthography, phonology, lexis, syntax, and sentence meaning (Urquhart & Weir, 1998). These processes can happen sequentially or parallelly.

The most notable example of a bottom-up reading model is Gough's (1972) model. This process model suggests that reading is text-driven, and the reader is supposed to process every single word of a text letter by letter (Gough, 1972). The components of Gough's (1972) model are the scanner, the decoder, the librarian, the lexicon, and the Merlin. The reading comprehension process starts by the readers recognising the letters with the help of the scanner. After that, the recognised letters are converted into a string of systematic phonemes by the decoder. Then, the word matching the string of phonemes is recognised by the librarian and the lexicon. The readers process all words in a sentence in this way and then proceed to assigning meaning to the sentence with the help of Merlin, which can recognise the syntactic and semantic rules necessary to understand the sentence. As Gough's

model is a reading-aloud model, the last component is the vocal system, which helps the readers utter the text orally (Gough, 1972).

Gough's (1972) original model seems to suggest that letters are fed into the scanner one-by-one which would theoretically imply that recognising a word takes longer than recognising a single letter. However, research conducted by Rayner and Pollatsek (1989) suggests that this is not true, and letters are not processed one-by-one but parallelly. In addition, Kolers (1968) found that bilingual readers reading a mixed language text pronounce all words according to the ways of the predominant text language. He brings the example of the French word 'murs' being pronounced 'moors' in a predominantly English text. This supports the idea that reading comprehension is not unidirectional and higher-level information can be used in word recognition (Kolers, 1968).

Traditionally, top-down processing models used to be presented as the opposites of the bottom-up approach. However, this is not necessarily true. In reality, the top-down approach means that text processing is reader-driven instead of data-driven (Urquhart & Weir, 1998). Top-down reading models propose that the readers starts processing the text with expectations and hypotheses in their mind.

Goodman (1967) is the most frequently associated researcher with the top-down approach; however, as he himself was opposed to this association, a more appropriate representative would be Smith (1971, 1973). The top-down reading approach hypothesises that the reading process is driven by meaning, and it has a whole-to-part direction. The emphasis is on what the reader brings to the text, and the aim of reading is essentially to bring meaning to print (Smith, 1971, 1973). The top-down approach suggest that readers are able to understand a section of a text even if they do not recognise all words in it because the processing of the text is driven by the reader's prior experiences and expectations (Urquhart & Weir, 1998).

This view of reading comprehension seems to be a logical approach. However, research suggests that the top-down approach does not explain the reading process in its whole either. Rayner and Pollatsek's (1989) eye-movement tracking experiments seem to contradict the idea that the reader skips large chunks of the text. Furthermore, if the top-down approach were entirely correct then there should be a significant difference in the context use of skilled and unskilled readers; namely, that unskilled readers would not rely on the context at all. Instead, research shows that skilled and unskilled readers both draw on context; the difference lies in the ability to decode information quickly (Nicholson, 1993; Perfetti, Goldman, & Hogaboam, 1979). Another criticism that can be brought against accepting the top-down approach as a fully accurate description of the reading processes is that most of these models were created based on data collected from native speakers of English; therefore, they do not take the L2 speaker into account.

The third type of the process models are the interactive models. They envisage the reading comprehension process not as a sequence of actions where one action finishes before the next one starts, but as a parallel interaction of the components (Urquhart & Weir, 1998). One of the first interactive models was Rumelhart's model (1977), where the components of reading comprehension are the Visual Information Store, the Feature Extraction Device, the Pattern Synthesiser, the Syntactical Knowledge, the Semantic Knowledge, the Lexical Knowledge, and the Orthographic Knowledge. These components were hypothesised to operate at the same time (Rumelhart, 1977).

Despite the fact that he is usually considered to be a proponent of the top-down approach, Goodman (1967) himself rejected this association as already mentioned above, and considered his Psycholinguistic Guessing Game model an interactive reading model. Goodman (1967) suggested that first the readers scan the text and fixate at a point; then they identify graphic information which will be influenced by their language knowledge,

strategies, and prior hypotheses; and lastly, the word is identified by tentative guessing, based on both textual information and expectations. However, this model has been criticised by Grabe (2009) because of the lack of supporting evidence and the amount of existing counter-evidence. There is no evidence that trying to guess the meaning of words facilitate the improvement of fluent reading (Grabe, 2009). Furthermore, the analysis of fluent readers' eye movement suggests that eye movement in fluent reading is constrained and automatic, so the readers are probably not sampling the text during fluent reading (Rayner, Juhász & Pollatsek, 2005).

Stanovich's (1980) Interactive-Compensatory model assumes that there are two core processes interacting in reading comprehension: an automatic activation process and a conscious attention mechanism. This view suggests that weaknesses in some skills or areas of knowledge can be compensated for by the reader's strengths in other areas. If one comprehension process becomes less efficient, another process starts to compensate for it so the comprehension process can continue. For instance, if the reader cannot recognize some words and the word recognition slows down, the word-recognition process starts to incorporate information from the context to enhance the comprehension process (Stanovich, 1980). The same idea was also proposed by Alderson and Urquhart (1985), when they presupposed that in some cases the reader's background knowledge can compensate for insufficient language skills. Such an approach to reading comprehension seems logical and generally supported by researchers; however, the main criticism against it is that it can only explain the results of reading experiments retrospectively, but it cannot predict them (Rayner & Pollatsek, 1989).

Another interactive model from the 1980's is Kintsch's (1988) Construction-Integration Model. This model was derived from the results of propositional analyses (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983), and it proposed that recognizing

overlapping connections among propositions is at the core of comprehension, and that the interpretation of a text necessitates the integration of summarising processes. Comprehension was hypothesised to be a combination of an automatic bottom-up processing and a restructuring process. In the construction component, the reader overgeneralizes information with the help of the lower-order processes, and during the integration process, this information is consolidated into a coherent representation of the text, where the weakly activated irrelevant information is deleted. The primary aim of this model was to understand the nature of comprehension (Kintsch, 1988).

Lastly, one of the more recent interactive processing models is Weir and Khalifa's (2008) cognitive model of reading, which has three major components of reading comprehension, namely the goal setter, the processing core, and the monitor. As the first step of the reading comprehension process, the goal setter decides what type of reading will be applied according to the purpose of the reading activity. Based on the purpose, the reading process will be either expeditious or careful, and it will take place on a local or a global level. Expeditious reading involves a selective type of reading, where the goal is to quickly and efficiently find the required information in the text; whereas in the case of careful reading, the intention is to extract the full meaning of all the information presented in the text.

Weir and Khalifa's (2008) model suggests that reading comprehension is a highly intricate process, and to execute the three steps (i.e., goal setting, central processing, and monitoring) of reading comprehension, certain reading sub-skills are required. Based on Urquhart and Weir (1998), these reading sub-skills are the following: skimming, scanning, search reading, careful reading, and browsing. In order to be able to successfully extract the necessary information from a text, the reader has to successfully apply the appropriate reading strategies (Weir & Khalifa, 2008).



Despite the fact that all interactive models describe the reading comprehension processes differently, they all seem to agree that the reading process always involves a combination of bottom-up and top-down processing. Top-down processing engages the world knowledge of the reader, whereas bottom-up processing engages the linguistic knowledge (e.g., orthographic, phonological, lexical and syntactic) (Anderson, 1977). Besides the readers' linguistic and world knowledge, context also has a notable influence on reading comprehension. According to Stanovich (1980), skilled and unskilled readers use context differently. While unskilled readers mostly rely on top-down processing and contextual clues in their reading comprehension, skilled readers only use context to enrich their understanding instead of complementing incomplete information and compensating for a lack of lexical access. However, the view that is currently accepted on the issue is that every reader uses both top-down and bottom-up processing simultaneously to establish the meaning of a text (Weir & Khalifa, 2008).

#### ***2.1.4 The role of context and background knowledge in reading comprehension***

The discussion of the different reading models indicates that the context and the reader's background knowledge play crucial roles in reading comprehension. According to Grabe (2009), the role context plays in reading comprehension is often undervalued in the literature, and it is simply presented as an aid for guessing the meanings of words. However, its role is far more complex than that because it has a multi-faceted influence on comprehension.

Firstly, context has a key role in the reader's ability to build the text model of comprehension and the situation model of interpretation. It helps the reader integrate new propositions into the text model of comprehension by linking prior and current propositions through inferencing. It also aids the adjustment of reading goals and the comprehension monitoring processes (Grabe, 2009). Secondly, context facilitates semantic priming by

relating the newly encountered ideas and meanings to the background knowledge of the reader (Stanovich, 2000). Thirdly, context helps the reader choose the most suitable meaning of a word. According to Gernsbacher (1997), during word recognition, initially all known meanings of a word are activated, and it is the context that helps exclude the contextually inappropriate meanings. Finally, good readers and poor readers appear to use context differently in reading comprehension. Good readers do not seem to rely on contextual information for word recognition in the case of words they already know. This claim is supported by the findings of several experiments which claim that the recognition of the meaning of known words happens quickly and even before the contextual facilitation of the recognition could begin (Morris, 2006; Perfetti, 1994, 1999; Rayner & Pollatsek, 1989). In contrast, poor readers gain a greater benefit from contextual information in word recognition because the contextual information can compensate for the lack of familiarity with the meaning of some words in the text (Perfetti, 1994; Stanovich, 2000).

Similarly to the context, background knowledge is also a primary factor in reading comprehension processes. It is thought to be in constant interaction with the other reading processes, so it cannot be handled as a simple uniform factor (Perfetti, Marron & Foltz, 1996). It can be separated into four sub-categories, namely, general knowledge of the world, cultural knowledge, topical knowledge, and specialist expertise knowledge (Grabe, 2009). According to Grabe (2009), readers who are in the possession of greater background knowledge on the topic of a text read that text in a different and more efficient way because they can make judgements, connections, and inferences more effectively than those readers who have less background knowledge on the topic. Additionally to having domain specific background knowledge, familiarity with the cultural background also has an influence on reading comprehension. Studies conducted on the topic established that stories which are culturally unfamiliar are more difficult to understand than culturally familiar ones, and, in

many cases the reading comprehension of L2 readers could be greatly facilitated by providing cultural background information related to the reading material (Alderson, 2000; Floyd & Carrell, 1987; Hudson, 2007; Johnson, 1981; Steffenson, Joagh-Dev & Anderson, 1979).

Regarding the effects of background knowledge on reading comprehension, research has suggested that in some cases it can also have a negative influence. For instance, Rapp, van den Broek, McMaster, Kendeou and Espin (2007) found that in many cases, poor readers activate inappropriate background knowledge and make wrong inferences about the text. Furthermore, L1 reading researchers found that background knowledge does not play an important role in reading comprehension in the texts which do not require any specific specialist or cultural knowledge. In contrast, some L2 reading research papers appear to suggest that background knowledge definitely has some effect on reading comprehension; however, it works in such close connection with other reading processes (e.g., reading strategies) that the exact degree of its effect on reading comprehension is difficult to measure (Carrel & Wise, 1998; Pritchard, 1990).

### ***2.1.5 Schema theory and the role of schemata in reading comprehension***

Related to background knowledge, the concepts of categorisation, conceptualisation, and schema should also be explored. According to Ellis (2005), as readers accumulate more and more background knowledge from their experiences, they start to categorise and conceptualise the repeatedly encountered information. These categories have an impact on the readers' ability to make inferences, build the interpretation of the text, and learn new information (Ellis, 2005; Kintsch, 1998).

These categories and conceptualisations are very often discussed in connection with schema theory. Schemata are usually defined as “building blocks of cognition” (Rumelhart, 1980, p. 33), and they contain sets of categories and rules related to a particular event or

field (Johns, 1988). The term itself originates from cognitive psychology, and it was first proposed by Kant (1781).

Kant (1781) suggested that relating new information to something that the individual is already familiar with is needed for new information to make sense for the individual. In the 20th century, Bartlett (1932) re-introduced the term, and re-defined it as being the reflection of a person's past experiences. Alderson (2000) defined schemata as "interlocking mental structures representing readers' knowledge" (p. 33). Schemata influence both information recognition and information storage (Alderson, 2000).

With the help of activating existing schema, it is presupposed that readers can decode and comprehend new situations more time efficiently. However, according to Widdowson (1983), the effect of schema on reading comprehension goes beyond the initial comprehension processes. He claimed that schemata are "cognitive constructs which allow for the organisation of information in long-term memory" (Widdowson, 1983, p. 34). This is enabled by the ability of schemata to embed into each other. As a result of embedding, a dominant schema emerges which can hold an infinite number of sub-schemata related to the dominant schemata to a certain extent. Schemata are thought to be organised into scripts, which are event sequences describing concepts, things and events belonging to a schema and the relationships and possible interactions between them. This type of organisation is considered to help the recipient comprehend a situation more easily and to memorise new information in a more effective way by assimilating the new information into the already existing parts of the schema (Nist & Mealey, 1991; Widdowson, 1983). This approach suggests that schematic structures are essentially similar to maps and blueprints, and they include a set of fixed categories and rules of formation. This way, during text comprehension readers sub-consciously relate new information to their existing schemata.

The role of schema in text comprehension has been formalised under the concept of schema theory, which was proposed by Bartlett (1932). Schema theory was a predominant theory explaining the role of background knowledge in reading in the 1980s and in the 1990s, and it assumed that the text itself did not include the complete meaning. Instead, it was believed that the text only contained linguistic and contextual cues used to activate the appropriate schemata. The reader was thought to create a coherent text interpretation based on this. Schemata were imagined to create knowledge networks which were built up in a hierarchical structure, from specific schemata on the bottom to more general ones on the top. During activation, the schemata are activated in a bottom-up direction (Rummelhart, 1980). Furthermore, Brown (2001) also claimed that meaning in a text is created by the schemata of the reader and is not included in the text itself, so misunderstanding a text is often caused by lacking the necessary schemata.

Despite its popularity in the 1980s and in the 1990s, schema theory has been criticised for several reasons. First of all, Paivio (2007) claimed that the concept of schema theory was very vague and ambiguous, and it was unable to provide testable predictions. Furthermore, Paivio (2007) and other researchers also pointed out that terms related to the schema theory have several different interpretations and definitions, and that imagining a fixed mental representation which always defines the same relations between ideas is a very limiting and probably unsupportable representation (Kintsch, 1998; Nassaji, 2002; Rayner & Pollatsek, 1989; Paivio, 2007). Kintsch (1998) specifically pointed out that comprehension is always context-sensitive and flexible, so schema theory presents such a fixed view on the comprehension process which is highly unlikely. In addition, Perfetti (1986) claimed that schema theory cannot adequately account for general reading ability because each reader has different knowledge structures.

Logan's (1997, 2002) Instance Theory of Automaticity and Kintsch's (1988, 1998) Construction-Integration Model are some examples of theories proposed as better alternatives for the representation of memory retrieval. Logan (1997, 2002) suggested that mental representations emerge from the combination of past experiences and repeatedly met input. This way, during comprehension, the reader is considered to retrieve the strongest or the most recent versions of past memories. Empirical research conducted on Logan's (1997, 2002) theory suggested that this theory appears to be a slightly better representation of memory activation than schema theory (Hampton, 1997; Medin & Ross, 1989). On the other hand, Kintsch's (1988, 1998) Construction-Integration Model, which is already discussed in more detail in Section 2.1.3.2, presents schemata as flexible and variable knowledge networks which are activated by the information being processed in the working memory. During comprehension, sets of knowledge are activated as loose knowledge nets, and the most relevant information is selected to aid the comprehension (Kintsch, 1988, 1998).

In conclusion, according to Grabe (2009), schema theory should be handled as more of a metaphorical explanation of the role of background knowledge in comprehension because the current views of researchers assume it to be an overly fixed structure. For this reason, its existence should be acknowledged, but it should not be used as a corner-stone of building reading comprehension trainings in the L1 or L2 context, and the ways background knowledge and text information can be connected with instruction should be explored more carefully (Grabe, 2009).

#### ***2.1.6 L1 and L2 reading comprehension***

When discussing reading comprehension, the possible differences between L1 and L2 reading should be taken into consideration. Both in the L1 and L2 context extensive research has been carried out on reading comprehension. The aim of this section is to summarise those findings in the topic which are relevant for the present research study.

The first main research topic regarding the differences between L1 and L2 readers is related to the linguistic and processing problems they encounter during reading. One of the main differences between L1 and L2 readers is that they do not begin learning to read from the same starting point. According to Finegan (2008), by the time a child in the USA starts learning to read at the age of six, they already have a solid knowledge of the basic English grammatical structures. In addition, according to Cunningham (2005), they also already know approximately 6000 English words at that point. Therefore, in such a context, techniques like sounding out a word can be beneficial because the student is likely to already know the articulated form of the word that they are trying to read out (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). In contrast, L2 readers usually begin to learn at the same time as they begin to build their vocabulary and grammar knowledge, so sounding out a word does not help them in matching it to its meaning. As they still lack the basic grammatical and discourse knowledge when they start learning to read, L2 readers need a foundation first about the basics of text structure and text organisation in the L2 (Alderson, 2000; Khalifa & Weir, 2009).

As a result of their early exposure to information about discourse structure, L2 readers develop a higher awareness of their reading processes than their L1 reader peers, who subconsciously rely on their inherent knowledge of their L1 (Koda, 2008). This conscious attention to the language and the structures results in high metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness in L2 readers (Koda, 2008). Therefore, L2 readers can become consciously aware of their reading processes more easily than L1 readers (Grabe & Stoller, 2013).

Taking the level of language proficiency into consideration is also an important part of L2 reading research. According to the Short-Circuit Hypothesis (Clarke, 1988), the L2 reader must reach a certain language proficiency level in the L2 to be able to effectively use those reading strategies and skills which form part of their reading abilities in their L1. This

language proficiency level is called the ‘threshold’. This hypothesis suggests that at least up to a certain language proficiency level the lack of necessary linguistic knowledge cannot be compensated for with high L1 reading ability and knowledge of efficient reading strategies in the L1 (Pichette, Segalowitz & Connors, 2003; Yamashita, 2002). Researchers could not agree about the exact amount of L2 language knowledge necessary for passing the threshold, and the most widely accepted idea is that this threshold is different depending on several factors, such as the topic and the difficulty of the text, or the reading task itself (Alderson, 2000).

An L2 reading research area closely related to the Short-Circuit Hypothesis (Clarke, 1988) investigates transfer. The idea of transfer is usually defined in L2 reading as the reader using their knowledge and experience in L1 reading to solve L2 reading tasks (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). The effects of transfer can be both negative and positive. In the negative cases transfer of the L1 background knowledge, reading purposes, and metacognitive knowledge (e.g., strategies, attitudes, motivation and inferences) can negatively affect the L2 reading task execution. Transfer is assumed to mostly cause interference on lower language proficiency levels where the L2 reader does not have a substantial amount of language knowledge and they have to rely on their L1 reading abilities.

The transfer of basic L1 reading purposes can have especially detrimental consequences in the L2 academic context because this setting might require substantially different reading purposes than the students’ previous L1 reading experiences (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). In order to minimize the interfering effects of such a transfer, research suggests that students need to explore many different L2 reading goals and to learn the appropriate strategies for L2 reading task execution. It is also important to help them link the information presented in the text to their own background knowledge (Koda, 2007).



On the other hand, transfer can also have a positive effect on L2 reading comprehension. In the case of students who have highly developed L1 reading competence, the transfer of effective reading skills and strategies, awareness about comprehension monitoring processes, and appropriate reading purposes can accelerate the development and improvement of L2 reading abilities, especially when receiving explicit instruction on L2 reading comprehension processes. Therefore, examining the students' L1 reading skills might be beneficial at the beginning of L2 reading courses (Grabe & Stoller, 2013; Koda, 2007). According to Koda (2007), L1 transfer automatically activates in the case of L2 readers. Therefore, L2 reading is always influenced by the interaction of two languages, which is also a crucial difference between L1 and L2 reading.

The unequal amount of exposure to the target language material also differentiates L2 readers from L1 readers. According to Koda (2005) and Lundberg (1999), a problem which should be addressed in the case of the L2 readers is that they do not have enough exposure to reading material in the L2 to be able to build a large enough vocabulary for fluent and automatized L2 reading processes. For this reason, addressing this issue should be a core component of L2 reading comprehension trainings. In addition, the types of texts L1 and L2 readers are exposed to might also notably differ from each other. According to Grabe and Stoller (2013), L2 readers usually encounter shorter and less difficult texts during their studies as their L1 counterparts with similar cognitive ability levels. This is because L2 course books often include shorter and less difficult materials even when those are authentic texts. Furthermore, there are several genres L2 students are not exposed to often because many of these genres are read by the L1 students outside the educational context. According to Gardner (2004), this can lead to limited exposure to new vocabulary and the lack of familiarity with several L2 genres.

The lack of familiarity with certain genres can also put L2 readers at a disadvantage regarding the organisation of discourse and the organisation of different text types. As every language has its own conventions for structuring arguments, presenting ideas, and ways of developing an idea, the organisation of the L2 text might not match the L2 readers' expectations and L1 reading experiences. According to researchers of intercultural rhetoric (Connor, Nagelhout & Rozycki, 2008; Hudson, 2007; Kaplan, 2005), the main points of difference in text organisation that can influence the understanding of L2 texts are the expressions of interpersonal relations between the author and the reader in the text (e.g., using personal pronouns), how and where new information appears in the text (e.g., nominalisations), and the degree of reader-friendliness of the text (e.g., the amount of elaborative details). Therefore, making L2 readers aware of the discourse organisation of texts in the L2 can be highly beneficial.

Lastly, there might be another socio-cultural aspect of L1 and L2 reader differences, namely the potentially different requirements and expectations of the L1 and L2 educational contexts. These differences can be present in the national curricula, student-teacher relationships, aspects of the classroom management, or in the national exams among many others. If the student brings a resistant attitude towards these possible differences, they might not be able to make the necessary changes required for succeeding in the L2 context, and this can even lead to unexpected reading difficulties (Fairbanks, Cooper, Masterson & Webb, 2009; Hanley, Tzeng & Huang, 1999; Ogbu & Simmons, 1998).

Taking the differences presented above into consideration, it can be concluded that the training of L2 readers has to involve different learning goals and different instruction than that of the L1 readers. Such training should take into consideration that L2 reading comprehension always happens through incorporating two languages, and that L1 transfer seems to be inevitable, so developing effective L2 reading skills and strategies should be

based on the already existing L1 reading abilities. Therefore, L2 reading instruction should probably take a different approach than reading instruction in the L1 context.

### ***2.1.7 Reading strategies***

As it has already been stipulated in Section 2.1.2, the present dissertation defines reading strategies as “abilities that are potentially open to conscious reflection and reflect a reader’s intention to address a problem or a specific goal while reading” (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 10). Based on research conducted on the topic, effective reading strategy use is a necessary characteristic of good readers both in the L1 and L2 context (Anderson, 1991; Cohen, 1998; Guthrie & Taboada, 2004; Hudson, 2007; Phakiti, 2003; Pressley, 2006). According to Grabe (2009), eight effective, empirically supported reading comprehension strategies can be distilled from the approximately five decades of reading strategy research. These strategies are the following: (1) summarising, (2) forming questions, (3) answering questions, (4) activating prior knowledge, (5) monitoring comprehension, (6) using text-structure awareness, (7) using visual graphics and graphic organisers, and (8) inferencing.

Regarding the effectiveness of summarisation as a reading strategy, relatively few research studies are available in the L2 reading context. However, several studies have been conducted in the L1 context, and they showed that summarising can significantly enhance the reading comprehension of students. For instance, when conducting a meta-analysis of 18 comprehension strategy research studies done with elementary school students, Trabasso and Bouchard (2002) found that summarisation helped students recall more details from the reading material and practising summarisation also greatly improved their comprehension skills.

Forming questions is also a frequently used reading strategy which is considered to help students more successfully memorise information presented in the reading material, more efficiently identify main ideas, and answer questions related to the reading material

more accurately (Rosenshine, Meister & Chapman, 1996). Taboada and Guthrie (2006) examined 360 third- and fourth-grade students and found that those students who managed to formulate questions which were conceptually more elaborate had better comprehension abilities. Furthermore, McKeown and Beck (2004) developed the ‘Questioning the Author’ approach to facilitate the students’ meaningful interaction with the information presented in the reading material. In their study, they investigated the reading lessons of six teachers who used the questioning the author method to train their students during a 7-month period. The results suggested that the teachers had a positive experience with using the method and they found it to be a helpful resource. Moreover, answering questions also appears to be an effective reading strategy because it helps students recall more details from reading materials (Woloshyn, Pressley & Schneider, 1992), and it also has a positive effect on the ability to make inferences and on the ability of coherence building in the case of university students (Ozgungor & Guthrie, 2004).

Activating prior knowledge is also an important reading strategy, which can improve information recall (Trabasso & Bouchard, 2002). However, it can also have negative effects on comprehension when such prior knowledge is activated which is inconsistent with the information presented in the reading material (Goldman, Varma & Coté, 1996). Additionally, McNamara and Kintsch (1996) suggested that having less background in the topic might not be a drawback, in fact, because students who are more skilled but have limited background knowledge put more effort into building a coherent text understanding than those who have more background knowledge but are less skilled readers.

Furthermore, reading strategies targeted at monitoring the comprehension are crucial elements of reading research. Grabe (2009) identified eight strategies which are usually used for monitoring reading comprehension. These are summarised in Table 1. The list shows that monitoring comprehension is a rather complex process and according to Pressley (2002)

this is the reading strategy that is the most difficult to teach. Nevertheless, the study conducted by Trabasso and Bouchard (2002) suggested that improving monitoring comprehension helps students better detect text difficulties, improve their recall of read information and generally perform better on reading comprehension tests.

Table 1

*Strategies Used for Comprehension Monitoring* (Grabe, 2009, p. 211)

<b>Strategies Used for Comprehension Monitoring</b>
1 Has a reason for reading and is aware of it
2 Recognises text structure
3 Identifies important and main-idea information
4 Relates text to background knowledge
5 Recognises relevance of text to reading goal(s)
6 Recognises and attends to difficulties
7 Reads carefully
8 Clarifies misunderstanding

Using text-structure awareness is another complex strategy which can help students better comprehend a text and more successfully recall the information presented in it. According to Meyer and Poon (2001), knowledge about text structure can greatly improve reading comprehension. They conducted a study with 111 adults and subjected them to a training session about discourse structure. During the training, the participants were taught about the structures of basic text types (i.e., description, problem-solution, comparison-contrast, cause-effect, and sequence). The results suggest that the participants could successfully employ their text-structure knowledge in information recall and summary writing across several text-types, and they were even able to transfer their knowledge of discourse structure to more complex types of texts. Related to text-structure awareness and main idea recognition, using graphic organisers such as flow charts and Venn-diagrams, also proved to be a helpful reading comprehension strategy. Research suggest that such graphic organisers can aid students in identifying the text structure and recognising the relationship between the main ideas and the supporting ideas both in the L1 and L2 context (e.g., Carrell, Pharis & Liberto, 1989; Tang, 1992; Vacca, 2002).

Despite the fact that it is difficult to separate from processing skills, the ability to use inferencing as a reading strategy is also an often-used method to distinguish between skilled readers and poor readers (Yuill & Oakhill, 1991). Similarly to monitoring comprehension, inferencing is also connected to several complex comprehension processes, and it is

influenced by the ability to use other reading strategies, such as prior knowledge activation, text-structure awareness, and comprehension monitoring among others. Nonetheless, Gernsbacher (1997) and Kintsch (1998) pinpointed inferencing as one of the main mechanisms necessary for coherence building in text comprehension.

Lastly, mental translation is L2 specific reading comprehension strategy which can provide additional help for L2 readers. Research evidence seems to indicate that mentally translating parts or the whole text to their L1 has a positive effect on students' L2 reading comprehension. For instance, Kern (1994) found that mental translation helped French L2 students understand difficult reading passages better especially in the cases of students who had weaker abilities. In addition, Laufer and Girsai (2008) found that translating key words to their L1 help students learn new vocabulary from a text more efficiently. These research results also seem to support the theoretical view advocated by Koda (2005, 2007) and Cook (2001, 2009) which states that L2 reading always emerges from a combination of L1 and L2 resources.

Regarding the development of reading strategies, researchers seem to agree that explicit instruction is necessary both in the L1 and L2 context. A case study conducted by Pressley, Gaskins, Solic and Collins (2006) investigated the criteria which contribute to the effectiveness of an intensive L1 reading strategy instruction curriculum in a US elementary school that teaches students with reading and learning difficulties. Explicit reading strategy instruction was part of almost every class, and the results suggest that the curriculum was highly successful in improving the students' reading comprehension abilities (Pressley et al., 2006).

Regarding the L2 context, Macaro and Erler (2008) conducted a 14-month long longitudinal study investigating the impact of explicit reading strategy instruction on L2 reading comprehension. The study was conducted with the participation of 11-12-year-old

English students whose L2 was French. The participants were beginners in their L2. In the study, the performance of the investigated treatment group was compared with the performance of a control group at the end of the 14-month long training. The results indicate that the members of the treatment group significantly outperformed the control group on a reading comprehension test, and they also used significantly more text-engagement strategies than their peers from the control group.

Finally, Olson (2003) and Olson and Land (2007) arrived at similar results when conducting the Pathway Project in a US secondary school. They found that receiving explicit instruction in reading comprehension and writing strategies had a positive impact on students' reading skills, and at the end of the project they significantly outperformed their peers from the control group on academic reading and writing tests.

In conclusion, effective use of reading strategies is essential for successful reading comprehension. Research suggests that both in the L1 and L2 context explicit instruction has an important role in the development of reading strategies. Therefore, it should be the cornerstone of reading comprehension education both in the L1 and L2 context.

## **2.2 The layers of meaning**

As it has been discussed in connection with the processes of reading comprehension, comprehension is considered to occur on several different levels. This idea has been considered by researchers in several different ways. For instance, Gray (1960) distinguished between three different understandings: the ability to read 'the lines' (i.e., comprehending the literal meaning), the ability to read 'between the lines' (i.e., comprehending the implied meaning), and the ability to read 'beyond the lines' (i.e., the ability to critically evaluate the reading material). Similarly, Kintsch and Yarbrough (1982) distinguished a different set of three layers of text comprehension (i.e., word level, sentence level, and the level of text organisation), and they claimed that it is possible for the reader to understand only certain



levels. Therefore, in order to be able to comprehend a text, the reader has to create a meaning structure of the ideas presented in it.

Research (e.g., Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; van Dijk, 1980; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983, Renkema, 2004; Tankó, 2014) suggests that every text has two layers of meaning: a microstructure and a macrostructure. Based on Renkema's (2004) summary of Kintsch and van Dijk's work (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; van Dijk, 1980; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983), microstructure refers to the relationship between sentences and sentence segments whereas macrostructure refers to the global meaning of discourse. The macrostructure of a text can be extracted with the help of three macrorules: the deletion rule, generalisation rule, and construction rule. Tankó (2014) summarises the macrorules as follows: the deletion rule helps the reader to eliminate those propositions from the text that are not relevant from the point of view of the reading purpose. The generalization rule requires the reader to be able to categorise propositional content based on an organising principle in order to create a general proposition. Instead of simply deleting information, this rule merges specific details into an overarching category. The construction rule helps the reader to construct one single proposition from multiple propositions. To be able to do that, the reader needs to use their background knowledge to identify the situation presented in the text and complete the propositional content of the source text with the missing relevant information. This process is different from the generalisation rule because in the case of the generalisation rule all the elements which are collapsed into a general category are actually present in the text; however, in the case of the construction rule not all propositions which are used to create a general proposition are actually present in the text (Tankó, 2014). According to Kintsch and van Dijk (1978), the deletion rule is a lower-level macrorule which requires a lower-level of cognitive processing than the other two rules; therefore, they can be confidently used even by readers of elementary level. In contrast, the generalisation rule and the construction rule

are considered to require higher-levels of cognitive processing, and they can usually not be successfully applied by novice readers (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978).

Another discourse layer readers should be aware of is superstructure. According to Renkema's (2004) definition based on van Dijk (1980), superstructures are "conventionalised schemas that provide the global form for the macrostructural content of a discourse" (p. 97). If macrostructure presents how content is organised in a text, superstructure provides details about the form of a text and where specific types of information can be found in it. Above the level of the superstructure, there are those textual clues which provide information about the macrostructure or superstructure. These clues can be titles, subtitles, tables of content, or introductory paragraphs explaining the content (i.e., macrostructure) and the structure of the text (i.e., superstructure). These are called advance organisers. The advance organizers can help readers to orient themselves in the text, and research suggests that they can enhance the learning process when the reader has no background knowledge on the topic of the text (Renkema, 2004).

The discussion above shows that extracting meaning from a text is a cognitively complex and sometimes challenging process which heavily draws on the ability to be able to decide the relevance of the pieces of information presented in the text. Even though every text has a macrostructure which follows the hierarchical organisation of meaning intended by the author of the text, the relevance of the ideas should be decided by the readers based on their reading purpose. According to Kintsch and van Dijk (1978), the way the macrorules are used to extract the macrostructure is governed by the decision whether a certain piece of information is relevant or redundant. The relevance of information is determined based on the specifications set by the reading purpose. This way, every text can have multiple different equally valid macrostructures, depending on the differences among the reading purposes. For instance, Decameron can both be read as a set of narrative stories and also

with the purpose of focusing on the investigation of the women's role in 14th century Italy (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978). Therefore, it is the reading purpose that defines what parts and types of information in a text are prioritized during the reading comprehension process.

### **2.3 Summary of the theoretical background**

Reading comprehension is a complex process which has been investigated from several different perspectives. The present dissertation focuses on the reading processes of fluent readers, fluent reading being defined as “multiple tasks being performed at the same time, such as decoding the words, comprehending the information, relating the information to prior knowledge of the subject matter, making inferences, and evaluating the information's usefulness to a report [the reader is] writing” (Samuels & Flor, 1997, p. 107). As there are several different approaches to defining reading comprehension, the present dissertation accepted the definition proposed by the RAND Reading Study Group (2002), which defined reading comprehension as “the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language” (p. 11). This definition was favoured over other available definitions because it presents reading comprehension as an active meaning making process, where the reader is constantly interacting with the text.

Reading comprehension is the result of the interaction of different higher-level and lower-level processes (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). According to Grabe and Stoller (2013), the lower-level processes are word recognition, syntactic parsing, and semantic proposition formation; whereas higher-level processes are the text model of comprehension, the situation model of reader interpretation, background knowledge use and inferencing, and executive control processes. Of these, word recognition, syntactic parsing, and semantic proposition formation are considered to be lower-level processes, and they are usually automatically carried out by fluent readers without requiring any conscious attention most

of the time. Because of this, the reader usually finds it difficult to reflect on these processes. Higher-level processes can also occur in an automatized way when there are no comprehension difficulties, but they are more easily accessible for conscious examination, and they are more easily monitored and manipulated by the reader than lower-level comprehension processes (Grabe & Stoller, 2013).

Reading comprehension is influenced by several factors, one of these being reading purpose. People can read for different purposes depending on the context of the activity. The present dissertation is concerned with the reading comprehension processes of first-year university students, so the main type of reading purpose examined here is reading for academic purposes. Reading for academic purposes is defined as reading in order to understand the content and the language of a text for the purpose of such academic activities as knowledge acquisition, academic writing, or giving a presentation in a classroom setting. The aim of academic reading, therefore, is to collect facts and data, and evidence, and to understand theories, ideas, and viewpoints, and it includes reading any type of text in the academic context (Jordan, 1997). Researchers created several different taxonomies of reading purposes (e.g., Carver, 2000; Grabe, 2009; Linderholm & van den Broek, 2002; Weir, 1993), however, as Grabe's (2009) taxonomy of six major reading purposes was developed specifically for the academic context, the present dissertation study adopted this as its theoretical underpinnings. According to Grabe (2009), these six major reading purposes are (1) reading to search for information, (2) reading for quick understanding, (3) reading to learn, (4) reading to integrate information, (5) reading to evaluate, critique, and use information, and (6) reading for general comprehension. The fact that different reading situations require different types of comprehension processes has also been supported by research evidence (e.g., Linderholm & van den Broek, 2002; Lorch, Lorch & Kluzewitz, 1993).

Other factors influencing reading comprehension are the context and the reader's background knowledge. According to Grabe (2009), the context can help a reader build the text model of comprehension and the situation model of interpretation, adjust the reading goals, monitor the comprehension processes, relate new ideas to the background knowledge, and choose the contextually appropriate meaning of a word. Similarly, the readers' background knowledge can also have a substantial influence on the reading process. For instance, having some domain specific background knowledge or familiarity with the cultural background can aid the reader in understanding a text (Alderson, 2000; Floyd & Carrell, 1987; Hudson, 2007; Johnson, 1981; Steffenson, Joagh-Dev & Anderson, 1979). However, background knowledge can also have a negative influence on the reading process if poor readers activate inappropriate background knowledge and make wrong inferences about the text (Rapp et al., 2007).

The extent to which reading strategies are used consciously is also generally believed to have an influence on reading comprehension. Reading strategies are "abilities that are potentially open to conscious reflection and reflect a reader's intention to address a problem or a specific goal while reading" (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 10). According to Grabe (2009), eight effective, empirically supported reading comprehension strategies can be distilled from the approximately five decades of reading strategy research. These strategies are the following: (1) summarising, (2) forming questions, (3) answering questions, (4) activating prior knowledge, (5) monitoring comprehension, (6) using text-structure awareness, (7) using visual graphics and graphic organisers, and (8) inferencing. Research suggests that explicit instruction is necessary for the efficient development of reading strategies both in the L1 and the L2 context (Macaro & Erler, 2008; Olson, 2003; Olson & Land, 2007; Pressley et al., 2006). For this reason, the present dissertation study also investigates the effectiveness of explicit instructions in reading strategy use.

### **3 Methods**

The following sections discuss the methods of data collection and data analysis applied in the present dissertation study. Section 3.1 (p. 51) describes the research problem investigated in the present study; Section 3.2 (p. 54) discusses the context of the study; Section 3.3 (p. 56) presents the main methods of data collection and data analysis, along with the participants of the study and the data collection instruments used; Section 3.4 (p. 86) explores the possible ethical concerns emerging in connection with the research study; and Section 3.5 (p. 89) provides a short summary of the research design.

#### **3.1 The research problem**

The aim of this dissertation is to explore how students process information when they have to read for academic purposes. Therefore, the present exploratory study investigated the reading processes and followed the skill development of 14 students participating in an academic skills course at a major Hungarian university during the autumn semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. It intends to answer the following main research question:

- **How do first-year EFL learner BA students process written academic texts?**

This study attempts to find answers to this main research question using the following sub-research questions:

1. What characterizes the reading processes of first-year students before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies?
2. What characterizes the reading processes of first-year students after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies?
3. What propositions are included in the final guided summaries of first-year students before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies?
4. What propositions are included in the final guided summaries of first-year students after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies?
5. Does the language proficiency level of the participants influence the efficiency of their reading processes in terms of identifying and including content points in their guided summaries before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies? If yes, how?

6. Does the language proficiency level of the participants influence the efficiency of their reading processes in terms of identifying and including content points in their guided summaries after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies? If yes, how?

As the proposed research problem has not been widely investigated before in the context of Hungarian tertiary education, and as it has an exploratory nature, the philosophical underpinning of the study is the theory of social constructivism (Creswell, 2014). The social constructivist worldview claims that human beings construct meaning as they engage with the world and try to interpret their experiences, and this interpretation process is heavily influenced by the individuals' historical and social perspectives (Creswell, 2014). For this reason, taking the context into consideration should be an essential element of the investigation of any phenomenon. This view supports the purposes of the present study, as the present study wants to gain an in-depth understanding of the academic reading comprehension processes of the participants, and it aims to explore every participant's individual experience related to reading for academic purposes. Furthermore, because reading comprehension in general appears to be a problematic area in Hungarian education (OECD, 2015), the present study is also influenced by the ideas of the advocacy-participatory worldview (Creswell, 2014), and it attempts to discover the reasons behind the problem in order to open a discussion about the issue and its possible solutions.

In order to be able to investigate the proposed research problem, the study adopted a qualitative exploratory research design. This design was favoured over the quantitative approach because exploratory research aims to achieve a better understanding of the issues under scrutiny and therefore uses no preconceptions or hypotheses that would need to be tested (Creswell, 2014). Verbal data – in the form of think-aloud, retrospective interviews and the participants' writings – was collected to help explore the characteristics of reading processes. Thus, a large-scale quantitative study would not have yielded the desired type of data.

To gather the desired type of verbal data and to be able to gain a deep understanding of the investigated research problem in context, the case study was chosen as the strategy of inquiry (Creswell, 2014). Based on its definition, the case study is “a qualitative, interpretive approach to understanding the experiences, features, behaviours, and processes of a bounded (a specific or defined) unit” (Duff & Anderson, 2015, p. 112). According to Duff and Anderson (2015), the main advantage of using the case study as a strategy of inquiry is that it provides a holistic and in-depth understanding of the investigated issue in its particular context. Furthermore, it can also provide a nuanced, first-hand perspective for the researcher (Duff & Anderson, 2015). As the effective use of reading comprehension skills is a salient topic in the case of the first-year English major BA students, the participants in a first semester academic skills course were chosen as the bounded unit investigated in the present study. This particular group was chosen because of its homogeneity and representativeness: every member of the group was a first-year student whose mother tongue was Hungarian; they all attended Hungarian high schools before enrolling into university; and English was the primary foreign language they had learnt during their secondary school years. The fact that they all had different language proficiency levels (cf. Section 3.3.4) maximized the variety of the cases investigated in the study. With these characteristics, they can also be considered to represent the average English major BA student in Hungarian tertiary education. During the sampling, the use of multiple cases was favoured over the use of a single case because this could provide a more nuanced understanding of the research problem than just analysing a single case would have. Furthermore, it presented the voice of multiple different participants, and it managed to uncover a wider variety of factors contributing to their experience than the analysis of a single case would have.



### **3.2 The context of the study**

The participants of the present study were all members of the same academic skills course group taught by the author herself. The course took place in the autumn semester of the 2017-2018 academic year, and it lasted from the beginning of the second week of September until the end of the second week of December. The group met once a week for 90 minutes, and the aim of the course was to improve the English academic reading and writing skills of the participants in order to prepare them for the tasks and assignments they would encounter during their university studies. The aim of the in-class work and home assignments was to show the participants the use of a wide variety of reading strategies in order to encourage them to develop their own reading techniques. Furthermore, the course focused on practicing reading with a clear purpose in mind; judging the relevance of source text information based on the reading goal; extracting, summarising, and paraphrasing information from a source text; and creating well-formed, short academic English texts.

During the first week of the semester, the participants received a short introduction about the aims and requirements of the course, and then they had to write a placement test measuring their general English proficiency. Taking a placement test is usually not part of the academic skills course, and it was only introduced for the sake of the present study. For a detailed discussion about the structure of the placement test and the reasons behind administering it, see Section 3.3.5.1. The material covered during the second and third week was introducing the participants to the basics of paraphrasing and the importance of avoiding plagiarism in academic writing. Additionally, in a home assignment, they were required to paraphrase a short academic reading paragraph. The topic of the fourth and fifth weeks was the basics of summarisation skills, and the students had the opportunity to practice summarising the main ideas from short academic reading paragraphs. During the sixth week, the focus of the course was on introducing the students to the paragraph structures of English

academic texts, paying special attention to the means of creating unity, cohesion, and coherence in a text. On the seventh week, the topic of the class was split between punctuation and reading strategies. As a pre-class assignment, the students received a reading about the basic punctuation rules used in the APA referencing system, and they were asked to read it and practice the punctuation rules on a set of practice tasks. In the first half of the seventh-week class, the punctuation practice tasks were checked, and the students' concerns and questions related to punctuation were discussed. During the second half of the class, the students were introduced to a list of reading strategies, and these strategies were discussed in detail. As the eighth week was the autumn break/reading week, the students were given a longer reading as home assignment, and they were asked to fill-in a reading strategy questionnaire after solving the reading task. The aim of this task was to make the students more conscious about their reading processes and to encourage them to reflect on the methods they use when they want to comprehend a text. After the autumn break, the focus of the course shifted to guided summary writing as every student taking the academic skills course at the university was required to take a standardised academic skills test. Given that the aim of the academic skills test was to assess the reading comprehension, paraphrasing, summarising, and academic writing skills of the students with the help of a guided summarisation task, weeks 9, 10, and 11 introduced the students to the basics of guided summarisation and required the students to complete several guided summary writing tasks. The academic skills test took place during the class of the 12th week, and because of its length, it took up the full class time. The 13th week provided tasks for the participants which enabled them to reflect on the skills they had developed during the semester; whereas the last week was devoted to discussing the results of the academic skills test and closing the course.

Participation in the classes was compulsory, and the students were only allowed to miss maximum three classes. The final course grade was composed of the grades the students received for their home assignments, a grade awarded for their in-class work, and the grade they received for their academic skills test. If the students had questions which could not be discussed during class time, they had the opportunity to arrange an office hour appointment with the tutor.

### **3.3 Data collection and data analysis**

The present dissertation study was conducted during the course of a school semester at a major Hungarian university with the participation of 14 first-year English major Hungarian BA students of the same compulsory academic skills class. The data was collected in three phases during the autumn semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. Preparations for the data collection procedures commenced in 2017 August when the data collection instruments were created. This preparatory phase lasted until the end of the first teaching week in September, when the participant sampling took place. The preparatory phase was followed by the first data collection phase, which took place during the second and third weeks of the autumn semester. The second data collection session was conducted during the first two weeks in December, at the end of the semester. The following sections present the data collection procedures, instruments, participants, and data analysis procedures of each phase.

#### ***3.3.1 Preparatory phase***

During the summer preceding the 2017-2018 academic year, the instruments intended to be used for participant selection and data collection in the first and second phase were developed. For participant selection purposes, the listening and grammar tasks of a 2004 version of the Oxford placement test were chosen. The 2004 version was selected because it was the only placement test available for the researcher at the time of conducting

the present study. As the Oxford placement test only had a grammar and a listening part, it was supplemented with an academic reading task from an IELTS academic examination. For a detailed discussion of the placement test, see Section 3.3.5.1.

For data collection purposes, two guided summarisation tasks were developed and piloted. The guided summarisation task was chosen over other possible reading comprehension tasks because of the complexity of the assignment. Similarly to any reading task, the participants had to find particular pieces of information in the text. However, compared to short-answer or multiple-choice reading tasks, in the guided summary task, they had to provide a longer and more elaborated answer, which reflected their understanding of the text in a more detailed manner. The two guided summarisation tasks developed for the present study can be found in Appendix D. The piloting of the guided summarisation tasks was conducted with the help of three participants.

Because the main data collection method of the first and second phase was planned to be the think-aloud procedure, four think-aloud practice tasks and two demonstration tasks were also developed and piloted. The tasks were created based on the suggestions of Bowles (2010), and they were piloted with two members of the population. These tasks were designed to be used as illustrations and practice opportunities when explaining the think-aloud procedure to the participants.

The next section discusses the participants involved in the pilots of the preparatory phase. As the instruments developed in this phase served as data collection instruments during the first and the second phase, each one of them is discussed in detail in the Instruments sections of those phases.

#### *3.3.1.1 Participants of the preparatory phase*

In the case of the guided summarisation tasks, as the first step of the piloting process, the two tasks were sent to the supervisor of this dissertation for expert feedback. Based on

his comments, the two tasks were finalised and piloted with three participants. The participants were selected on a voluntary basis, and in order to protect their identity they are mentioned under pseudonyms in the study. Bella, Erika, and Alfonz were all advanced speakers of English, and they had considerable experience with reading academic texts in English and finding specific information in a text. Reading academic texts was also a task which all three participants encountered every day in their work because Bella was a third year English major BA student, Erika was a high-school English teacher, and Alfonz was a fellow researcher and PhD student who had experience with professional writing and teaching academic skills.

The participants received the two tasks at the same time via email, and their processes were not timed or recorded. They were only asked to refrain from the use of a dictionary or any other materials than the text in each of the tasks while attempting to find the information required by the task. As the main aim of the piloting was to arrive at a finalised list of task-relevant content from the text, the participants were only asked to provide a bullet-point list of the content they found task-relevant from the text, and they did not have to write a full guided summary. In addition, they were also asked to highlight those parts of the text they interpreted as task-relevant information. After they completed the tasks, they were asked to send their solutions back via e-mail along with their brief explanations in a comment for choosing those particular pieces of information. Based on their feedback, the list of possible task-relevant content for the tasks was finalised. The participants could not meet the researcher in person because of their busy schedules during the summer, so e-mail communication was chosen over a personal one.

The think-aloud demonstration and practice tasks developed for the later phases of the data collection were piloted with two members from the population. Emilia and Sarolta were two high school students beginning their 12th grade studies in 2017 September, and

they were private students of the researcher preparing for a B2 level language examination. They individually met the researcher in person, and they were trained to use the think-aloud method in the same fashion as it was intended to be done in the later phases of the data collection. First, the basic idea of the think-aloud method was explained to the participants with the help of the demonstration tasks, and then they were asked to practice the method with the help of the practice tasks. During the practice, they had to verbalize their task-solving processes, and at the end they were asked for feedback about the usefulness of the demonstration and practice tasks. During the pilot, both demonstration tasks were presented to both participants, and they had to solve all four tasks during the practice. Based on their feedback, the demonstration and practice tasks were modified and finalised.

### ***3.3.2 First phase***

The first data collection phase took place in September 2017. During the first teaching week of the semester, the academic skills groups taught by the author were given an Oxford placement test and an IELTS academic reading task. The academic skills group participating in the present study was selected based on the placement test results. This was the sample that showed the largest variety regarding the members' language proficiency levels, and as the Research Questions 5 and 6 refer to the possible effect of the language proficiency levels on reading comprehension skills, this group seemed to be the ideal sample. This group was also selected because all the participants were coming from a Hungarian educational background, and Hungarian was the mother tongue of all the participants. The common educational background provided a certain level of homogeneity in the sample, which was necessary to be able to analyse the cases from the point of view of the context. However, as the participants came from different high schools and they had different language proficiency levels, the variety of the cases investigated was maximised.

In the two weeks following the placement test, every participant met the researcher one-on-one for the first think-aloud interview. Before beginning the think-aloud interviews, the participants were informed that participating in the study was on a voluntary basis, and they could opt out of the participation at any point during the data collection. To ensure that they were aware of the necessary information about the study and the participation in general, they were given a form of consent (cf. Appendix A), and they were asked to read it and sign it if they agreed to the information contained in the consent form. As the participants' mother tongue was Hungarian, the language of the consent form was also Hungarian. The consent form was signed by the participants and the researcher in two copies, and the participants kept one of the copies.

As the participants were not familiar with the think-aloud method, before the beginning of the interview they received an approximately 15-minute training in the use of the method with a chance to practice it. The training started with the researcher demonstrating the think-aloud method on a demonstration task, and then each participant had the opportunity to practice it with two practice tasks. When the participants felt comfortable with using the think-aloud method, they received one of the guided summarisation tasks and were instructed to solve the task while verbalising every thought emerging in their mind. The participants were ensured that this verbalisation could happen both in English and Hungarian, and they were encouraged to verbalise their thoughts as much as possible without any filtering and on the language the thoughts emerged in their mind. It was explained to them that the aim of the process was to guide the researcher through their task execution process, and that there were no right or wrong answers when solving the task. This was the same instruction they received during the think-aloud training, and besides these instructions concerning how to perform the think-aloud procedure, they were not provided any other input on how to solve the guided summarisation task. The

participants were asked to execute the task as they would normally do it in preparation for one of their classes. During the task execution, they were asked to refrain from using any dictionaries or outside material other than the source text of the task. This decision was made because coping with unknown words in a text forms part of the domain of reading strategies. They were given approximately one hour to solve the task; however, the time limit was handled flexibly, and the participants were not stopped if they went overtime.

All think-aloud processes were audio and video recorded. To maximise the protection of the participants' privacy, the video camera was set up in a way not to record their faces. The participants were informed about this at the beginning of the data collection, and they were provided an opportunity to opt out of any type of recording. Even though all participants agreed initially to being both audio and video recorded, many of them mentioned at the end of the think-aloud that they felt being video recorded frustrating to some extent.

As part of the think-aloud procedure, when the participants finished the guided summarisation task, they were asked retrospective questions about the parts of the task execution that they did not explain in detail during the think-aloud. In order to aid this, parts of the video recordings were re-watched for a stimulated recall. No participant needed or wanted to re-watch their whole think-aloud protocol in order to be able to clarify further details about their task solving processes. Furthermore, eight out of the 14 participants did not want to re-watch any part of the video, five of them claiming that they remembered their process clearly, and three of them saying that they felt it too frustrating to watch a video recording of themselves.

After they finished the think-aloud procedure, a semi-structured interview was also conducted with the participants about their biographical data, educational background and experience with receiving information about reading strategies. During the interviews, the



participants were encouraged to describe any additional details about the discussed issues even if there was no interview question targeting it. As the think-aloud processes were only video recorded to help the participants recall their processes during the follow-up interviews, the follow-up interviews themselves were only audio recorded. The whole data collection procedure took approximately 80-90 minutes per participant, and beside the audio and video recorded think-aloud procedures, the participants' notes and guided summaries were also collected.

### ***3.3.3 Second phase***

The second phase of the data collection took place in the first two weeks of December 2017. Similarly to the data collection procedures of the first phase, the participants met the researcher individually at a pre-allocated time. Before beginning the data collection, the participants were reminded about the terms of participation, they were given a form of consent (cf. Appendix A) and they were asked to sign it after reading and acknowledging its content. The consent form was signed both by the participants and the researcher in two copies out of which one copy remained with the participants.

After signing the consent form, the participants received a short training in the think-aloud process again to refresh their memories about the method. To illustrate the method, a new demonstration task was used, and they had the opportunity to practice the method with two new practice tasks. When they felt comfortable using the think-aloud method, they were given a data collection task. To ensure that the data collection was not influenced by the participants' familiarity with the topic, the second data collection task was selected so as to be about a completely different topic than the first one. The participants received the same instructions as in case of the first phase, and just as in the first phase they were not allowed to use any outside sources during solving the task. At the end of the think-aloud, they were asked to provide further explanation about certain points of their task

execution processes. However, in the case of most participants, this was not as necessary as in the first phase of the data collection because they could verbalise their thoughts more successfully. After the think-aloud protocols, a semi-structured interview was conducted with each participant about their impressions of the course material and the possible changes in their reading strategy use. Similarly to the first phase, at the end of the interview all the participants' notes and guided summaries were collected.

In contrast with the first data collection phase, during the second phase, the data collection processes were only audio-recorded. The decision to eliminate the video recording was made because the majority of the participants claimed to be frustrated by the presence of the video camera during the first data collection session. Even though without the video recording the opportunity to re-watch the process was lost, the participants appeared to be more relaxed and talkative than in the first phase. This could be the cumulative result of their familiarity with the researcher and the think-aloud method as well as the absence of the video camera. The fact that the think-aloud protocols recorded in the second data collection phase were richer in detail managed to counterbalance the absence of the video recordings as the participants could provide a detailed account of their task execution processes, so there would have been no need to re-watch the video recordings for further explanations.

#### ***3.3.4 Participants in the first and second phase***

The first phase had 14 participants (12 females and 2 males) who were first-year English major BA students at a major Hungarian university. At the beginning of the data collection, they were starting the first semester of their university studies, and they were between the ages of 18-24. The data collection originally started with 15 participants, but one of the students switched groups in the third week of the semester, and her data was excluded from the data analysis. The biographical data of the participants is summarised in

Table 2. As the table shows, the participants' proficiency of English varied, and all of them had been learning English for at least four years.

Table 2

*Participants' Profiles*

Name	Age	Proficiency	Oxford placement test score (/200)	Reading test score (/14)	Has learnt English for (in years)
<i>Panni</i>	18	A2	110	3	12
<i>Emma</i>	20	B1	134	3	13
<i>Ibolya</i>	19	B2	135	5	8
<i>Ádám</i>	19	B2	138	9	5
<i>Anita</i>	19	B2	140	10	10
<i>Dia</i>	19	B2	143	3	8
<i>Lilla</i>	20	B2	144	8	12
<i>Johanna</i>	19	B2	145	12	10
<i>Boglárka</i>	19	C1	154	5	10
<i>Pálma</i>	22	C1	155	7	16
<i>Tamás</i>	24	C1	164	7	11
<i>Beáta</i>	20	C1	166	9	6
<i>Judit</i>	19	C2	172	12	12
<i>Adél</i>	19	C2	175	9	12

Panni started learning English in the first grade of elementary school. During her studies, she claimed that she did not receive any instructions about reading strategies neither in the Hungarian Language and Communication classes nor in the foreign language classes, including English. Regarding summarisation tasks, she had never had to summarise a text based on a guiding idea; the only summarisation tasks she had to do during her high school studies were global summarisation tasks where she had to summarise all the main ideas of each paragraph during the preparation for the Hungarian Language and Communication final school leaving examination.

Similarly to Panni, Emma also started learning English in the first grade of the elementary school, and during her high school studies she also took private lessons in English. Before beginning her current university studies, she was a biology BSc major at another university. As during her studies she realised that she would like to become an

English and biology teacher, she took the advanced level English final school leaving examination because previously she only had an intermediate level English final school leaving examination certificate. When she saw her Oxford placement test results, she was very surprised because she claimed to have obtained a C1 level language certificate from a major Hungarian language examination centre during her high school studies. Regarding instruction about reading comprehension, she said that she developed her text processing strategies on her own, and no explicit instruction was provided about this topic at any point of her studies. Concerning summarisation tasks, she also only had to do global summaries and nothing similar to the data collection task.

Ibolya started learning English in the fifth grade of elementary school. She said that she had received some instructions regarding reading strategies during her Hungarian Language and Communication classes in high school. The teacher taught her to first read the text carefully and then look at the questions, go back to the text and underline the relevant parts. Regarding summarisation skills, she never had to produce a written summary, she only had to orally summarise the main ideas of a text during her final school leaving examination preparation for the Hungarian Language and Communication and the English subjects.

Ádám had been learning English for five years and had attended a foreign language preparatory type of high school programme, where he had learnt English in an increased number of contact hours. He had never received any formal instructions about reading strategies or summarisation, and he claimed that he had developed his own methods of working with a text based on his own experience.

Just as Ádám, Anita had also not received any instruction about reading or summarisation strategies. She started learning English when she was 9 years old, so she had been learning English for approximately 10 years. Besides studying English at school, she

also had private lessons in English. At the end of her high school studies, she took an advanced level English final school leaving examination.

Dia had been learning English since the fifth grade of elementary school, and during her high school studies she attended a foreign language preparatory type of high school programme, where she learnt English in an increased number of contact hours. Regarding reading skills, she did not receive any formal instruction; however, she had to solve several reading comprehension tasks when preparing for her Hungarian Language and Communication school leaving examination, so during the practice she developed her own method of handling a text. She also mentioned that some of the final school leaving examination preparatory tasks had items which required the paraphrasing of short sections of a text, so she was already familiar with the idea of paraphrase at the beginning of her university studies. Concerning summarisation skills, she had never received any explicit instruction, and she only had to orally summarise the main idea of a short paragraph during a few English classes.

Lilla had been studying English for 12 years, and she had attended a bilingual elementary school. Besides learning English in an increased number of contact hours during her elementary and high school studies, she had also studied Spanish in an intensive way during this period. At the university, English was her major and her minor was Dutch, which shows that Lilla was highly interested in learning foreign languages. She took an advanced level final school leaving examination in English during her 11th grade, and she claimed that she only had very limited instruction about reading strategies. During the preparation for the English and Hungarian school leaving examinations, the teachers taught her that she should read the text very carefully and then read the task and underline the relevant information in the text. She developed all of her other reading strategies based on her own experience and by reading up on the topic on the Internet. In connection with summarisation,

she had never encountered any formal instruction during her studies, and she only had to sometimes summarise the main idea of a paragraph orally in her high school classes.

Johanna had started studying English 10 years before in elementary school and she had also attended private English classes since then. During her studies she had not encountered any summarisation tasks; therefore, she had not received any instruction in connection with summarisation. Concerning reading strategies, even though she had to solve several reading tasks during the preparation for her Hungarian and English final school leaving examinations, her teachers did not provide any formal instruction on how to process a text.

Boglárka started learning English in elementary school, and during her high school studies she attended a foreign language preparatory type of high school programme where she learnt English in an increased number of contact hours. She had never learnt about reading strategies in any of her classes even though there were reading comprehension tasks in the Hungarian and English school leaving examinations. For this reason, she researched tips related to text comprehension and reading strategies on the Internet, and she developed her own reading comprehension methods based on this information and her own experience. To improve her English skills, she likes watching films and reading articles and books in English in her free time. As far as summarisation is concerned, she had never been required to execute summarisation tasks during her studies, so she also had not received any instructions regarding it.

Pálma started learning English when she was six years old and she attended private English classes from the beginning of fifth grade until the end of her high school studies. After finishing high school, she started a French BA major, and in addition she also started the English major in the year of the data collection. During her studies, she did not receive any explicit instruction about reading strategies or summarisation, neither in the French nor

in the English classes. Therefore, she developed her own reading strategies based on her experience to be able to execute the reading tasks of the final school leaving examinations.

Tamás started learning English when he was 13 years old and he took his final school leaving examinations including the advanced level English examination in 2012. After his high school studies, he started a biology BSc at another university, and during this period he only used the English language in informal contexts except for having one biology class in English in one of the semesters. Regarding reading comprehension tasks, he had to do several exercises while preparing for his English and Hungarian final school leaving examinations; however, he did not receive any instructions on reading strategies from his teachers. Similarly to some of the other participants, he also only had to occasionally do short oral summaries during his high school studies, but he never had to do written summary tasks, and he had never received instructions on the topic.

Beáta started learning English in high school when she attended a foreign language preparatory type of high school programme where she learnt English in an increased number of contact hours. As she had always been interested in learning English, she also took private English classes during her high school studies. The methods and strategies she usually uses for working with a text had been developed only based on her own experience because she did not receive any instructions on the topic in any of her classes. Similarly, summarisation was not discussed in any of the high school classes, and she had not encountered any tasks requiring summary writing during her studies.

Judit started learning English in the first grade of elementary school, and besides English she had also learnt French in an intensive way during her high school studies. As she was highly interested in studying English at the university level in the last two years of her high school studies, she also took private classes in a British organisation specialising in educational trainings and she managed to obtain a C1 level English language certificate at a

major British language examination centre. During her studies with this organisation, she learnt about reading strategies, and she had ample amount of practice with them as part of her preparation for the language examination. As far as summarisation is concerned, she only had to do one sentences summaries of short paragraphs as part of her preparation for the language examination. Instructions in reading strategies and summarisation did not form part of her high school education at any level.

Adél started learning English in the second grade of the elementary school, where she attended an English specialisation track. During her high school studies, she attended a bilingual high school, and as a preparation for the English final school leaving examination, she also took private English classes. Instructions on summarisation and summarisation tasks did not form part of her education, and despite the fact that she had to do reading comprehension tasks in every English class in the preceding year of her final school leaving examination, she did not receive any explicit instruction on reading strategies. She developed her own methods by combining her own experience with relevant information read on the Internet.

### ***3.3.5 Data collection instruments in the first and second phase***

The following sections discuss the data collection instruments used in the present study. The instruments are presented in the order they were used during the data collection phases. Therefore, the first sub-section discusses the placement test used to assess the language proficiency levels of the participants; the second sub-section describes the demonstration and example tasks used for training the participants in the use of the think-aloud method; the third sub-section presents the two guided summarisation tasks used as the main data collection instruments in the study; and the last sub-section discusses the semi-structured interview schedules administered at the end of the first and second data collection phases.



### *3.3.5.1 The Oxford placement test and the IELTS academic reading task*

Given that Research Questions 5 and 6 of the present study refer to the possible effects of language proficiency on reading comprehension skills, the language proficiency levels of the participants had to be assessed at the beginning of the data collection. For this reason, as part of the first academic skills class of the semester, a 2004 version of the Oxford placement test was administered to the participants. The test had two parts: a listening and a grammar part. First, the listening part of the test was played for the students as instructed by the test manual. The students received the 100-item listening section of the test in a printed format, and they could listen to the recording only once. Their task was to select the words they heard on the track out of two options. At the end of the listening section, the answer sheets were collected, and the participants received the 50 item grammar section, for which they had 40 minutes. The items of the grammar section had a multiple-choice format, and the participants had to choose the correct answer out of three options. At the end of the 40 minutes, the answer sheets of the participants were collected. The tests were corrected based on the official key, and the results were interpreted based on the appendix of the placement test. For legal considerations regarding possible copyright violations, the present dissertation does not include a sample of the test in the Appendices Section. This test was selected for two reasons: firstly, because besides being a validated and reliable test, its results were also calibrated onto the Common European Framework; and secondly, because the set of items, the official key, and the official documentation for the interpretation of the results were all available for the researcher.

As the Oxford placement test did not contain any sections measuring specifically reading comprehension, an IELTS academic reading test task was added to the placement test. This step was necessary because reading comprehension is the topic of the present study. The IELTS academic reading task was specifically chosen because it was designed

for assessing the academic reading competence of students who wish to study in English in tertiary education. Administering the full reading component of an IELTS academic test would have taken 60 minutes, so administering it together with the placement text was not feasible in the context of the 90-minute long class, and spending one more occasion on administering the full reading test would have taken away too much time from the course material. For this reason, one single reading task was chosen from the IELTS academic examination's publicly available practice tasks (IELTS Mentor, 2017a). The topic of the text was about the use and future of helium, and the students had to execute three tasks based on this text: a paragraph matching task (5 items), a true or false task (4 items), and a fill-in-the-gap task (5 items). This particular reading task was chosen because of its fill-in-the-gap component as in this part the candidates had to complete a short summary of the text with one or two words. The students had 20 minutes to complete the reading component, which was administered immediately after the grammar test. At the end of the 20 minutes, the answer sheets were collected from the participants and they were corrected based on their official answer key. As this reading task is publicly available on the Internet (IELTS Mentor, 2017a), it is not included in the appendices. The language proficiency levels of the students were calculated based on their Oxford placement test results only because the reading test was originally not part of the placement test. The reading test results were used as additional information about the initial reading comprehension skills of the participants.

#### *3.3.5.2 The think-aloud demonstration tasks and practice tasks*

In order to avoid any possible influence on the way participants approach the data collection task, summarisation tasks were not used either for demonstration or for practice purposes during the think-aloud training. In the first phase, an arithmetic task was used to present the think-aloud method. In this arithmetic problem the task was to make four litres of water with the help of a five-litre and a three-litre jug. In the second phase, the

demonstration task was a short, 61-word long reading task. The reading was about the first ladies' latest project in the White House, and there was one item which had to be answered based on the text. Both demonstration tasks can be found in Appendix B.

Both in the first phase and the second phase, jumbled sentences (cf. Appendix C) were used as practice opportunities for the participants. The jumbled sentences were chosen as practice tasks because they appeared to be less intimidating and more closely related to the studies of English major students than arithmetic problems. The whole think-aloud training process took approximately 15 minutes in the case of each participant. However, initially there was no time limit put on the training session, and it was only finished when the participants felt completely comfortable with using the method.

#### *3.3.5.3 The guided summarisation tasks*

The guided summarisation tasks were chosen to be the main data collection instruments in the present study because they can be successfully used to assess the reading comprehension skills of the participants. A summary can be defined as “a superordinate term for a number of discourse types which have in common these relationships with the original: (1) being shortened versions, (2) including only the main ideas, and (in most cases) (3) retaining the original organisation and focus” (Johns, 1988, p. 79). Summaries can be categorised based on several different criteria, one of these criteria being how the source text is processed. Depending on this criterion, global summaries and guided summaries can be distinguished. According to Tankó (2019), the main difference between global summaries and guided summaries is that global summaries have to contain “all the main ideas from a source and cover them in a balanced manner” (p. 45), whereas guided summaries should contain “only those ideas that are relevant to [the intended] purposes while ignoring the rest” (p. 45). According to Rose (2001), summarisation tasks require the reader to actively engage with the source text through re-organising and reflecting on the presented ideas. The reader

has to critically assess the information presented in the source text and consciously decide about their relevance to the reading goal (Rose, 2001). Therefore, summarisation tasks can provide an insight into the reading comprehension skills of the reader. Guided summarisation tasks were selected over global summarisation tasks because the ideas relevant to the reading goal often do not coincide with the main ideas of the paragraphs, so they can provide a better picture about the participants' understanding of the source text.

As the first step in the task development, two academic reading texts of similar difficulty were chosen. Besides the difficulty of the text, the topic was also taken into consideration. Both texts were chosen because they discuss topics that first-year BA students can be familiar with or can encounter during their studies. The topic of the input text in Task A was investigating how children speak and understand their native language. Even though first-year students might not have read about such topics before, the chosen text was written in a plain and informative way without the use of complicated technical terminology. Moreover, the topic of the text was similar to those that usually emerge in the reading lists for introductory courses in an English BA programme.

The topic of the input text in Task B was about the suffragette movement, which students might have already been familiar with to some extent based on their high school studies. Similarly to the text in Task A, the text in Task B also used simple academic language free of highly specialised terminology. To further ensure the appropriateness of the texts, they were chosen from a pool of academic reading practice tests intended for IELTS examinees (IELTS Mentor, 2017b; 2017c). For the full text of Task A and that of Task B, see Appendix D.

To ensure that the texts required approximately the same language proficiency levels and reading proficiency levels to understand, the difficulty and complexity of the texts was analysed with the help of readability formulas. According to Nuttal (1982), readability

formulas were developed to help the selection of appropriate and suitable reading material for students without having to rely on teachers' judgement. The readability of a text depends on the combination of its structural and lexical difficulty (Nuttal, 1982). The results of the readability calculations for the two texts used in this dissertation can be seen in Table 3.

A website called Readability Formulas (Readability Formulas, n.d.) was chosen over manual analysis to assess the complexity and difficulty of the texts. The website analyses texts by calculating the number of sentences, words, syllables and characters, and puts this information into seven different formulas resulting in seven different readability indices. These formulas are the Flesch Reading Ease Score, the Gunning Fog, the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level, the Coleman-Liau Index, the SMOG Index, the Automated Readability Index, and the Linsear Write Formula.

According to Readability Formulas (n.d.), the Flesch Reading Ease Score intends to show the grade-level of a reader who can read a specific text by taking into consideration the average sentence length and the average number of syllables in a text. The 30-49 range, in which the indices of the text of Task A and Task B belong, signifies a difficult text.

The Gunning Fog index investigates the complexity of a text by considering the ratio of hard words compared to the average sentence length. Hard words are those three or more syllable long words which are not proper nouns or hyphenated words. Those texts which have Gunning Fog indices around 16 are considered to be extremely difficult for the average reader.

Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level takes into consideration the average sentence length and the average number of syllables per word to calculate the Flesch-Kincaid Reading Age of the reader. Indices around 13 indicate that the text is meant for college students as a 9.3 score usually indicates readings appropriate for 9th-graders.

The Coleman-Liau Index considers the number of characters in a word instead of the number of syllables, and it calculates the ratio of the average number of letters compared to the average number of syllables. An index around 10.6 signifies an appropriate difficulty level for 10th and 11th grade students, so the 12 index seems to be appropriate for first-year university students. The SMOG Index can be calculated by adding 3 to the square root of the polysyllable count, and it shows the reading grade necessary for fully understanding the text. According to the SMOG Index, the text of Task A and the text of Task B are appropriate for a 12th grade student. The Automated Readability Index is calculated from the number of letters per word and the number of words per sentences. The results for the texts of Task A and Task B suggest that these tasks are appropriate for college students. The Linsear Write Formula takes into consideration the number of easy words (i.e., two syllables or less) and the total number of sentences in the text. The 15.6 and 17.6 indices indicate a difficult text which requires higher levels of reading proficiency (Readability Formulas, n.d.).

As Table 3 shows, the results of the calculations executed with the different readability indices are not exactly the same for the two texts; however, the final scores calculated based on the eight different readability indices are close. The readability indices indicate that both texts are approximately on college level difficulty, fit for the participants of this dissertation study. Even though Task A has a slightly lower readability index, it discusses a topic that might potentially be less familiar for the students than the topic of task B. On the other hand, Task B discusses a topic with which some participants might be familiar, but the complexity of the text is slightly higher. However, the readability scores suggest that both texts are appropriate for college-level readers.

Table 3

*Readability Indices of the Text of Task A and Task B*

<b>Readability index</b>	<b>Investigating Children's Language (Text of task A)</b>	<b>Votes for Women (Text of task B)</b>
<i>Flesch Reading Ease score</i>	40.9	43.1
<i>Gunning Fog</i>	16.7	16.4
<i>Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level</i>	13.2	13.8
<i>The Coleman-Liau Index</i>	12	12
<i>The SMOG Index</i>	12	12
<i>Automated Readability Index</i>	13.9	15.4
<i>Linsear Write Formula</i>	15.6	17.6
<i>Readability Consensus</i>	13	14

Besides the topic and the complexity of the texts, other characteristics, such as length and text type were also considered. It was crucial that the chosen texts were academic expository texts designed for reading for academic purposes because the research aim of the present study was to examine the academic reading processes of students in an academic context. It was also important that the texts are approximately 700-750 words long. They had to be sufficiently informative but also short enough to comfortably fit into the one-hour long data collection procedure. The use of longer texts was also dismissed to be able to exclude the possible effects of fatigue induced by the combination of the cognitive challenge of performing a think-aloud and the length of the task. As the original texts were 856 words (Task A) and 821 words (Task B) long, they had to be edited. During the text selection, 10 possible texts were examined and considered for task development. However, based on the discussed requirements, *Investigating Children's Language* and *Votes for Women* were selected for the data collection tasks over the other texts because they were the most similar in difficulty, and they had the most appropriate topics.

After the texts were selected, the two guided summarisation tasks had to be designed. To do so, the edited and finalised texts were subjected to propositional analysis based on the guidelines described by Bovair and Kieras (1985). The results of the analysis are presented in Appendix E. Based on the results of the propositional analysis, it was decided that the

guiding prompt for Task A would be *‘the difficulties of collecting data from children’* and for Task B *‘the ways in which the suffragettes managed to promote their movement’* as these were the most recurring and substantially discussed sub-topics in the texts. Furthermore, a list of possible content points (CPs) was created.

To pilot the guided summarisation tasks, the three participants in the preparatory phase were asked to find the content points in the two texts based on the previously mentioned thematic aspects. Based on their answers, the list of CPs for each task was finalised. As a result, Task A contained four CPs, whereas Task B contained five CPs. For a list of the CPs, see Table 4.

Table 4

*Content Points in Task A and Task B*

<b>Content Point</b>	<b>Task A</b>	<b>Task B</b>
<i>CP1</i>	Certain techniques cannot be used with children because certain aspects of their cognitive development are not advanced enough.	They had an effective slogan.
<i>CP2</i>	Children cannot make systematic judgements about language.	They introduced a colour scheme and sold goods and wore a uniform in those colours.
<i>CP3</i>	The presence of the researcher and the tape-recorded might frustrate children.	Their newspapers provided effective communication with the members.
<i>CP4</i>	It is difficult to maintain good acoustic quality.	They organised fund-raising events like the Woman’s Exhibition.
<i>CP5</i>	n.a.	They wrote the time and place of meetings on the pavement.

The task instruction was formulated based on the general instructions used in one of the core guided summarisation practice books used in the academic skills course attended by the participants of this study, namely *Paraphrasing, Summarising and Synthesising Skills for Academic Writers: Theory and Practice* (Tankó, 2019). Therefore, the instruction for



both tasks was formulated in the following way: *Read the passage below and write a paragraph of 130 words (+/-10%) in which you summarise in your own words as far as possible [guiding prompt], which are discussed in the reading passage below.*

The length of 130 words (+/-10%) was chosen because it represents approximately 20% of the original text, and it is proportionate to the length of the source text information that should be represented in the guided summaries. The use of the term *guided summary* was avoided both in the instruction and throughout the data collection for two reasons: first, the present study aimed to focus on the reading comprehension processes of the participants and not on their summary writing skills; and second, it was presupposed that the majority of the participants initially would not be familiar with the meaning of the term *guided summary*, so using it would have been confusing for them. For these reasons, during the data collection the tasks were simply referred to as reading comprehension tasks.

#### *3.3.5.4 Semi-structured interview schedules*

Both in the first phase and the second phase think-aloud, the students participated in a semi-structured interview after finishing the think-aloud protocols. In the first phase, the first question referred to the age of the participant, and the second and the third questions asked about their language learning history. The fourth, fifth and sixth questions asked about the participants' knowledge and training in the use of reading strategies while the seventh and the eighth questions enquired about the same information regarding summarisation skills. The last question was asked to ensure that no important details related to the discussed topics were left undiscussed.

Compared to the interview schedule of the first phase, the interview schedule of the second phase was shorter because there was no need to ask about the biographical data. Here, the first two questions referred to the possible changes in the participants' reading processes and task-solving methods, whereas the third question enquired about the material

of other university courses the participant took during the semester. Similarly to the first interview, the last question was asked to ensure that all the important details relevant to the topic were discussed.

The semi-structured interview schedule was chosen instead of a more rigidly structured instrument because of its flexibility, and because the aim was to catch all the nuanced details of the participants' experiences. Both in the first and the second phase, the created interview schedules were piloted and finalised during the first three interviews. Moreover, the rest of participants were also encouraged to add any ideas that they found relevant to the topic at any point of the interview. The full interview schedules can be found in Appendix F.

### ***3.3.6 First and second phase data analysis***

The following sections aim to describe the procedures used to analyse the data collected during the first and second phases in the data collection. The first sub-section focuses on the analysis of the placement test data, the second sub-section briefly presents the analysis of the semi-structured interview data, the third sub-section discusses the analysis of the think-aloud procedures, and the fourth sub-section presents the propositional analysis of the guided summaries.

#### ***3.3.6.1 Analysis of the placement test data***

The placement test data collected during the preliminary phase was analysed based on the instruction guide provided with the Oxford Placement Test. First, the answers of the participants were corrected based on the official key featured in the guide, and every correct answer was counted as one point. The points the participants obtained in the grammar and the listening sections of the test were added, their final scores were interpreted based on the score interpretation table in the guide, and the language proficiency levels of the participants were assessed. For information on the scores matching each language proficiency level, see

Table 5. Table 5 is an adapted version of the full table that can be found in the instruction guide. Exact copies of tables from the Oxford Placement Test instruction guide were not included into this dissertation to avoid any possible violations of copyright.

Table 5

*Placement Test Scores and Language Proficiency Levels*

<b>Oxford Placement Test score</b>	<b>Common European Framework Level</b>
170-200	C2
150-169	C1
135-149	B2
120-134	B1
105-119	A2
90-104	A1
Below 90	Beginner

Similarly to the grammar and listening sections, the answers of the participants for the reading section were corrected based on the official key provided with the test. However, as the reading test did not form part of the Oxford Placement Test, its results were not included into the assessment of the participants' language proficiency levels; they were only used as supplementary information during the analysis.

*3.3.6.2 Analysis of the semi-structured interview data*

The audio-recorded semi-structured interviews were transcribed and subjected to content analysis in order to learn about the participants' biographical data, educational background, their perceptions of the course material, and the possible changes they perceived their reading strategy use to undergo during the course of the semester. These pieces of information were used to create the participant profiles presented in Section 3.3.4 and to answer Research Question 2.

*3.3.6.3 Analysis of the think-aloud procedures*

First, the audio-recordings of the think-aloud procedures collected during the first and second data collection phase were transcribed. When it was necessary, the transcription process was also aided with the video recordings in the case of the first data collection think-

aloud procedures. In the case of the second data collection think-aloud protocols, no video recordings were available. However, as the participants were more familiar and comfortable with the think-aloud method, such help was not necessary for creating the transcripts.

After transcribing the think-aloud protocols, the transcripts were subjected to content analysis, and emerging themes were searched for. The analysis was focusing on the reading processes of the participants and their use of reading strategies while solving the guided summarisation task. In the coding of the emerging themes, the constant comparative method (Maykut & Morehouse, 2002) was used. The initial coding scheme was created with the help of a co-coder, and it was based on the coding scheme used in Szűcs and Kövér (2016), on Urquhart and Weir's (1998) taxonomy of reading types, on Grabe's (2009) list of empirically supported reading strategies, and on Grabe's (2009) strategies used for monitoring reading comprehension. As the present research study focused on reading in the academic context, Grabe's (2009) taxonomy of reading purposes in the academic context was also taken into consideration. The coding scheme was created based on the combination of these taxonomies, and it was modified and improved in accordance with the emerging themes in the data.

The coding was done manually, and to ensure its reliability, 50% of the think-aloud protocols (i.e., seven think-aloud protocol from the first data collection phase, and seven think-aloud protocols from the second data collection phase) were also coded by a co-coder. The co-coder was a fellow researcher who had considerable experience with coding qualitative data, and he also had previous knowledge about the topic of reading processes and reading strategy use. The 50% of the data was selected to ensure that the co-coder coded at least one protocol from each language proficiency level from both data collection phases. The results of the co-coding were entered into SPSS 22.0, and Cohen's Kappa was calculated

to assess the inter-coder reliability. The results suggested a substantial agreement because  $\kappa = 0.82$  ( $p < 0.001$ ).

#### *3.3.6.4 Analysis of the guided summaries*

In order to be able to answer Research Questions 3 and 4, the final guided summaries produced by the participants in the first and the second data collection phase were subjected to propositional analysis along with the source texts used in the two data collection tasks. The method of propositional analysis was chosen because of its potential to provide a formal representation of the semantic content of a text, and because it allows for the analysis and evaluation of reading comprehension performance (Bovair & Kieras, 1985). It can provide a more objective base for deciding what content from the source texts is represented in the guided summaries of the participants than simply just relying on the subjective intuition of the researcher. Bovair and Kieras's (1985) approach was chosen over the other viable methods of propositional analysis because of the detailed explanation of the guidelines of the analysis and because the system of analysis was developed for analysing and scoring source text recall, which could be easily adapted to the needs of the present study.

As the first step of the analysis, the source texts and the guided summaries were broken down into their propositional content. During this process, the propositional analysis guidelines of Bovair and Kieras (1985) were followed without modification. For cases where Bovair and Kieras (1985) did not have examples or guidelines, the following analytical decisions were made:

1. The major and obvious grammatical problems encountered in the summaries of the participants were considered in their grammatically correct forms during the analysis in the cases where the meaning was obvious. For example, "they couldn't concentrating as good as the adults" (Panni, first phase guided summary) was considered in the analysis as 'they couldn't concentrate as well as adults'.
2. Similarly to the first decision, inappropriately used linking words were also replaced in the analysis when the intended meaning was obvious. For example, in the analysis of the sentence "However children develop cognitively as time goes by, some tasks

can be made with children below the age of three.” (Boglárka, first phase guided summary) the linking word ‘however’ was replaced with ‘even though’.

3. Punctuation mistakes were not taken into consideration during the analysis.
4. When conducting the propositional analysis of the guided summaries, overly complicated sentence structures were transcribed in a structure as close to the source text as possible. For instance, in the sentence “Although there are no rules of studying them, naturalistic sampling and some experimentations (two paradigms) might help us.” (Beáta, first phase guided summary) ‘naturalistic sampling’ and ‘some experimentations’ were transcribed as examples even though they were not punctuated as such. Similarly, the sentence “Taking into consideration the possible site (home, foreign place) and the child’s speaking ability, several problems are to be faced” (Beáta, first phase guided summary) was transcribed as an ‘if clause’ to aid the analysis.
5. In all the summaries, the topic and concluding sentences were excluded from the analysis because of their function to provide a general summary of the ideas presented in the body part of the paragraph.
6. Pronouns in the guided summaries were always interpreted during the analysis based on the sentences surrounding them.
7. The linking word ‘and’, its synonyms, and structures generally indicating the addition of an idea were not transcribed in the analysis because this was considered to be the basic relationship linking sentences in a text. For this reason, only linking words connecting alternatives, introducing contrast, or marking subordination were transcribed in the analysis. Ideas linked with the linking word ‘and’, its synonyms, or structures indicating the addition of an idea were only marked in the analysis when they had a restrictive meaning. For instance, in the sentence “They created merchandise [...] not only to spread the word, but to raise money for future projects” (Judit, first phase guided summary) the ideas “spread the word” and “raise money for future projects” were linked in the analysis with ‘and’ in order to suggest that they were both the results of creating merchandise. Similarly, in the sentence “All of these actions made them so popular and well-known that they decided to start fundraising activities.” (Tamás, first phase guided summary) “popular” and “well-known” were transcribed with an ‘and’ relationship because they appear to be mutually necessary reasons for deciding to start the fund-raising activities.
8. When a predicate had multiple arguments of the same type, these arguments were transcribed in the same line using a slash mark, like in the sentence “[...] campaigners couldn’t use the radio or the TV.” (Ibolya, first phase guided summary) was transcribed as P4 (USE CAMPAIGNER RADIO/TV). This decision was made in order to simplify the reading of the analysis.
9. When breaking down the source texts and guided summaries into their propositional content, the propositional content was represented based on the guidelines of Bovair and Kieras (1985). When their guidebook did not contain any suggestions about situations emerging in the transcription process, the following practices were established: (1) structures containing the words ‘a lot of’ were always transcribed with the predicate AMOUNT-OF; (2) structures containing the word ‘some’ were always transcribed with the predicate NUMBER-OF; and (3) structures containing the word ‘numerous’ were always transcribed with the predicate NUMBER-OF.

The propositional analysis of the source texts and the guided summaries was done manually and by the researcher alone. When it was finished, it was sent to the supervisor of this dissertation for expert check, and the propositional content of the source texts and the summaries was finalised based on that feedback.

As the second step of the analysis, the propositional content of the two source texts and the propositional content of the participants' guided summaries were compared and contrasted. Based on the list of content points — task-relevant information (Tankó, 2017) — presented in Table 4, the task-relevant propositional content was defined. During the analysis, two aspects of the summaries were investigated: firstly, the amount of the task-relevant propositional content included in the participants' guided summaries; and secondly, whether the task-irrelevant propositional content of the summaries could be categorised as irrelevant information or added information. Based on Tankó (2017), the present dissertation defines irrelevant information as a piece of information included into the summary of a participant which is present in the source text of the summarisation task, but it is not relevant from the point of view of the task instruction, and added information as “ideas not present in the source text, such as the test taker's personal contributions in the form of opinions, interpretations, analyses” (p. 3).

The reproduction of the task-relevant propositional content was scored based on the guidelines provided by Bovair and Kieras (1985). A version of liberal scoring described by Bovair and Kieras (1985) was applied because of its flexibility. Based on their description, liberal scoring allows the researcher to consider what the possible source text proposition could be that the participant had in mind when writing a certain idea into the summary. Thus, liberal scoring allows information usually considered as ‘noise’ to emerge in the analysis, which is necessary to gain a deep enough insight into the reading processes of the participants. As the guided summarisation task requires the writer to manipulate the order

of the ideas of the source text and to reproduce them in the summary in their own words to avoid plagiarism, it had to be expected that the guided summaries of the participants would never reproduce an idea word-for-word from the source text, and that they would use synonyms, antonyms and alternative sentence structures to express the same ideas as the source text. For this reason, strict scoring as described by Bovair and Kieras (1985) could not be applied in the present study.

As liberal scoring can be rather subjective, a co-coder was used in the process of deciding whether a piece of propositional content can be considered as reproduction of the task-relevant propositions of the source text. The co-coder was a fellow researcher experienced in text analysis. Before the data analysis, the co-coder was trained in the method of propositional analysis by the researcher. Then the researcher and the co-coder analysed the degree of reproduction of the task-relevant propositional content, and they categorised the task-irrelevant propositional content in 14 guided summaries (i.e., 7 guided summaries from the first phase, and 7 guided summaries from the second phase) together. The scoring and the categorisations of the researcher and the co-coder were entered into SPSS 22.0 and Cohen's Kappa was calculated to assess the inter-coder reliability of the analysis. The results suggested a substantial agreement because  $\kappa = 0.78$  ( $p < 0.001$ ).

In the scoring process, a piece of propositional content was given credit for and was considered as an acceptable reproduction of the original propositional content when it was closely reproduced. Close reproduction meant word-for-word reproduction or reproduction with contextually appropriate close synonyms or antonyms. The appropriateness and closeness of synonyms was decided based on dictionary definitions. Deviating from the scoring applied by Bovair and Kieras (1985), the reproduction of embedded propositions was also accepted, even when the main proposition they were embedded into was not reproduced. This decision was made in order to gain the fullest overview possible of the



units of propositional content from the source text reproduced by the participants in their summaries. Furthermore, ideas reproduced with different sentence structures but clearly expressing the same idea as the source text were also accepted as appropriate reproduction. For example, “[...] can cause negative effects on the quality of sound” (Tamás, second data collection guided summary) was accepted as an appropriate reproduction of “[...] it is not always easy to maintain good acoustic quality [...]” (Investigating Children’s Language, CP4).

### **3.4 Ethical considerations**

Similarly to any research endeavour involving human participants, the present study also raises several ethical considerations. The primary consideration was related to the informed consent of the participants. To ensure that the principle of non-maleficence (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) was adhered to, the participants were briefly informed about the content and the nature of the research study before they agreed to participate. Furthermore, they were ensured that participation in the study was voluntary, and even if they agreed to participate, they had the right to refuse to do any part of the data collection or withdraw entirely at any point without any consequences. In addition, at the beginning of both the first and the second phase data collection procedure, the participants were asked to read and sign a consent form (cf. Appendix A.). The consent form provided a brief overview of the data collection procedure, it described the voluntary nature of the participation and the participants’ right to refuse to do any tasks or completely withdraw from participation at any point of the procedure, and about the ways the participants’ data was planned to be handled during and after the research procedure. To ensure the anonymity, non-traceability, and confidentiality of the data provided, the participants were given pseudonyms. To protect their identity, the co-coder also only saw the data with the pseudonyms, and nobody except for the researcher knew about the identity of the participants.

The fact that the researcher was also the academic skills teacher of the group raised the ethical dilemma of an unequal power relationship (Kubanyiova, 2015). Despite the fact that they were informed about the voluntary nature of the participation in the consent form, the participants could have been afraid of the possible negative consequences of their withdrawal on their academic skills course grades. In order to avoid this, they were continually reminded that their participation had no effect on their academic skills course assessment and when it was felt that they were uncomfortable answering a question during the data collection, especially in the interviews, they were encouraged to skip the question. This opportunity was especially prevalent during the semi-structured interview section of the data collection because some of the participants were less comfortable to talk about their educational experience than others. This is also reflected in the way each participant is described in Section 3.3.4 because some of the participants were happy to share details related to their English language learning and high school experiences, whereas other participants only shared basic information in short answers.

In addition to the ethical considerations raised by the use of the think-aloud method and the interview as data collection instruments, the fact that the data collection sessions were both audio and video recorded was also a problem which had to be dealt with from an ethical point of view. At the beginning of each data collection phase, the participants were asked if they agreed to be audio and video recorded. To ensure their anonymity, their names were not recorded and the recordings were saved under their pseudonyms. In the video recordings, the camera was positioned to record only the participants' hands and the task sheet. In addition, the video recordings were also only watched by the researcher and the participants themselves, and after the researcher transcribed the think-aloud procedures, the videos were deleted. As several participants mentioned at the end of the first data collection

phase that they felt uncomfortable being video recorded, during the second data collection phase no video recordings were made.

Ethical concerns can also emerge in connection with the ways data is interpreted. To ensure the validity and the reliability of the results, which is not only a methodological issue, but also an ethical concern, 50% of the think-aloud protocols was double coded with the help of a co-coder, who also helped to establish the list of emerging themes. As noted earlier, the co-coder was a fellow researcher who already had considerable experience with analysing qualitative data. Furthermore, the propositional analysis of the guided summaries was also sent to the supervisor of this dissertation for expert check, and 50% of the guided summaries was also categorised by a co-coder.

Lastly, the principle of justice (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) was also taken into consideration to ensure that the participants gained some benefits from their participation in the study. The placement test results could provide feedback for the participants about their language proficiency levels, and an opportunity to reflect on those language areas they needed to practice more. This placement test is not part of the regular academic skills course syllabus at the university where the research study took place, so the participants of the study received this as extra input. Furthermore, they were encouraged to view the two guided summarisation tasks they had to solve during the data collection as extra practice opportunities for the academic skills test that they had to take at the end of the semester. To help them get the most benefit from these extra practice opportunities, at the end of each data collection session, their task solving processes and their guided summaries were discussed with them in detail. The participants were also encouraged to view the think-aloud method as a new learning tool which could help them become conscious about and reflect on their reading and summarisation processes.

### **3.5 Summary of the research design**

The aim of the present study was to investigate how students process information when they have to read for academic purposes. The study was conducted in three phases, and it intended to answer six research questions. The three phases of the study, the research questions, and the data analysis procedures used to answer the research questions are summarised in Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 6

*The Data Collection Phases of the Present Study*

<b>Phases of the study</b>	<b>Data collection procedures</b>	<b>Participants</b>
<i>Preparatory phase</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the development of two guided summarisation tasks</li> <li>• the pilot of the two guided summarisation tasks</li> <li>• the development of two think-aloud demonstration tasks and four think-aloud practice tasks</li> <li>• the pilot of the think-aloud demonstration and practice tasks</li> </ul>	three advanced users of English and two English learners preparing for a B2 level language examination
<i>First Phase</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the administration of a placement test to the participants</li> <li>• training the participants for the think-aloud method</li> <li>• each participant executing the guided summarisation task while performing think-aloud on it</li> <li>• semi-structured interview with each participant about their educational background</li> </ul>	14 first-year English major BA students attending the academic skills course taught by the researcher
<i>Second phase</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• short think-aloud training to refresh the memories of the participants</li> <li>• each participant executing the guided summarisation task while performing think-aloud on it</li> <li>• semi-structured interview with each participant about the possible changes in their reading strategy use compared to the first data collection phase</li> </ul>	14 first-year English major BA students attending the academic skills course taught by the researcher

Table 7

*Summary of the Research Questions and Data Analysis Procedures*

	<b>Research question</b>	<b>Data source</b>	<b>Method of analysis</b>
1.	What characterizes the reading processes of first-year students before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies?	first phase think-aloud protocols and first phase semi-structured interviews	content analysis, constant comparative method
2.	What characterizes the reading processes of first-year students after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies?	second phase think-aloud protocols and second phase semi-structured interviews	content analysis, constant comparative method
3.	What propositions are included in the final guided summaries of first-year students before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies?	source texts of the guided summarisation tasks, first phase guided summaries	propositional analysis
4.	What propositions are included in the final guided summaries of first-year students after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies?	source texts of the guided summarisation tasks, second phase guided summaries	propositional analysis
5.	Does the language proficiency level of the participants influence the efficiency of their reading processes in terms of identifying and including content points in their guided summaries before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies? If yes, how?	placement test results, first phase think-aloud protocols, first phase guided summaries	content analysis of the first phase think-aloud protocols and propositional analysis of the first phase guided summaries contrasted with the participants' results on the baseline language proficiency test
6.	Does the language proficiency level of the participants influence the efficiency of their reading processes in terms of identifying and including content points in their guided summaries after receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies? If yes, how?	placement test results, second phase think-aloud protocols, second phase guided summaries	content analysis of the second phase think-aloud protocols and propositional analysis of the second phase guided summaries contrasted with the participants' results on the baseline language proficiency test

## **4 The outcomes of the dissertation study**

The following sub-sections present the outcomes of the present dissertation study. As the two main data collection instruments of this research study were the think-alouds and the summaries produced by the participants in the two data collection phases, the following two sections focus on the findings of the content analysis of the think-aloud protocols and the outcomes of the propositional analysis of the participants' guided summaries.

### **4.1 The outcomes of the think-aloud analysis**

In order to be able to answer Research Questions 1 and 2, the reading processes of the participants were investigated through their reading strategy use. To control for the possible method effect, the two guided summarisation tasks were administered in a counterbalanced design. The division of the tasks among the participants for each data collection phase is summarised in Table 8.

Table 8

*The Division of the Tasks Among the Participants for Each Data Collection Phase*

<b>Participant</b>	<b>First phase</b>	<b>Second phase</b>
<i>Panni</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women
<i>Emma</i>	Votes for Women	Investigating Children's Language
<i>Ibolya</i>	Votes for Women	Investigating Children's Language
<i>Ádám</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women
<i>Anita</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women
<i>Dia</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women
<i>Lilla</i>	Votes for Women	Investigating Children's Language
<i>Johanna</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women
<i>Boglárka</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women
<i>Pálma</i>	Votes for Women	Investigating Children's Language
<i>Tamás</i>	Votes for Women	Investigating Children's Language
<i>Beáta</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women
<i>Judit</i>	Votes for Women	Investigating Children's Language
<i>Adél</i>	Investigating Children's Language	Votes for Women

As part of the analysis, 1539 relevant think-aloud segments were coded. During the analysis, those transcribed segments which only referred to the participants' writing processes were disregarded, and only those segments were considered as relevant which referred to their reading processes. In the dataset, 28 emerging themes were identified, and they were grouped into three main categories: defining the reading purpose, processing the text, and monitoring comprehension. The category called processing the text can be further divided into four sub-categories: building a mental model, creating a text level structure, inferencing, and recognising and attending to difficulties. The definitions of the categories and the emerging themes are presented in detail in Table 9.



Table 9

*Emerging Themes and Categories*

Category	Definition	Sub-categories	Emerging themes	Example
Defining the reading purpose	The reader interprets the reading task and decides the focus of the reading process.	N. A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading the task instruction</li> </ul>	“Now I’m going to start by checking what I have to do.” (Adám, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpreting the task instruction</li> </ul>	“I have to sum up in my own words how the suffragettes promoted their movement.” (Adél, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Misinterpreting the task instruction</li> </ul>	“Ok. So I have to write down in my own words what the text is about.” (Emma, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verbalizing the reading purpose</li> </ul>	“This text is about a lot of things, but I will only focus on the difficulties.” (Anita, first phase think-aloud)
Processing the text	The reader uses various reading and task solving strategies to construct the interpretation of the information presented in the source text.	Building mental model <sup>a</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note taking</li> </ul>	“I will take notes on the side of the text so later I will know where to find the content points” (Lilla, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using graphic organisers</li> </ul>	“I am circling these and I am linking them with an arrow to remind myself that these ideas belong together.” (Dia, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skimming a paragraph</li> </ul>	“I think there might be more relevant information in this paragraph so I will take a look at it again.” (Johanna, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading one sentence from the source text</li> </ul>	“I am going to read the first sentence now.” (Boglárka, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carefully reading a whole paragraph of the source text</li> </ul>	“I will read the first paragraph to see what the text is about.” (Pálma, first phase think-aloud)

Category	Definition	Sub-categories	Emerging themes	Example
Processing the text  <i>Cont.</i>	The reader uses various reading and task solving strategies to construct the interpretation of the information presented in the source text. <i>Cont.</i>	Building a mental model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judging the relevance of one piece of information</li> </ul>	“This seems to be a form of promotion, so I will underline it” (Beáta, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judging the relevance of a paragraph</li> </ul>	“The first paragraph is useless, so I will not read it again” (Judit, second phase think-aloud)
		<i>Cont.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Postponing the judgement about the relevance of a piece of information</li> </ul>	“I’m not sure if this is a content point or not, so I will read it again when I finished the text.” (Panni, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluating the logical relations between the sentences of the source text</li> </ul>	“This paragraph says essentially the same thing as the beginning of the text” (Adél, first phase think-aloud)
		Creating a text-level structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formulating an idea relevant to the reading purpose</li> </ul>	“So they came up with a good slogan.” (Adél, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organising the ideas relevant to the reading purpose into a logical order</li> </ul>	“Now I will formulate my content points, and I try to organise them logically” (Judit, second phase think-aloud)

Category	Definition	Sub-categories	Emerging themes	Example
Processing the text <i>Cont.</i>	The reader uses various reading and task solving strategies to construct the interpretation of the information presented in the source text. <i>Cont.</i>	Integrating earlier experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relating a topic discussed in the source text to his/her own knowledge of the world</li> </ul>	“This is a very good topic. We learnt about this in 12th grade in high school.” (Ibolya, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relating the present task to previously encountered reading tasks</li> </ul>	“[I have to write down in my own words what the text is about]. I had to do reading tasks like this at school.” (Emma, first phase think-aloud)
		Recognising and attending to difficulties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trying to interpret an unknown word based on its morphological form</li> </ul>	“I’m not sure what ‘sampling’ is. Sample is ‘minta’ in Hungarian, right? Maybe ‘mintát keresni?’” (Beáta, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trying to interpret an unknown word based on its context</li> </ul>	“I don’t know the word ‘eliciting’, but from this sentence I guess it means ‘collecting’.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trying to interpret an unknown word based on his/her knowledge of the world</li> </ul>	“I don’t this word, ‘enfranchise’, but I remember that New Zealand and Australia were among the first places where women could vote, so probably it means ‘being allowed to vote’ or something like that.” (Ibolya, first phase think-aloud)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skipping an unknown word</li> </ul>	“I don’t know what ‘enfranchised’ means, but it doesn’t seem important.” (Pálma, first phase think-aloud)			

Category	Definition	Sub-categories	Emerging themes	Example
Monitoring comprehension	The reader constantly monitors and assesses his/her reading processes and the appropriacy and correctness of his/her interpretation of the information presented in the source text.	N. A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-reading the task instruction</li> </ul>	“Sorry, I have to read the task again. I don’t remember what I am supposed to do.” (Boglárka, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Checking the reading purpose</li> </ul>	“Let me check again what I have to focus on.” (Adél, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-evaluating the reading purpose</li> </ul>	“I think I’m on the wrong track. This is not even about promotion” (Dia, second phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-reading a sentence to ensure its correct understanding</li> </ul>	“I don’t understand this sentence. I have to read it again.” (Anita, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-reading a paragraph to ensure its correct understanding</li> </ul>	“I will go back to this paragraph just to double check that it really is about promotion” (Judit, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-reading those parts of the text which were deemed relevant to ensure that all information relevant to the reading purpose was found</li> </ul>	“Before I begin to write the summary, I will re-read the things I underlined to see if they are all important.” (Ádám, first phase think-aloud)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-reading those parts of the text which were previously deemed irrelevant to ensure that all information relevant to the reading purpose was found</li> </ul>	“My summary is a little bit short, so I will re-read this paragraph. Maybe I can find more things to include.” (Boglárka, second phase think-aloud)

During the first data collection phase, Panni first read the task instruction and then she read out loud the whole text without stopping at any point. After finishing the text, she read the task instruction again, and misinterpreted it by claiming that she was required to write down her own opinion about the difficulties of collecting data from children which was the topic of the source text. Then, she read the text a second time going paragraph-by-paragraph, trying to identify the meaning of unknown words based on their context. During the second reading, she tried to focus on understanding all the ideas presented in the text, and after finishing the second reading, she started to write down her own opinion about the difficulties of collecting data from children. During writing, she re-read the whole text one more time in order to get inspiration about the topic. Therefore, her final written product resembled a short opinion essay rather than a guided summary of the source text.

Similarly, during the second data collection phase she began with reading the task instruction and interpreting it. However, in contrast with the first data collection phase, she interpreted the task correctly and decided to underline the key words in the instruction and to verbalize her reading purpose to help her focus her attention while reading the source text. During the first reading of the source text, she proceeded paragraph-by-paragraph, and at the end of each paragraph, she made a judgement about the relevance of the pieces of the information presented in it. In addition, she underlined those pieces of information which she deemed relevant to the reading purpose. During the second reading of the text, she only re-read the underlined pieces of information in order to be able to paraphrase them for her guided summary. In order to ensure that she had found all the information relevant to the reading purpose, she decided to re-read the previously disregarded parts of the text. While writing her guided summary, she returned to underlined parts of the text two more times to ensure that her understanding of these sections was correct.

In the same way as Panni, Emma started the first think-aloud with reading the task instruction and reading out the whole text without pausing. Then she went back to the task instruction, and she misinterpreted it by claiming that she had to write down what the text was about. Recalling her previous experience with reading tasks, she said that she already had to do similar tasks at school when preparing for a foreign language examination, and she said that this task was identical to those ones. During the second reading, she read the text word-by-word, trying to understand all the ideas presented in the text, and when encountering unknown words, she tried to decode their meanings from the context. During the third reading she read the text paragraph-by-paragraph. At the end of each paragraph she stopped to write down the main idea into her summary. At the end of the third reading, she considered the possibility that her summary was too long, and she said that she had learnt that a summary has to be approximately the half of the length of the source text. Then she went back to the task instruction and realised that the required length was 130 words +/- 10%, which was much shorter than the half of the source text. For this reason, she went back to the text again, and re-read certain parts to understand the logical relations between the ideas, and to find those sentences which expressed the same idea. After re-reading certain parts of the text several times, she managed to reduce the length of her summary to 217 words, and she claimed that she did not know how to further reduce the word count.

During the second data collection, Emma appeared to be more focused in her task solving processes. She began by reading and interpreting the task instruction, and she noted down her reading purpose on the task sheet. After that she started to read the text paragraph-by-paragraph, and in each paragraph she underlined those pieces of information which she deemed relevant to the reading purpose. During the second reading, she skimmed the text again, stopping to carefully read those sentences which she assumed held additional relevant pieces of information she had not recognised during her first reading. After this, she went

back to re-read the underlined pieces of information to ensure that they were indeed relevant for the reading purpose. Then, she started writing her guided summary and occasionally re-read the underlined sentences to ensure that they were paraphrased correctly in her summary.

During the first data collection, Ibolya also began by reading and interpreting the task instruction. Similarly to the previous two participants, she misinterpreted the instruction by saying that she had to summarise the whole text in her own words. She read the text once completely and claimed that she had always found the topic of suffragette movement interesting, even when she had learnt about it at high school. She read the text for a second time, and she focused on underlining the main ideas in each paragraph. Then she re-read the task instruction, and she claimed that she probably misunderstood the task. From this point forward, she attempted to only focus on the methods the suffragette used to promote their movement. She correctly identified that the last paragraph of the text did not contain any relevant pieces of information, and she re-read the text to underline those pieces of information which were deemed relevant for the revised reading purpose. Despite the fact that she claimed that the aim of the task was to write a summary focusing on the methods the suffragettes used for promoting their movement, Ibolya decided to begin her summary with a general introduction about the background of the suffragette movement.

During the second data collection, she also started with reading and interpreting the task instruction and identifying the reading purpose. During the first reading, she read the text sentence-by-sentence and underlined those ones she deemed to hold relevant pieces of information for the reading purpose. She decided to postpone her judgement regarding the relevance of several pieces of information, and she claimed to return to those sentences later. Before the second reading, she checked the reading purpose again and then she re-read the underlined pieces of information to re-evaluate their relevance. During the next reading, she returned to those sections which she previously could not assess, re-read these sections, and

made a decision about the relevance of the ideas presented in them. Then, she began to write her guided summary, and only returned to the underlined pieces of information to ensure that she understood them correctly.

Just as the previously described participants, *Ádám* started by reading and interpreting the task instruction. He also appeared to misinterpret the task because he claimed that he had to extract the main ideas from each paragraph. During his first reading of the text, he read it paragraph-by-paragraph. He stopped at the end of each paragraph and underlined some key words which were supposed to help him remember the gist of the paragraph. During the second reading, he attempted to focus only on the key words, trying to formulate one sentence summaries of each paragraph. Then, he counted the number of words in his summary and realised that it is longer than the required length. Therefore, he skimmed through the input text again with an attempt to cross out some of the underlined key words and to find those ideas which did not belong to the main topic of the paragraph. With this method, he managed to reduce his summary to the appropriate length and considered the task finished.

During the second data collection, *Ádám* started again with reading and interpreting the task instruction. Then, he carefully read the text once to understand all the ideas presented in it. Then he re-read the task instruction and formulated his reading purpose, and during the second reading, he read the paragraphs with the intention to find and underline those pieces of information which were relevant to his reading purpose. After the second reading, he started to write his summary and only occasionally re-read the underlined bits of the text to ensure that his understanding of the ideas was correct.

During the first data collection *Anita* also began by reading and interpreting the task instruction. Out of all the participants of the study, she was the one who spent the most time on interpreting the instructions, paying careful attention to the details. She formulated her



reading purpose by claiming that she had to focus on the difficulties of collecting data from children in her summary. Then, she started to carefully read the text. During the first reading, she re-read certain sentences several times to ensure that her understanding was correct, and she tried to underline those ideas which she deemed relevant to the reading purpose. After the first reading, she re-read the task instruction again, and she reminded herself of the reading purpose. During the second reading of the text, she only re-read the underlined parts in the text to ensure that they were indeed relevant to the reading purpose. As she was unsure about having found all the relevant pieces of information, she re-read the whole text again and found more pieces of information seemingly relevant to the reading purpose. When she was unsure about the meaning of a word, she tried to figure it out based on the context or the morphology. Then, she created an outline for her summary, and started to write it. While writing, she returned to the text twice to ensure that her understanding of certain information was correct.

At the second data collection, she was just as careful in her reading and interpretation of the task instruction as on the first data collection session. She formulated her reading purpose and started to read the text. During her first reading, she focused on finding those pieces of information which were relevant to the reading purpose, and she underlined those pieces of information. Then, she re-read the task instruction to ensure that she had the correct reading purpose in mind. During, her second reading of her text, she only re-read the underlined parts to ensure the correct understanding. Then she formulated the pieces of information relevant to the reading purpose in her own words and started to write her summary. While writing, she only returned to her own reformulations and not to the text.

Dia began the first data collection by reading the task instruction and saying that the task was similar to reading task she had to do in preparation for the final school leaving examination and English language examination. She formulated her reading purpose and

claimed that she had to summarise the main points of the text which was a misinterpretation of the task. Then, she read the text carefully once. After that, she re-read the task instruction and realised that she misinterpreted the task. She re-formulated her reading purpose and she started to read the text again. This time she attempted to focus on finding those pieces of information which were relevant to the reading purpose and to underline these pieces of information. She decided to also underline some other pieces of information which were not strictly relevant to the reading purpose, and she intended to include these only if her summary was short. Then, she went back to the underlined pieces of relevant information and summarised these in her own words. As her summary was initially short, she decided to also include some of the irrelevant pieces of information.

On the second data collection session, Dia appeared to be more focused and she started by reading the task instruction and correctly formulating the reading purpose. Then she began to read the text paragraph-by-paragraph, and she assessed the relevance of all pieces of information presented in the text based on her reading purpose. She decided to underline those pieces of information she deemed relevant. During the second reading, she only focussed on the underlined pieces of information, and she tried to find the logical connection between them. She marked the logical connections with the help of graphic organisers such as circles and arrows. Then she paraphrased each relevant piece of information in her own words, organised them into a logical order on a separate piece of paper, and while writing her summary she only returned to these notes and not to the text.

Lilla approached the task in a similar way as the previously described participants during the first data collection session. She started by reading and interpreting the task instruction and by skimming the text to get a general idea about the topic. Then she re-read the text paragraph-by-paragraph, circled the unknown words, and underlined the main ideas in each paragraph. She tried to understand the unknown words based on the sentences

surrounding it, and she re-read the text again to ensure that she understood it correctly. When she was not sure that she understood a sentence or a paragraph correctly, she re-read it several times with an attempt to interpret it. When she felt that she finally fully understood the text, she started to write her summary. She began the summary with a general introduction about the suffragette movement because she claimed that in high school, she was always required to provide a general introduction about the topic in every writing assignment. While writing the summary, she relied on her memory, and she chose not to re-read any parts of the text.

During the second data collection, Lilla again started by reading the task instruction, but she interpreted it more carefully than the first time. She underlined the information regarding the length of the summary, and she carefully formulated her reading purpose. During the first reading, she already focussed on finding those pieces of information which were relevant to the reading purpose, and she also underlined them. She again circled the unknown words and tried to interpret them based on the context. She claimed that she found the topic of the text very interesting but a bit challenging. After the first reading, she was unsure about having found all the relevant pieces of information, so she re-read those parts of the text which she previously deemed irrelevant. This way, she underlined more relevant pieces of information. After the second reading, she re-read and paraphrased the underlined pieces of information in her own words. She organised these into a logical order and began to write her summary. While writing the summary, she occasionally returned to the underlined pieces of information in the text to ensure that her understanding of them was correct.

During the first data collection session, Johanna first read and interpreted the task instruction. Then, she formulated her reading purpose and started reading the text. During the first reading, she skimmed the text to get a general understanding about the topic. Then,

she claimed that the aim of the task was to summarise the main ideas of the text, so the task was the same as the ones she had to do in preparation for her final school leaving examination. During the second reading, she read the text paragraph-by-paragraph, and at the end of each paragraph, she stopped and formulated a one sentence summary of the paragraph. After this, she counted the words in her summary and realised that it was longer than it should have been. She re-read the source text again to ensure that she understood it correctly, and then tried to formulate the same ideas as previously in fewer words. When she encountered an unknown word in the source text, she decided to skip it.

On the second data collection session, she again started by reading and interpreting the task instruction. She correctly identified the reading purpose, and then she started to read the text. During the first reading, she read the text carefully and focussed on understanding all the ideas presented in the text. Then, she re-read the text and focussed only on finding those pieces of information which were relevant to the reading purpose. She underlined the information deemed relevant in the text, and during the third reading she re-read and paraphrased the underlined parts in her own words. When she started to write her summary, she only returned to these paraphrased versions. When she finished her summary and counted the number of the words, she realised that it was not long enough, so she skimmed the text again to ensure that she had found all the relevant pieces of information.

At the first data collection, Boglárka found it frustrating to have a one-hour time limit to complete the whole task. She first read and interpreted the task instruction and said that the task was similar to the ones she had to solve in high school when preparing for the Hungarian final school leaving examination. She clearly misinterpreted the task because she claimed that she had to summarise all the main ideas of the text. Then she read the whole text carefully, and after every 2-3 sentences, she paused to interpret what she was reading. When she felt that she could not fully understand what she was reading, she re-read the part

in question several times. When she encountered an unknown word, she either skipped it or she tried to interpret it based on its context. After the first reading, she re-read the task instruction, and began to read the text again. During the second reading, she underlined those pieces of the text she deemed relevant for the reading purpose. After that, she started to write her summary, and during this, she only went back briefly to the underlined parts of the text. When she finished her summary, she counted the words and realized that it was longer than the required length. She claimed that she could not shorten the text further, and announced that she wanted to finish the task.

During the second data collection session, Boglárka again started by reading and interpreting the task instruction, and this time she managed to correctly set the reading purpose. Even during the first reading of the text, she already focused on finding the pieces of information relevant for the reading purpose, and she tried to underline these. Then she re-read the instructions and reminded herself about the reading purpose. During the second reading, she re-read those parts of the text she previously deemed irrelevant to ensure that she found all the relevant pieces of information. After this, she only re-read the underlined pieces of information, and she attempted to find the connection between the pieces of information presented in the different paragraphs, and she signalled these relationships with the help of arrows. Then she started to write her summary, and occasionally re-read the underlined part of the text several times to ensure that she understood them correctly.

During the first data collection, Pálma also started the task execution process by reading and interpreting the task instruction. She defined the reading purpose correctly, claiming that her summary had to focus on the ways the suffragettes promoted their movement, then she started to read the text. During the first reading, she read the text carefully, and tried to understand all the information presented in it. When encountering unknown words, in the case of adverbs and adjectives, she decided to simply skip the word,

and in the case of verbs, she tried to guess the meaning from context. During the second reading, she quickly re-read the text and attempted to find those pieces of information which seemed relevant to the reading purpose. Then she re-read the text carefully paragraph-by-paragraph to ensure that she found all the relevant pieces of information. Then she started to write her summary, and she returned to the underlined pieces of information in the text several times to ensure that her understanding of them was correct. Despite defining the correct reading purpose, she decided to include information not strictly related to the reading purpose in order to provide context in her summary. She claimed that she did this based on the instruction she received in high school regarding writing assignments.

At the second session, she also began by reading and interpreting the task instruction, and she formulated her reading purpose. Then she skimmed the text once. She claimed that the text seemed more complicated than the ones she previously had to read, so she had difficulties understanding it. She fully re-read the text two more times in a careful way to make sure that she really understood it. She went back to some of the paragraphs several times because there were several unknown words in them. She handled the unknown words in the same way as she did during the first data collection session. When she ensured that she fully understood the text, Pálma read the text again and underlined the pieces of information she deemed relevant for the reading purpose. Then she started to write her summary and only occasionally re-read the underlined parts of the text to remind herself about their content and to ensure the correct understanding.

During the first data collection, Tamás first read and interpreted the task instruction. Then he started to read the text paragraph-by-paragraph. At the end of each paragraph, he stopped and interpreted what he had read. At the end of the first reading, he went back to the task instruction and misinterpreted them by saying that he was required to write about the suffragette movement in general based on the text. He scanned the text for dates to be

able to organize the events presented in the text into a chronological order. Then he re-read each paragraph of the text and underlined the main idea in each one of them. After that, he started to write the summary, and he began by writing a general introduction. He claimed that he did this because he was told in high school to always start compositions with a general introduction. Then he re-read the underlined parts of the text and formulated them in his own words. He finished his summary with a general conclusion, following what he had learnt in high school about compositions.

At the second data collection session, Tamás appeared to be more focused and efficient in his task solving processes. First, he read and interpreted the task instruction and formulated his reading purpose. Then he started to read the text and immediately began to underline those parts of the text he deemed relevant for the reading purpose. When he encountered a sentence he could not fully understand, he re-read it several times. During the second reading, he re-read the text only superficially to ensure that he found all the relevant pieces of information. Then he began to write his summary, and he only sporadically returned to the underlined pieces of information to ensure that he understood them correctly.

Beáta approached the task of the first data collection session similarly to the other participants. She first read and interpreted the task instruction, and she started to read the text carefully sentence-by-sentence. In each paragraph, she underlined the main idea. When she encountered unknown words, she tried to infer their meaning from their morphological form or the context. When she was unsure about understanding a sentence correctly, she re-read it. After the first reading, she re-read the text superficially the text to find the logical connection among the underlined main ideas, and she created an outline for her summary. She re-read the task instruction, and she defined the reading purpose incorrectly, claiming that she was required to summarise all the main ideas in the text. Then she began to write

her summary, and she only re-read the underlined parts of the text to ensure that she understood the ideas correctly.

During the second data collection session, she managed to interpret the task instruction correctly, and she set an appropriate reading purpose. She began by reading the text paragraph-by-paragraph. After each paragraph, she stopped to evaluate the relevance of the information content of the paragraph, and she underlined those pieces of information she deemed relevant. Additionally, she took an empty sheet of paper and began to paraphrase the underlined information in her own words right after underlining it in the text. After the first reading, she re-read the text to ensure that she found all the relevant piece of information, and then she started to write her summary. While writing, she only returned to the paraphrased versions of the relevant ideas and not to the text.

Compared to the previously described participants, Judit approached the task during the first data collection slightly differently. She started by reading and interpreting the task instruction, and she correctly interpreted that she had to focus on the ways suffragettes promoted their movement. She explained that she wanted to approach the task in two steps: first, she wanted to read the whole text carefully to understand it in its entirety, then she wanted to re-read it again, only focusing on the ideas relevant for the reading purpose. During the second reading, she immediately skipped those parts of the text she deemed to be irrelevant for the reading purpose, and she underlined the relevant pieces of information. When she finished the second reading, she paraphrased the relevant ideas in her own words on a separate piece of paper, and she signalled the logical connection among them with the help of arrows. Then she began to write her summary and only returned to her notes while writing.

During the second data collection, she approached the task in a similar fashion. She read and interpreted the task first, and she formulated the reading purpose. Then she started



to read the text, and immediately claimed that the first paragraph held no relevant information. Then she read the text paragraph-by-paragraph and underlined the relevant pieces of information. When underlining the relevant pieces of information, she also paraphrased them on the margin in her own words. When finding new pieces of information, she also quickly glanced back to the previously underlined pieces of information to create logical connections among them. She indicated these connections with arrows. In one of the paragraphs she encountered several unknown words; however, she claimed that that section of the paragraph appeared to be irrelevant for the reading purpose, so she decided to skip the unknown words. After finishing reading the text, she started writing her summary, and she only re-read her own paraphrased sentences and not the text. Therefore, during the second data collection session, Judit only fully read the text once.

Similarly to Judit, Adél was one of the most efficient readers among the participants. During the first data collection, she first read and interpreted the task and she correctly interpreted that she only had to focus in her summary on the difficulties of collecting data from children. When she read the title of the source text, she claimed that the text probably also contained several other types of information that were irrelevant for her, which proved that she indeed interpreted the task instruction correctly. She began by reading the source text paragraph-by-paragraph, and she underlined the pieces of information she deemed relevant to the reading purpose. Then she started to write her summary, which she began with a general introduction about the topic because she claimed that she had been instructed in high school to always start writing assignments with a general introduction about the topic. Then, even though she appropriately interpreted the task instruction, she was reluctant to immediately start writing about the difficulties of collecting data from children, and she started writing about the different types of data collection methods. She claimed that she did this based on what she learnt in high school. She finished her summary with the difficulties

of collecting data from children and a general concluding sentence about the topic. While writing the summary, she only re-read the underlined pieces of information once.

Adél's reading processes did not substantially change for the second data collection phase. She began by reading and correctly interpreting the task instruction and setting an appropriate reading purpose. Then she read the text paragraph-by-paragraph and underlined those pieces of information which she deemed relevant for the reading purpose. She decided to first only skim the paragraphs, and she only read them carefully if it appeared that they held relevant pieces of information. During the second reading, she only read the underlined pieces of information in order to ensure that they were indeed relevant to the reading purpose, and she paraphrased the underlined information on the margins. Then she started to write her summary, and during this, she only re-read her own notes on the margins and not the text. In contrast with the first data collection session, she only focused on the relevant pieces of information in her summary, and she did not feel the need to include an extra information into it.

#### **4.2 The outcomes of the propositional analysis**

In order to answer the Research Questions 3 and 4, the source texts of the summarisation tasks and the final guided summaries produced by the participants in both data collection phases were subjected to propositional analysis. The analysis was carried out based on the recommendations of Bovair and Kieras (1985). The method and the analytical decisions behind the analysis are detailed in Section 3.3.6.4. As the first step of the analysis, the source texts of both guided summarisation tasks were subjected to propositional analysis. The tabulated analysis of the two texts can be found in Appendix E.

Based on the pilot of the data collection tasks conducted in the preparatory phase of the present study, the *Investigating Children's Language* text had four task-relevant pieces of information (i.e., content points) which had to be extracted from the text, and the *Votes*

*for Women* text had six. These content points (CPs) and their propositional analysis are summarised in Tables 10 and 11.

Table 10

*CPs in the 'Investigating Children's Language' Text*

CP	Text	Propositional analysis
	<b>S1:</b> Many of the linguist's routine techniques of enquiry cannot be used with children.	<b>S1:</b> P1 (ABLE-TO \$ P2) P2 (USE \$ TECHNIQUE) P3 (NEGATE P1) P4 (MOD TECHNIQUE ENQUIRY) P5 (MOD P4 ROUTINE) P6 (POSSESS LINGUIST P5) P7 (NUMBER-OF P6 MANY) P8 (WITH P1 CHILDREN)
CP1	<b>S2:</b> It is not possible to carry out certain kinds of experiments, because aspects of children's cognitive development – such as their ability to pay attention or to remember instructions – may not be sufficiently advanced.	<b>S2:</b> P1 (MOD P3 POSSIBLE) P2 (NEGATE P1) P3 (CARRY-OUT \$ EXPERIMENT) P4 (MOD EXPERIMENT CERTAIN-KIND) P5 (BECAUSE P1 P12) P6 (MOD DEVELOPMENT ADVANCED) P7 (AMOUNT-OF P6 SUFFICIENT) P8 (MOD DEVELOPMENT COGNITIVE) P9 (POSSESS CHILDREN P8) P10 (DEGREE-OF P9 ASPECT) P11 (MOD P7 POSSIBLE) P12 (NEGATE P11) P13 (EXAMPLE-OF P10 P14) P14 (OR P15 P16) P15 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN PAY-ATTENTION) P16 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN P17) P17 (REMEMBER CHILDREN INSTRUCTION)

CP	Text	Propositional analysis
CP2	Nor is it easy to get children to make systematic judgments about language, a task that is virtually impossible below the age of three.	P1 (MOD P2 EASY) P2 (GET-TO-MAKE CHILDREN JUDGMENT) P3 (NEGATE P1) P4 (MOD JUDGMENT SYSTEMATIC) P5 (ABOUT JUDGMENT LANGUAGE) P6 (REF P2 P7) P7 (MOD TASK IMPOSSIBLE) P8 (TIME P7 BELOW-THE-AGE) P9 (NUMBER-OF AGE THREE)
CP3	<p><b>S1:</b> Some children, it seems, are innately programmed to switch off as soon as they notice a tape recorder being switched on.</p> <p><b>S2:</b> (...) the presence of the researcher or the recording equipment can be a distraction (especially if the proceedings are being filmed).</p>	<p><b>S1:</b> P1 (SEEM P2)            P2 (ROGRAMME-TO CHILDREN P5)            P3 (NUMBER-OF CHILDREN SOME)            P4 (MOD PROGRAMME INNATELY)            P5 (SWITCH-OFF CHILDREN)            P6 (AS-SOON-AS P5 P7)            P7 (NOTICE CHILDREN P8)            P8 (SWITCH-ON \$ TAPE-RECORDER)</p> <p><b>S2:</b> P1 (ISA RESEARCHER/RECORDING-EQUIPMENT DISTRACTION)            P2 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE)            P3 (IF P2 P4)            P4 (FILM \$ PROCEEDING)            P5 (MOD P4 ESPECIAL)</p>
CP4	(...) it is not always easy to maintain good acoustic quality (...)	P1 (NEGATE P2) P2 (MOD P4 EASY) P3 (TIME P2 ALWAYS) P4 (MAINTAIN \$ QUALITY) P5 (MOD QUALITY ACOUSTIC) P6 (MOD P5 GOOD)

Table 11

*CPs in the 'Votes for Women' Text*

CP	Text	Propositional analysis
CP1	(...) their slogan 'Deeds not words' (...)	P1 (CREATE WSPU SLOGAN) P2 (LABEL SLOGAN DEEDS-NOT-WORDS)
	<b>S1:</b> (...) introduction of the colour scheme	<b>S1:</b> P1 (INTRODUCE WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME)
	<b>S2:</b> The group began to sell playing cards, board games, Christmas and greeting cards, and countless other goods, all in the purple, white and green colours.	<b>S2:</b> P1 (BEGIN GROUP P2) P2 (SELL GROUP PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS) P3 (MOD GOODS OTHER) P4 (NUMBER-OF P3 COUNTLESS) P5 (MOD PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)
	<b>S3:</b> In 1906 such merchandising of a corporate identity was a new marketing concept.	<b>S3:</b> P1 (ISA P2 CONCEPT) P2 (MENCHANDISE CORPORATE-IDENTITY) P3 (MOD CONCEPT MARKETING) P4 (MOD P3 NEW) P5 (TIME P1 1906)
CP2		
	<b>S4:</b> (...) wearing their official uniforms of a white frock decorated with purple, white and green accessories (...)	<b>S4:</b> P1 (WEAR MEMBER UNIFORM) P2 (MOD MEMBER WSPU) P3 (MOD UNIFORM OFFICIAL) P4 (POSSESS WSPU UNIFORM) P5 (IS UNIFORM FROCK) P6 (MOD FROCK WHITE/DECORATED) P7 (WITH DECORATED ACCESSORY) P8 (MOD ACCESSORY PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)
	<b>S5:</b> (...) postcards and greeting cards designed by women artists for the movement (...)	<b>S5:</b> P1 (DESIGN ARTIST POSTCARD/GREETING-CARD) P2 (MOD ARTIST WOMAN) P3 (FOR P1 MOVEMENT)

CP	Text	Propositional analysis
CP3	<b>S1:</b> The newspapers produced by the WSPU, first Votes for Women and later The Suffragette, played a vital role in this communication.	<b>S1:</b> P1 (PLAY NEWSPAPER ROLE) P2 (MOD ROLE VITAL) P3 (IN P1 COMMUNICATION) P4 (PRODUCE WSPU NEWSPAPER) P5 (LABEL NEWSPAPER VOTES-FOR-WOMEN) P6 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE)
	<b>S2:</b> Both were sold throughout the country and proved an invaluable way of informing members of meetings, marches, fund-raising events and the latest news and views on the movement.	<b>S2:</b> P1 (SELL \$ NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2) P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER1 VOTES-FOR-WOMEN) P3 (LABEL NEWSPAPER2 THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P4 (THROUGHOUT P1 COUNTRY) P5 (PROVIDE NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2 WAY) P6 (MOD WAY INVALUABLE) P7 (OF WAY P8) P8 (INFORM \$ MEMBER) P9 (ABOUT INFORM MEETING/MARCH/FUND-RAISING-EVENT/NEWS/VIEWS) P10 (MOD NEWS/VIEWS LATEST) P11 (ON VIEW MOVEMENT)
	<b>S3:</b> (...) women selling The Suffragette at street corners (...)	<b>S3:</b> P1 (SELL WOMAN NEWSPAPER) P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P3 (ON P1 STREET-CORNER)
CP4	<b>S1:</b> (...) numerous other fundraising activities combined (...)	<b>S1:</b> P1 (ORGANISE WSPU FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY)
	<b>S2:</b> The most notable of these was the Woman's Exhibition (...)	<b>S2:</b> P1 (MOD FUNDRAISING-ACTIVITY NOTABLE) P2 (MOD NOTABLE MOST) P3 (REF P1 EXHIBITION) P4 (LABEL EXHIBITION WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION)
CP5	(...) chalking up pavements with details of a forthcoming meeting.	P1 (CHALK-UP WOMAN PAVEMENT) P2 (WITH P1 DETAILS) P3 (POSSESS MEETING DETAIL) P4 (MOD MEETING FORTHCOMING)

The next step of the analysis was to carry out the propositional analysis of the summaries produced by the participants in the first and the second data collection phase, and to compare the propositional content of these summaries to the list of task-relevant propositional content of the two source texts. The results of this comparison are summarised in Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15. The tables list all the task-relevant propositions from the source texts. Those propositions which could be found in a particular participant's guided summary are marked with a cross ('x').

As Table 12 indicates there were eight participants who worked with the *'Investigating Children's Language'* text in the first data collection phase, and out of these eight participants, Johanna and Beáta did not manage to reproduce any of the task-relevant propositions in their guided summaries, and Panni only managed to reproduce one task-relevant proposition. Ádám managed to partially reproduce the propositional content of the first content point, but he did not include any relevant pieces of information from the other content points into his guided summary. Dia managed to partially reproduce the propositional content of the first and the second content points; whereas Boglárka partially reproduced the propositional content of the first, second, and third content points, including this way some relevant propositional content from almost each content point into her guided summary. Adél and Anita both managed to fully reproduce the fourth content point in their summaries, and they also partially included the propositional content of the third content point. In addition, Adél also included one relevant proposition from the first content point into her summary.



Table 12

*Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the First Phase from the 'Investigating Children's Language' Text*

CP	Propositions	Panni	Ádám	Anita	Dia	Johanna	Boglárka	Beáta	Adél
	S1: P1 (ABLE-TO P2)						x		
	P2 (USE \$ TECHNIQUE)						x		
	P3 (NEGATE P1)						x		
	P4 (MOD TECHNIQUE ENQUIRY)								
	P5 (MOD P4 ROUTINE)								
	P6 (POSSESS LINGUIST P5)								
	P7 (NUMBER-OF P6 MANY)								
	P8 (WITH P1 CHILDREN)						x		
	S2: P1 (MOD P3 POSSIBLE)		x						
	P2 (NEGATE P1)		x						
	P3 (CARRY-OUT \$ EXPERIMENT)		x						
	P4 (MOD EXPERIMENT CERTAIN-KIND)		x						
	P5 (BECAUSE P1 P12)								
CP1	P6 (MOD DEVELOPMENT ADVANCED)								
	P7 (AMOUNT-OF P6 SUFFICIENT)								
	P8 (MOD DEVELOPMENT COGNITIVE)								
	P9 (POSSESS CHILDREN P8)								
	P10 (DEGREE-OF P9 ASPECT)								
	P11 (MOD P7 POSSIBLE)								
	P12 (NEGATE P11)								
	P13 (EXAMPLE-OF P10 P14)								
	P14 (OR P15 P16)								
	P15 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN PAY-ATTENTION)	x				x			x
	P16 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN P17)					x			
	P17 (REMEMBER CHILDREN INSTRUCTION)					x			

CP	Propositions	Panni	Ádám	Anita	Dia	Johanna	Boglárka	Beáta	Adél
CP2	P1 (MOD P2 EASY)				x				
	P2 (GET-TO-MAKE CHILDREN JUDGMENT)				x				
	P3 (NEGATE P1)				x				
	P4 (MOD JUDGMENT SYSTEMATIC)								
	P5 (ABOUT JUDGMENT LANGUAGE)				x				
	P6 (REF P2 P7)								
	P7 (MOD TASK IMPOSSIBLE)						x		
	P8 (TIME P7 BELOW-THE-AGE)						x		
	P9 (NUMBER-OF AGE THREE)								
CP3	<b>S1:</b> P1 (SEEM P2)								
	P2 (ROGRAMME-TO CHILDREN P5)								
	P3 (NUMBER-OF CHILDREN SOME)						x		
	P4 (MOD PROGRAMME INNATELY)								
	P5 (SWITCH-OFF CHILDREN)			x			x		x
	P6 (AS-SOON-AS P5 P7)			x			x		x
	P7 (NOTICE CHILDREN P8)			x			x		x
	P8 (SWITCH-ON \$ TAPE-RECORDER)			x					x
	<b>S2:</b> P1 (ISA RESEARCHER/RECORDING-EQUIPMENT DISTRACTION)			x					x
	P2 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE)			x					x
	P3 (IF P2 P4)								
P4 (FILM \$ PROCEEDING)									
P5 (MOD P4 ESPECIAL)									
CP4	P1 (NEGATE P2)			x					x
	P2 (MOD P4 EASY)			x					x
	P3 (TIME P2 ALWAYS)			x					x
	P4 (MAINTAIN \$ QUALITY)			x					x
	P5 (MOD QUALITY ACOUSTIC)			x					x
	P6 (MOD P5 GOOD)			x					x

As Table 13 shows, there were six participants who worked with the *‘Investigating Children’s Language’* text in the second data collection phase. In contrast with those participants who worked with this text in the first data collection phase, in the second data collection phase each participant managed to reproduce at least some task-relevant propositions in their summaries. Ibolya and Lilla managed to partially reproduce the second content point, but they did not include any propositions from the other content points into their summaries. Pálma managed to partially reproduce the propositional content of the first and the second content points, whereas Judit partially reproduced the first three content points in her summary. Tamás partially reproduced the first and the third content points, and he fully reproduced the propositional content of the fourth content point. Emma was the only participant out of the five who managed to partially reproduce the propositional content of all four content points in her summary.

Table 13

*Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the Second Phase from the 'Investigating Children's Language' Text*

CP	Propositions	Emma	Ibolya	Lilla	Pálma	Tamás	Judit
CP1	S1: P1 (ABLE-TO P2)					X	
	P2 (USE \$ TECHNIQUE)					X	
	P3 (NEGATE P1)					X	
	P4 (MOD TECHNIQUE ENQUIRY)					X	
	P5 (MOD P4 ROUTINE)						
	P6 (POSSESS LINGUIST P5)						
	P7 (NUMBER-OF P6 MANY)					X	
	P8 (WITH P1 CHILDREN)					X	
	S2: P1 (MOD P3 POSSIBLE)						X
	P2 (NEGATE P1)						X
	P3 (CARRY-OUT \$ EXPERIMENT)						X
	P4 (MOD EXPERIMENT CERTAIN-KIND)						X
	P5 (BECAUSE P1 P12)						X
	P6 (MOD DEVELOPMENT ADVANCED)						X
	P7 (AMOUNT-OF P6 SUFFICIENT)						X
	P8 (MOD DEVELOPMENT COGNITIVE)						X
	P9 (POSSESS CHILDREN P8)						X
P10 (DEGREE-OF P9 ASPECT)						X	
P11 (MOD P7 POSSIBLE)						X	
P12 (NEGATE P11)						X	
P13 (EXAMPLE-OF P10 P14)							
P14 (OR P15 P16)					X		
P15 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN PAY-ATTENTION)		X			X		
P16 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN P17)		X			X		
P17 (REMEMBER CHILDREN INSTRUCTION)		X			X		

CP	Propositions	Emma	Ibolya	Lilla	Pálma	Tamás	Judit
	P1 (MOD P2 EASY)				X		X
	P2 (GET-TO-MAKE CHILDREN JUDGMENT)				X		X
	P3 (NEGATE P1)				X		X
	P4 (MOD JUDGMENT SYSTEMATIC)	X					X
CP2	P5 (ABOUT JUDGMENT LANGUAGE)						X
	P6 (REF P2 P7)						
	P7 (MOD TASK IMPOSSIBLE)	X			X		
	P8 (TIME P7 BELOW-THE-AGE)	X			X		
	P9 (NUMBER-OF AGE THREE)	X			X		
	<b>S1:</b> P1 (SEEM P2)						
	P2 (ROGRAMME-TO CHILDREN P5)						
	P3 (NUMBER-OF CHILDREN SOME)						
	P4 (MOD PROGRAMME INNATELY)						
	P5 (SWITCH-OFF CHILDREN)						
	P6 (AS-SOON-AS P5 P7)						
CP3	P7 (NOTICE CHILDREN P8)						
	P8 (SWITCH-ON \$ TAPE-RECORDER)						
	<b>S2:</b> P1 (ISA RESEARCHER/RECORDING-EQUIPMENT DISTRACTION)	X	X	X		X	X
	P2 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE)		X	X		X	X
	P3 (IF P2 P4)						
	P4 (FILM \$ PROCEEDING)						
	P5 (MOD P4 ESPECIAL)						
	P1 (NEGATE P2)	X				X	
	P2 (MOD P4 EASY)					X	
CP4	P3 (TIME P2 ALWAYS)					X	
	P4 (MAINTAIN \$ QUALITY)					X	
	P5 (MOD QUALITY ACOUSTIC)	X				X	
	P6 (MOD P5 GOOD)	X				X	

As Table 14 shows, there were six participants who worked with the *'Votes for Women'* text in the first data collection phase. Out of the five content points present in the text, the fifth content point appeared to be the most challenging for the participants as none of them reproduced its propositional content in their summaries. Pálma was the only one who managed to include some propositional content from all the other four content points into her summary. Emma, Ibolya, and Lilla managed to partially reproduce three out of the five content points, whereas in his summary Tamás partially reproduced the second and the third content points and fully reproduced the fourth content point. Judit only managed to reproduce some parts of the second and the third content points.

Table 14

*Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the First Phase from the 'Votes for Women' Text*

CP	Propositions	Emma	Ibolya	Lilla	Pálma	Tamás	Judit
CP1	P1 (CREATE WSPU SLOGAN)			x	x		
	P2 (LABEL SLOGAN DEEDS-NOT-WORDS)			x			
CP2	<b>S1:</b> P1 (INTRODUCE WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME)				x	x	
	<b>S2:</b> P1 (BEGIN GROUP P2)				x	x	
	P2 (SELL GROUP PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS)	x		x	x	x	x
	P3 (MOD GOODS OTHER)	x				x	
	P4 (NUMBER-OF P3 COUNTLESS)						
	P5 (MOD PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)	x	x		x	x	
	<b>S3:</b> P1 (ISA P2 CONCEPT)						
	P2 (MENRCHANDISE CORPORATE-IDENTITY)		x				
	P3 (MOD CONCEPT MARKETING)					x	
	P4 (MOD P3 NEW)					x	
	P5 (TIME P1 1906)						
	<b>S4:</b> P1 (WEAR MEMBER UNIFORM)						
	P2 (MOD MEMBER WSPU)						
	P3 (MOD UNIFORM OFFICIAL)						
	P4 (POSSESS WSPU UNIFORM)						
P5 (IS UNIFORM FROCK)							
P6 (MOD FROCK WHITE/DECORATED)							
P7 (WITH DECORATED ACCESSORY)							
P8 (MOD ACCESSORY PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)				x			
<b>S5:</b> P1 (DESIGN ARTIST POSTCARD/GREETING-CARD)							
P2 (MOD ARTIST WOMAN)							
P3 (FOR P1 MOVEMENT)							

CP	Propositions	Emma	Ibolya	Lilla	Pálma	Tamás	Judit
	<b>S1:</b> P1 (PLAY NEWSPAPER ROLE)		x		x		
	P2 (MOD ROLE VITAL)	x	x		x		
	P3 (IN P1 COMMUNICATION)	x	x		x		
	P4 (PRODUCE WSPU NEWSPAPER)	x			x		x
	P5 (LABEL NEWSPAPER VOTES-FOR-WOMEN)						x
	P6 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE)						x
	<b>S2:</b> P1 (SELL \$ NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2)						
	P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER1 VOTES-FOR-WOMEN)						
	P3 (LABEL NEWSPAPER2 THE-SUFFRAGETTE)						
	P4 (THROUGHOUT P1 COUNTRY)						
CP3	P5 (PROVIDE NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2 WAY)					x	x
	P6 (MOD WAY INVALUABLE)					x	
	P7 (OF WAY P8)					x	x
	P8 (INFORM \$ MEMBER)					x	x
	P9 (ABOUT INFORM MEETING/MARCH/FUND-RAISING-EVENT/NEWS/VIEWS)						x
	P10 (MOD NEWS/VIEWS LATEST)						
	P11 (ON VIEW MOVEMENT)						
	<b>S3:</b> P1 (SELL WOMAN NEWSPAPER)						
	P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE)						
	P3 (ON P1 STREET-CORNER)						
	<b>S1:</b> P1 (ORGANISE WSPU FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY)	x	x	x	x	x	
CP4	<b>S2:</b> P1 (MOD FUNDRAISING-ACTIVITY NOTABLE)	x				x	
	P2 (MOD NOTABLE MOST)	x				x	
	P3 (REF P1 EXHIBITION)		x			x	
	P4 (LABEL EXHIBITION WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION)	x	x			x	
CP5	P1 (CHALK-UP WOMAN PAVEMENT)						
	P2 (WITH P1 DETAILS)						
	P3 (POSSESS MEETING DETAIL)						
	P4 (MOD MEETING FORTHCOMING)						



As Table 15 presents, there were eight participants who worked with the *'Votes for Women'* text in the second data collection phase. Similarly to those participants who worked with this text in the first data collection phase, none of the participants in the second phase managed to reproduce the propositional content of the fifth content point in their summaries. This might indicate that the full interpretation of the part of the source text which contains this content point was overly challenging for the participants. The first content point was also partially reproduced by only three participants. Johanna was the only participant who managed to partially reproduce four out of the five content points; whereas Adél, Beáta, Boglárka, Dia and Panni partially reproduced three content points out of five in their summaries. Ádám and Anita partially included the propositional content of two content points in their summaries.

Table 15

*Scoring of the CPs Reproduced in the Second Phase from the 'Votes for Women' Text*

CP	Propositions	Panni	Ádám	Anita	Dia	Johanna	Boglárka	Beáta	Adél
CP1	P1 (CREATE WSPU SLOGAN)		x			x			x
	P2 (LABEL SLOGAN DEEDS-NOT-WORDS)								
CP2	<b>S1:</b> P1 (INTRODUCE WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME)	x	x		x	x	x	x	
	<b>S2:</b> P1 (BEGIN GROUP P2)	x						x	x
	P2 (SELL GROUP PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS)	x	x	x		x		x	x
	P3 (MOD GOODS OTHER)	x	x			x			x
	P4 (NUMBER-OF P3 COUNTLESS)	x	x			x			
	P5 (MOD PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)	x	x	x		x		x	x
	<b>S3:</b> P1 (ISA P2 CONCEPT)					x			
	P2 (MENRCHANDISE CORPORATE-IDENTITY)						x		
	P3 (MOD CONCEPT MARKETING)					x	x		
	P4 (MOD P3 NEW)					x			
	P5 (TIME P1 1906)								
	<b>S4:</b> P1 (WEAR MEMBER UNIFORM)	x	x	x	x				x
	P2 (MOD MEMBER WSPU)	x	x			x			
	P3 (MOD UNIFORM OFFICIAL)			x		x			
	P4 (POSSESS WSPU UNIFORM)			x		x			
	P5 (IS UNIFORM FROCK)			x		x			
	P6 (MOD FROCK WHITE/DECORATED)			x					
	P7 (WITH DECORATED ACCESSORY)			x		x			
	P8 (MOD ACCESSORY PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)	x	x	x					
<b>S5:</b> P1 (DESIGN ARTIST POSTCARD/GREETING-CARD)				x	x				
P2 (MOD ARTIST WOMAN)				x	x				
P3 (FOR P1 MOVEMENT)				x	x				

CP	Propositions	Panni	Ádám	Anita	Dia	Johanna	Boglárka	Beáta	Adél
CP3	S1: P1 (PLAY NEWSPAPER ROLE)						X		
	P2 (MOD ROLE VITAL)						X		
	P3 (IN P1 COMMUNICATION)						X		
	P4 (PRODUCE WSPU NEWSPAPER)	X		X	X	X	X		X
	P5 (LABEL NEWSPAPER VOTES-FOR-WOMEN)								
	P6 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE)	X					X		
	S2: P1 (SELL \$ NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2)				X				
	P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER1 VOTES-FOR-WOMEN)								
	P3 (LABEL NEWSPAPER2 THE-SUFFRAGETTE)					X			
	P4 (THROUGHOUT P1 COUNTRY)								X
	P5 (PROVIDE NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2 WAY)						X		X
	P6 (MOD WAY INVALUABLE)								
	P7 (OF WAY P8)						X		X
	P8 (INFORM \$ MEMBER)						X	X	X
	P9 (ABOUT INFORM MEETING/MARCH/FUND-RAISING-EVENT/NEWS/VIEWS)						X	X	X
	P10 (MOD NEWS/VIEWS LATEST)				X				
	P11 (ON VIEW MOVEMENT)				X				
	S3: P1 (SELL WOMAN NEWSPAPER)	X							
	P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE)	X							
	P3 (ON P1 STREET-CORNER)								

CP	Propositions	Panni	Ádám	Anita	Dia	Johanna	Boglárka	Beáta	Adél
	S1: P1 (ORGANISE WSPU FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY)				x		x		
CP4	S2: P1 (MOD FUNDRAISING-ACTIVITY NOTABLE)	x				x		x	
	P2 (MOD NOTABLE MOST)	x						x	
	P3 (REF P1 EXHIBITION)	x					x	x	
	P4 (LABEL EXHIBITION WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION)					x	x	x	
CP5	P1 (CHALK-UP WOMAN PAVEMENT)								
	P2 (WITH P1 DETAILS)								
	P3 (POSSESS MEETING DETAIL)								
	P4 (MOD MEETING FORTHCOMING)								

The results presented in Tables 12–15 indicate that the participants could not fully reproduce all the task-relevant propositions in any of the data collection phases. However, in the case of several participants a positive development can be observed. In each source text there were 53 task-relevant propositions, and, for example, Panni reproduced only one task-relevant proposition in the first data collection phase, whereas she managed to find 16 task-relevant propositions in the second phase. Similarly, Johanna and Beáta could not reproduce any task-relevant propositions in the first phase, but they could find 14 and 12 respectively in the second data collection phase. Nevertheless, it must be mentioned that all three of them worked with the *Investigating Children’s Language* text during the first data collection phase, and the reason behind the low number of task-relevant propositions extracted can be the lack of background knowledge about the topic of the text. It is also possible that they found this text more difficult than the *Votes for Women* text; however, the readability indices calculated for the two texts indicate that they were of about the same difficulty (cf. Section 3.3.5.3). Furthermore, there are also counterexamples among the participants, who also worked with the *Investigating Children’s Language* text first. For instance, Anita could find 12 task-relevant propositions in the first phase and only 10 in the second phase, and Adél found 13 task-relevant propositions in the first phase and 10 in the second phase, which shows that these two participants found more task-relevant propositions in the *Investigating Children’s Language* text than in the *Votes for Women* text, even at the beginning of the semester, when they supposedly had less experience with such tasks. This suggests that neither of the texts is more difficult than the other, and that there must be another reason underlying the problems encountered by the participants.

Taking everything into consideration, most progress can be observed in the case of participants who worked with the *Investigating Children’s Language* text first. However, there are also examples such as Tamás, who found 14 task-relevant propositions during both

data collections. The guided summaries of Judit and Emma are also worth mentioning because they included 10 and 8 task-relevant pieces of information in the first phase when working with the *Votes for Women* text and 11 and 19 when working with the *Investigating Children's Language* text in the second phase. This might suggest that being practised with academic reading has some positive effect on the reading skills.

In the case of most participants, their initial language proficiency level did not seem to have a notable influence on the amount of task-relevant content they found in the first data collection phase. Although Panni, a participant with A2 level language proficiency, managed to include only one piece of task-relevant proposition into her summary, there were participants with higher language proficiency levels, like the B2-level Johanna and C1-level Beáta, who did not manage to include any task-relevant propositional content into their summaries. When examining those participants who included the most task-relevant propositions into their summaries, the results seem to be similarly independent from their language proficiency levels. The C2 level participant, Adél, included 13 task-relevant propositions into her first phase summary, but the C1-level Tamás and Pálma and the B2-level Anita included almost the same amount of task-relevant propositions into their summaries (i.e., 14, 12, and 12 respectively). The results of Emma, the B1 level participant, also indicate that the initial language proficiency level alone cannot be used in the present sample to predict the participants' success in including task-relevant propositional content into their summaries. Emma included 10 pieces of task-relevant propositions into her summary, which is the same number as the C1-level Boglárka found, and it is more than the eight task-relevant propositions the C2-level Judit included into her own summary. Furthermore, the participants' results on the reading test component of the placement test also do not seem to be indicative of their first phase performance. Judit and Johanna both achieved 12 points out of 14 on their reading tests; however, in the first data collection phase,

Johanna did not include any task-relevant propositions into her summary, and Judit gave an average performance in terms of including task-relevant propositions into her final written product. In contrast, Emma was one of the participants who achieved the lowest score on the reading test component of the placement test, yet she was one of those participants who included the highest number of task-relevant propositions into her summary. These results suggest that in the present sample, the initial language proficiency level did not have an influence on the participants' success of including task-relevant propositional content into their summaries.

In the second phase, the initial language proficiency level also does not seem to have a notable impact on the participants' ability to find and include task-relevant propositional content into their summaries. Judit, the C2 level participant, who also achieved one of the highest scores on the reading component of the placement test, included 19 task-relevant propositions into her summary, this way also showing notable improvement compared to her first-phase performance. However, the A2 level participant Panni, and the B2 level participant Johanna also included 16 task-relevant propositions into their summaries, giving a similarly high performance to Judit's. Adél's performance also seems to support the idea that the initial language proficiency level does not have an influence on the participants' abilities to include task-relevant content into their second phase summaries, given that despite being a C2 level participant, she managed to include fewer task-relevant propositions into her second phase summary (i.e., 10 pieces) than into her first phase summary (i.e., 13 pieces). This appears to suggest that in the present data set the participants' initial language proficiency level does not function as a predictor of their abilities to find and include task-relevant propositions into their summaries.

Examining the amount of task-irrelevant pieces of information the participants included into their summaries can also provide information about the participants' reading

skills. For instance, in the case of Panni's first phase summary, the propositional analysis shows that her first summary contains added information almost exclusively, which cannot be found anywhere in the source text (cf. Table 16). This is the result of the participant writing an opinion essay about the topic and not a summary of the required information from the text, which she also explicitly claimed in her think-aloud when interpreting the task instruction: "I have to write an essay about collecting data from children" (Panni, first phase think-aloud). Her statement shows that she set the wrong reading purpose at the beginning of the reading process. In Panni's case, there can be two potential causes for setting the wrong reading purpose: it may have been the result of her low English language proficiency level (i.e., A2 level language proficiency), or the result of a negative transfer of metacognitive knowledge and reading purpose. The possibility of the negative transfer is also supported by the literature, as Grabe and Stoller (2013) claim that L2 readers with lower language proficiency levels might be prone to compensating for their lack of language knowledge by relying on their L1 reading abilities. As Panni had never had to summarise a text based on a guiding idea before, the task was unfamiliar to her, and to be able to solve it, she probably relied on the use of task-solving and reading strategies which she had successfully applied in the past with other reading-into-writing tasks. This presupposition can also be supported by Panni's claim in her think-aloud that she frequently had to provide one sentence summaries of short texts during the Hungarian Language and Communication classes in high school.

In contrast with her first phase summary, her summary produced in the second data collection phase contains notably less added information, and it features more closely reproduced task-relevant propositions from the source text (cf. Table 17). This suggests that regardless of her initial language proficiency level, by becoming familiar with the new task type, she managed to set her reading purpose more appropriately and managed to tailor her



reading strategy use to that reading purpose. This finding is also in-line with the claims of Koda (2007), who found that making readers familiar with many different L2 reading goals can help them use reading strategies more effectively in L2 reading task execution.

Table 16

*The Propositions in Panni's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	I think there are a lot of difficulties of collecting data from children because they are too young, so they are immature.	P1 (EXIST DIFFICULTY) P2 (POSSESS COLLECTING-DATA DIFFICULTY) P3 (FROM COLLECTING-DATA CHILD) P4 (BECAUSE P1 P5) P5 (MOD CHILD YOUNG) P6 (MOD YOUNG TOO) P7 (SO P5 P8) P8 (MOD CHILD IMMATURE)	Added information
S2	They couldn't concentrating as good as the adults.	P1 (ABLE-TO CHILD P2) P2 (CONCENTRATE-AS-WELL-AS CHILD ADULT) P3 (NEGATE P1)	A part of CP1
S3	Maybe they afraid of people who are take questioned to her/his.	P1 (BE-AFRAID-OF CHILD PEOPLE) P2 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE) P3 (MOD PEOPLE P4) P4 (ASK PEOPLE QUESTION) P5 (FROM P4 CHILD)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Or they don't tell the truth about something because the kid's have bigger fantasy and they see the world from another viewpoint.	P1 (TELL CHILD TRUTH) P2 (ABOUT TRUTH SOMETHING) P3 (NEGATE P1) P4 (BECAUSE P1 P7) P5 (POSSESS CHILD FANTASY) P6 (MOD FANTASY BIG) P7 (AND P5 P8) P8 (SEE CHILD WORLD) P9 (FROM P8 VIEWPOINT) P10 (MOD VIEWPOINT DIFFERENT)	Added information
S5	The recorders have to be really patient and kind.	P1 (MUST RESEARCHER P2) P2 (AND P3 P5) P3 (BE-PATIENT-WITH RESEARCHER CHILD) P4 (MOD PATIENT REALLY) P5 (BE-KIND-WITH RESEARCHER CHILD)	Added information
S6	I guess in the first time they just should have to play with the children is in this way they will be more open to the questions and to the recorders too.	P1 (SHOULD RESEARCHER P2) P2 (PLAY-WITH RESEARCHER CHILD) P3 (TIME P2 THE-FIRST-TIME) P4 (THIS-WAY P1 P5) P5 (BE-MORE-OPEN-TO CHILD QUESTION) P6 (BE-MORE-OPEN-TO CHILD RESEARCHER)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S7	The kid's language can be different from the adult people's language, because the kids are uses special words and they don't pay enough attention to the researcher.	P1 (BE-DIFFERENT-FROM LANGUAGE1 LANGUAGE2) P2 (POSSESS CHILD LANGUAGE1) P3 (POSSESS ADULT LANGUAGE2) P4 (BECAUSE P1 P7) P5 (USE CHILD WORD) P6 (MOD WORD SPECIAL) P7 (AND P5 P8) P8 (PAY-ATTENTION-TO CHILD RESEARCHER) P9 (AMOUNT-OF ATTENTION ENOUGH) P10 (NEGATE P8)	Added information and the same part of CP1 as in S2

Table 17

*The Propositions in Panni's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	Firstly, the members of the WSPU went to meetings where they could speak about the movement.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (GO-TO MEMBER MEETING) P3 (POSSESS WSPU MEMBER) P4 (ABLE-TO MEMBER SPEAK) P5 (ABOUT SPEAK MOVEMENT) P6 (AT SPEAK MEETING)	Added information
S2	Moreover, they got an advertising place in the newspaper so in this way they could reach more women with money.	P1 (GET SUFFRAGETTE ADVERTISING-PLACE) P2 (IN ADVERTISING-PLACE NEWSPAPER) P3 (SO P1 P4) P4 (ABLE-TO SUFFRAGETTE P5) P5 (REACH SUFFRAGETTE WOMEN) P6 (MOD WOMEN RICH) P7 (AMOUNT-OF P6 MORE)	Added information
S3	They created The Suffragette and the members of the WSPU were selling them.	P1 (CREATE SUFFRAGETTE NEWSPAPER) P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P3 (SELL MEMBER THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P4 (POSSESS WSPU MEMBER)	Part of CP3
S4	They also created an own colour scheme it consist the purple, green and white colour.	P1 (CREATE SUFFRAGETTE COLOUR-SCHEME) P2 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE COLOUR-SCHEME) P3 (CONSIST-OF COLOUR-SCHEME PURPLE/GREEN/WHITE)	Part of CP2

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S5	In these colours they sold different things and they wearing these colours so it was a good advertisement.	P1 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE THING) P2 (MOD THING DIFFERET) P3 (IN P1 COLOUR) P4 (POSSESS COLOUR-SCHEME COLOUR) P5 (WEAR SUFFRAGETTE COLOUR) P6 (POSSESS COLOUR-SCHEME COLOUR) P7 (REF COLOUR-SCHEME ADVERTISMENT) P8 (MOD ADVERTISMENT GOOD)	Part of CP2
S6	Finally, they organised an exhibition to make more money and member, it was their most important campaign.	P1 (MOD P1 FINAL) P2 (ORGANISE SUFFRAGETTE EXHIBITION) P2 (IN-ORDER-TO P2 P4) P4 (MAKE SUFFRAGETTE MONEY/MEMBER) P5 (MOD MONEY MORE) P6 (MOD MEMBER MORE) P7 (REF EXHIBITION CAMPAIGN) P8 (MOD CAMPAIGN MOST-IMPORTANT) P9 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE CAMPAIGN)	Part of CP4, irrelevant information, and added information

Emma's first phase guided summary (cf. Table 18) contains all the main ideas of the source text, which makes it a global summary instead of a guided summary. The few task-relevant propositions reproduced in the summary appear to be there by accident because they coincided with the main ideas expressed by the source text. As a result, each sentence of Emma's first phase summary contains at least some pieces of relevant information. Similarly to Panni, when she had to face an unfamiliar reading task, Emma transferred reading purposes successfully applied in previous reading situations. Since during her studies she already had had to create global summaries of texts, when seeing the word 'summarise' in the task instruction, she associated the data collection task with the summarisation tasks she had to previously perform. This is also supported by the way she formulated her reading purpose in her first phase think-aloud: "[I have to write down in my own words what the text is about]. I had to do reading tasks like this at school" (Emma, first phase think-aloud).

In contrast, in her second guided summary (cf. Table 19) there is only one sentence which contains some irrelevant information besides the task-relevant propositions. In contrast with her first guided summary, the second one also contains some added information originally not featured in the source text. Her second guided summary shows that she had more control over her reading process and that she managed to set the task-appropriate reading purpose. The presence of irrelevant and added information can be the result of her low language proficiency level (i.e., B1 level language proficiency). Her lower language proficiency level could have resulted in her difficulties with fully understanding the source text.

Table 18

*The Propositions in Emma's First Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	The Woman's Social and Political Union was established in 1903 by Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters so as to put women's suffrage on the political agenda.	P1 (ESTABLISH MRS-EMMELINE-PANKHURST/DAUGHTER WSPU) P2 (POSSESS MRS-EMMELINE-PANKHURST DAUGHTER) P3 (TIME P1 1903) P4 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P5) P5 (PUT \$ SUFFRAGE) P6 (POSSESS WOMAN SUFFRAGE) P7 (ON P5 POLITICAL-AGENDA)	Irrelevant information
S2	Due to its campaigns, there was a fast raising number of members.	P1 (DUE-TO P2 P3) P2 (RUN WSPU CAMPAIGN) P3 (EXIST NUMBER) P4 (POSSESS MEMBER NUMBER) P5 (MOD NUMBER RAISING) P6 (MOD RAISING FAST)	Irrelevant information
S3	Their message spread throughout the country, however, their opportunity to communicate was limited.	P1 (SPREAD WSPU MESSAGE) P2 (TROUGHTOUT P1 COUNTRY) P3 (DESPITE-THE-FACT-THAT P1 P4) P4 (MOD COMMUNICATION LIMITED) P5 (POSSESS WSPU COMMUNICATION)	Irrelevant information



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Newspapers by the WSPU, besides being a communication channel, has another important function, which was making profit by selling the advertising place.	P1 (ISA NEWSPAPER COMMUNICATION-CHANNEL) P2 (POSSESS NEWSPAPER WSPU) P3 (BESIDES P1 P4) P4 (POSSESS NEWSPAPER FUNCTION) P5 (MOD FUNCTION IMPORTANT) P6 (MOD FUNCTION ANOTHER) P7 (REF FUNCTION P8) P8 (MAKE NEWSPAPER PROFIT) P9 (BY P8 P10) P10 (SELL \$ ADVERTISING-PLACE)	Part of CP3 and irrelevant information
S5	This profit was important for this rising political group, so they have another money making opportunity which was selling board games, greeting cards and several other things in their colour scheme which contains purple, white and green colours.	P1 (MOD PROFIT IMPORTANT) P2 (FOR IMPORTANT POLITICAL-GROUP) P3 (MOD POLITICAL-GROUP RISING) P4 (LABLE POLITICAL-GROUP WSPU) P5 (SO P1 P6) P6 (POSSESS WSPU MONEY-MAKING-OPPORTUNITY) P7 (MOD MONEY-MAKING-OPPORTUNITY ANOTHER) P8 (REF MONEY-MAKING-OPPORTUNITY P9) P9 (SELL WSPU BOARD-GAME/GREETING-CARD/THING) P10 (MOD THING OTHER) P11 (NUMBER-OF THING SEVERAL) P12 (IN P9 COLOUR-SCHEME) P13 (POSSESS WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME) P14 (CONTAIN COLOUR-SCHEME PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)	Irrelevant information and part of CP2

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S6	In spite of these activities, they have to organise a lot of other fund-raising event because they haven't got enough money to meet their organising costs.	P1 (IN-SPITE-OF ACTIVITIE P2) P2 (MUST WSPU P3) P3 (ORGANISE WSPU FUND-RAISING-EVENT) P4 (MOD FUND-RAISING-EVENT OTHER) P5 (AMOUNT-OF FUND-RAISING-EVENT LOT) P6 (BECAUSE P2 P7) P7 (POSSESS WSPU MONEY) P8 (MOD MONEY ENOUGH) P9 (NEGATE P7) P10 (TO P9 P11) P11 (MEET WSPU ORGANISING-COST) P12 (POSSESS WSPU ORGANISING-COST)	Part of CP4 and irrelevant information
S7	The most memorable event was the Woman's Exhibition with 250 000 pounds profit.	P1 (REF WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION EVENT) P2 (MOD EVENT MOST-MEMORABLE) P3 (WITH EVENT PROFIT) P4 (AMOUNT-OF PROFIT 250000-POUND)	Part of CP4 and irrelevant information
S8	Nowadays their movements are exhibited in the Museum of London.	P1 (EXHIBIT \$ MOVEMENT) P2 (POSSESS WSPU MOVEMENT) P3 (TIME P1 NOWADAYS) P4 (IN P1 MUSEUM) P5 (LABLE MUSEUM MUSEUM-OF-LONDON)	Irrelevant information
S9	It shows us objects, photographs, the WSPU uniform, postcards and greeting card.	P1 (SHOW EXHIBITION OBJECT/PHOTOGRAPH/UNIFORM/POSTCARD/GREETING-CARD) P2 (POSSESS WSPU UNIFORM)	Irrelevant information
S10	Moreover, the visitors can see a short film about the suffragettes.	P1 (ABLE-TO VISITOR P2) P2 (SEE VISITOR FILM) P3 (MOD FILM SHORT) P4 (ABOUT FILM SUFFRAGETTE)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S11	The suffragettes reached their goal because finally the adult female population of Britain can vote.	P1 (REACH SUFFRAGETTE GOAL) P2 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE GOAL) P3 (BECAUSE P1 P4) P4 (ABLE-TO FEMALE-POPULATION VOTE) P5 (MOD P4 FINALLY) P6 (POSSESS BRITAIN FEMALE-POPULATION) P7 (MOD FEMALE-POPULATION ADULT)	Irrelevant information
S12	The women could be role models because they have energy and ability to fight for freedom and equality.	P1 (ABLE-TO WOMAN P2) P2 (REF WOMAN ROLE-MODEL) P3 (BECAUSE P1 P6) P4 (POSSESS WOMAN ENERGY) P5 (POSSESS WOMAN ABILITY) P6 (AND P4 P5) P7 (TO P6 P10) P8 (FIGHT-FOR WOMAN FREEDOM) P9 (FIGHT-FOR WOMAN EQUALITY) P10 (AND P8 P9)	Irrelevant information

Table 19

*The Propositions in Emma's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	The first difficulty is linguists can't use their basic techniques when they deal with children.	P1 (ISA P7 DIFFICULTY) P2 (NUMBER-OF DIFFICULTY FIRST) P3 (ABLE-TO LINGUIST P4) P4 (USE LINGUIST TECHNIQUE) P5 (MOD TECHNIQUE BASIC) P6 (POSSESS LINGUIST TECHNIQUE) P7 (NEGATE P3) P8 (WHEN P7 P9) P9 (DEAL-WITH LINGUIST CHILD)	Added information
S2	Next problem is, children can't pay attention for the task and they can't remember the instructions because of their developing acquired abilities.	P1 (ISA P9 PROBLEM) P2 (MOD PROBLEM NEXT) P3 (ABLE-TO CHILD P4) P4 (PAY-ATTENTION-TO CHILD TASK) P5 (NEGATE P3) P6 (ABLE-TO CHILD P7) P7 (REMEMBER CHILD INSTRUCTION) P8 (NEGATE P6) P9 (AND P5 P8) P10 (BECAUSE-OF P9 ABILITY) P11 (MOD ABILITY DEVELOPING) P12 (MOD ABILITY ACQUIRED) P13 (POSSESS CHILD ABILITY)	Part of CP1 and added information
S3	Moreover, children under 3 years can't be able to judge the language systematically.	P1 (ABLE-TO CHILD P2) P2 (JUDGE CHILD LANGUAGE) P3 (NEGATE P1) P4 (MOD JUDGE SYSTEMATIC) P5 (MOD CHILD UNDER-3-YEARS)	Part of CP2

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Using tape recorder for collecting data isn't useful, because some children became frustrated because of it.	P1 (USE \$ TAPE-RECORDER) P2 (FOR P1 DATA-COLLECTION) P3 (MOD P1 USEFUL) P4 (NEGATE P3) P5 (BECAUSE P4 P6) P6 (FRUSTRATE TAPE-RECORDER CHILD) P7 (NUMBER-OF CHILD SOME)	Part of CP3
S5	Furthermore, it is hard to find the best place for recording because the child's home would be the best but the acoustic qualities can be bad there.	P1 (FIND \$ PLACE) P2 (MOD PLACE BEST) P3 (FOR P1 RECORDING) P4 (MOD P1 HARD) P5 (BECAUSE P4 P8) P6 (MODE HOME BEST) P7 (POSSESS CHILD HOME) P8 (BUT P6 P8) P9 (MOD ACOUSTIC-QUALITY BAD) P10 (MOD P9 POSSIBLE) P11 (IN P10 P7)	Irrelevant information and part of CP4
S6	The last difficulty is the child can be distracted by the researcher.	P1 (ISA P4 DIFFICULTY) P2 (MOD DIFFICULTY LAST) P3 (DISTRACT RESEARCHER CHILD) P4 (MOD P3 POSSIBLE)	Part of CP3

Ibolya's first summary (cf. Table 20) also resembles a global summary instead of a guided summary, and the task-relevant propositions seem to have been reproduced accidentally and not purposefully. Ibolya had to produce short oral global summaries of texts both in English and in Hungarian during her high school studies, so associating the new and unfamiliar summarisation task with the previously known summarisation tasks was the cause of setting the wrong reading purpose during the first data collection phase. Based on her think-aloud, when she first read the task instruction, Ibolya decided that the reading purpose was to extract and paraphrase all the main ideas of the text. However, later she re-read the instruction and correctly identified that her summary should only focus on the ways suffragettes promoted their movement. However, regardless of verbalising the correct reading purpose, Ibolya did not manage to control her reading processes appropriately for the task because she added several pieces of irrelevant and added information. The first two pieces of irrelevant information are added to provide background information on the topic, which Ibolya considered necessary based on what she learnt in high school: "My Hungarian Language and Communication teacher in high school said that compositions have to start with some background information. I can't immediately write about the ways of promoting the movement, first I need to write about the movement in a more general way" (Ibolya, first phase think-aloud). This decision probably should be considered as a problem related to production rather than reception. Nevertheless, it shows that regardless of correctly defining the reading purpose, Ibolya was unable to stay on task because she transferred task solving processes applied in previously encountered L1 reading situations. The rest of the irrelevant pieces of information present in Ibolya's first phase summary coincide with the main ideas of the source text, and the added information reflect Ibolya's own assumptions about the topic. Adding her own assumptions can also imply the transfer of background knowledge on the topic, as in her think-aloud she claimed to be familiar with the topic of the suffragette

movement: “This is a very good topic. We learnt about this in 12th grade History class” (Ibolya, first phase think-aloud).

Taking her second guided summary into consideration (cf. Table 21), the amount of added and irrelevant information is only slightly reduced, and only very little of the task-relevant content is included into it. The added pieces of information represent Ibolya’s own assumptions based on the source text information. The instances of irrelevant pieces of information present in her second phase summary suggest that Ibolya had difficulties setting the appropriate reading purpose, and she did not only focus on the difficulties of collecting data from children but also on the difficulties related to data analysis. They also suggest that Ibolya had difficulties with fully comprehending the source text, which could be the result of the combination of not having any background knowledge on the topic of the source text and her low English language proficiency level. She reached 135 points on the Oxford placement test, which is exactly the threshold between the B1 and B2 levels, so her language proficiency might not have been high enough to fully comprehend the source text.

Table 20

*The Propositions in Ibolya's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	First of all, they wanted to popularize the suffragette movement in a lot of ways and a lot of women joined to this.	P1 (MOD P1 FIRST) P2 (WANT-TO SUFFRAGETTE P3) P3 (POPULARISE SUFFRAGETTE MOVEMENT) P4 (POSSESS MOVEMENT SUFFRAGETTE) P5 (IN P3 WAY) P6 (AMOUNT-OF WAY LOT) P7 (JOIN WOMAN MOVEMENT) P8 (AMOUNT-OF WOMAN LOT)	Irrelevant information
S2	In those years the communication was difficult because the campaigners couldn't use the radio or the TV.	P1 (MOD COMMUNICATION DIFFICULT) P2 (TIME P1 IN-THOSE-YEARS) P3 (BECAUSE P1 P6) P4 (ABLE-TO CAMPAIGNER P5) P5 (USE CAMPAIGNER RADIO/TV) P6 (NEGATE P4)	Irrelevant information
S3	They wrote their thoughts only in newspapers which was the most important communication device between the campaigners and women.	P1 (WRITE CAMPAIGNER THOUGHT) P2 (IN P1 NEWSPAPER) P3 (REF NEWSPAPER COMMUNICATION-DEVICE) P4 (MOD COMMUNICATION-DEVICE MOST-IMPORTANT) P5 (MOD COMMUNICATION-DEVICE BETWEEN-CAMPAIGNERS-AND-WOMEN)	Added information and parts of CP3



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	On the other hand, the campaigners organized special events where they share the latest news and views on the movement.	P1 (ON-THE-OTHER-HAND S3:P2 P2) P2 (ORGANISE CAMPAIGNER EVENT) P3 (MOD EVENT SPECIAL) P4 (WHERE P2 P5) P5 (SHARE CAMPAIGNER NEWS/VIEWS) P6 (MOD NEWS/VIEW LATEST) P7 (ON NEWS/VIEW MOVEMENT)	Added information
S5	Furthermore, it's important that the newspaper returned a profit.	P1 (FURHTERMORE S4:P2 P2) P2 (RETURN NEWSPAPER PROFIT) P3 (MOD P2 IMPORTANT)	Irrelevant information
S6	In newspapers there were a lot of places for advertisements and in this way commercial enterprises tried to encourage women to spend their money.	P1 (POSSESS NEWSPAPER PLACE-FOR-ADVERTISEMENT) P2 (AMOUNT-OF PLACE-FOR-ADVERTISEMENT LOT) P3 (THIS-WAY P1 P4) P4 (TRY-TO COMMERCIAL-ENTERPRISE P5) P5 (ENCOURAGE COMMERCIAL-ENTERPRISE WOMAN) P6 (TO P5 P7) P7 (SPEND WOMAN MONEY) P8 (POSSESS WOMAN MONEY)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S7	In the market, started to make goods with the colours of the suffragette movements which had a significant effect on the woman's way of thinking because it showed the importance of the movement.	P1 (START-TO \$ P2) P2 (MAKE \$ GOODS) P3 (IN P1 MARKET) P4 (WITH GOODS COLOUR) P5 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE-MOVEMENT COLOUR) P6 (EFFECT P1 WAY-OF-THINKING) P7 (MOD EFFECT SIGNIFICANT) P8 (POSSESS WOMAN WAY-OF-THINKING) P9 (BECAUSE P6 P10) P10 (SHOW COLOUR IMPORTANCE) P11 (POSSESS MOVEMENT IMPORTANCE)	Part of CP2 and added information
S8	It was one of the merchandising activities	P1 (REF S7:P1 MARCHANDISING-ACTIVITY) P2 (NUMBER-OF MERCHANDISING-ACTIVITY ONE)	Part of CP2
S9	They also organized fund-raising activities like the Woman's Exhibition which was very popular in 1909.	P1 (ORGANISE SUFFRAGETTE FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY) P2 (EXAMPLE-OF FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION) P3 (MOD WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION POPULAR) P4 (TIME P3 1909)	Part of CP4 and added information

Table 21

*The Propositions in Ibolya's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	First of all, it is a difficult task to find suitable methods which is applied among children and it is also necessary that the method does not influence the development of children.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (ISA P4 TASK) P3 (MOD TASK DIFFICULT) P4 (FIND \$ METHOD) P5 (MOD METHOD SUITABLE) P6 (WHICH METHOD P7) P7 (APPLY \$ METHOD) P8 (AMONG P7 CHILD) P9 (MOD P11 NECESSARY) P10 (INFLUENCE METHOD DEVELOPMENT) P11 (NEGATE P10) P12 (POSSESS CHILD DEVELOPMENT)	Added information
S2	On the other hand, if the researching is made by tape recorder, it can disturb children and they do not behave naturally.	P1 (ON-THE-OTHER-HAND S1:P2 P2) P2 (IF P6 P4) P3 (MAKE \$ RESEARCH) P4 (BY P3 TAPE-RECORDER) P5 (DISTURB CHILDREN TAPE-RECORDER) P6 (MOD P5 POSSIBLE) P7 (BEHAVE CHLIDREN NATURAL) P8 (NEGATE P7)	Part of CP3 and added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S3	Furthermore, the recording equipment, which is used for the research, sometimes becomes useless and it is difficult to record a correct material.	P1 (BECOME RECORDING-EQUIPMENT USELESS) P2 (WHICH RECORDING-EQUIPMENT P3) P3 (USE \$ RECORDING-EQUIPMENT) P4 (FOR P3 RESEARCH) P5 (MOD P6 DIFFICULT) P6 (RECORD \$ MATERIAL) P7 (MOD MATERIAL CORRECT)	Added information
S4	Moreover, the lack of the information can cause several problems in the research because researchers are not capable of creating the whole analysis.	P1 (ABLE-TO LACK-OF-INFORMATION P2) P2 (CAUSE LACK-OF-INFORMATION PROBLEM) P3 (NUMBER-OF PROBLEM SEVERAL) P4 (IN PROBLEM RESEARCH) P5 (BECAUSE P1 P6) P6 (ABLE-TO RESEARCHER P7) P7 (CREATE RESEARCHER ANALYSIS) P8 (AMOUNT-OF ANALYSIS WHOLE)	Irrelevant information
S5	In addition, it is difficult for researchers to make a general conclusion from these datas.	P1 (MOD P2 DIFFICULT) P2 (MAKE RESEARCHER CONCLUSION) P3 (MOD CONCLUSION GENERAL) P4 (FROM P2 DATA)	Irrelevant information

Ádám's first phase summary (Table 22) is very similar to the first phase summaries of the previously discussed participants because it is a global summary focussing on the main ideas of the source text. This shows that like Panni, Emma, and Ibolya, Ádám also did not manage to set the appropriate reading purpose when solving the first phase data collection task. Based on his Oxford placement test results, Ádám was also one of the B2-level participants close to the threshold between the B1 and the B2 language proficiency levels, so the presence of the added and irrelevant pieces of information could be the result of not being able to fully comprehend the text. In addition, gaps in the L2 language knowledge could have led to a negative transfer of L1 reading strategies (cf. Pichette, Segalowitz & Connors, 2003; Yamashita, 2002) since Ádám claimed in his think-aloud that he had to execute several reading tasks in high school as a preparation for his Hungarian Language and Communication final school leaving examination.

His second phase guided summary (Table 23) shows a rather impressive contrast because it contains only one sentence with added information and one sentence containing irrelevant pieces of information. This indicates that in contrast with the first phase data collection session, during the second data collection phase, Ádám managed to set his reading purpose more task-appropriately, and he managed to stay on task more successfully, which suggests that his L2 reading abilities had notably improved during the time period between the first and the second data collection occasion.

Table 22

*The Propositions in Adam's First Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	People has been interested in children's language since the 19th century.	P1 (INTEREST PEOPLE P2) P2 (POSSESS CHILD LANGUAGE) P3 (DURATION-OF P1 19TH-CENTURY)	Irrelevant information
S2	Although they couldn't investigate properly before the invention of the tape recorder.	P1 (ALTHOUGH S1:P1 P4) P2 (INVESTIGATE-BEFORE PEOPLE \$) P3 (MOD INVESTIGATE PROPER) P4 (NEGATE P2) P5 (TIME P2 P6) P6 (INVENT \$ TAPE-RECORDER)	Irrelevant information
S3	Nowadays linguists and psychologists are using different techniques.	P1 (USE LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST TECHNIQUE) P2 (MOD TECHNIQUE DIFFERENT) P3 (TIME P1 NOWADAYS)	Irrelevant information
S4	They are facing lot of problems because children aren't as developed as adults.	P1 (FACE LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST PROBLEM) P2 (AMOUNT-OF PROBLEM LOT) P3 (BECAUSE P1 P5) P4 (AS-DEVELOPED-AS CHILD ADULTS) P5 (NEGATE P4)	Added information
S5	They can't use certain kinds of experiments.	P1 (ABLE-TO LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST P2) P2 (USE RESEARCHER EXPERIMENT) P3 (MOD EXPERIMENT CERTAIN-KIND) P4 (NEGATE P1)	Part of CP1
S6	Some of them switch off when they notice the tape recorder.	P1 (SWITCH-OFF LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST) P2 (NUMBER-OF LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGYST SOME) P3 (WHEN P1 P4) P4 (LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST NOTICE TAPE-RECORDER)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S7	Linguists and psychologists have found two solutions to the problem.	P1 (FIND LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST SOLUTION) P2 (NUMER-OF SOLUTION TWO) P3 (TO SOLUTION PROBLEM)	Added information
S8	These two are naturalistic sampling and experimentation.	P1 (REF SOLUTION NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING/EXPERIMENTATION)	Irrelevant information
S9	Naturalistic sampling is good but not perfect since it cannot be performed at home and has several limitations.	P1 (MOD NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING GOOD) P2 (MOD NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING PERFECT) P3 (NEGATE P2) P4 (BUT P1 P3) P5 (BECAUSE P3 P8) P6 (ABLE-TO \$ PERFORM) P7 (AT P6 HOME) P8 (NEGATE P6) P9 (BECAUSE P3 P10) P10 (POSSESS NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING LIMITATION) P11 (NUMBER-OF LIMITATION SEVERAL)	Irrelevant information
S10	For example: the sample can't contain everything.	P1 (EXAMPLE-OF P4 LIMITATION) P2 (POSSESS NATURALISTIC-SMAPLING LIMITATION) P3 (ABLE-TO SAMPLE P4) P4 (CONTAIN SAMPLE EVERYTHING) P5 (NEGATE P3)	Irrelevant information
S11	This method has to be supplemented.	P1 (MUST \$ P2) P2 (SUPPLEMENT \$ NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S12	Experimentation is about making hypothesis about children and proving the hypothesis.	P1 (REF EXPERIMENTATION P2) P2 (AND P3 P5) P3 (MAKE \$ HYPOTHESIS) P4 (ABOUT P3 CHILD) P5 (PROVE \$ HYPOTHESIS)	Irrelevant information
S13	This method is better but takes a lot of time.	P1 (BETTERT-THAN EXPERIMENTATION NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING) P2 (BUT P1 P3) P3 (TAKE EXPERIMENTATION TIME) P4 (AMOUNT-OF TIME LOT)	Irrelevant information



Table 23

*The Propositions in Adam's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	Firstly, the slogan they had, and the colour scheme introduction caused the movement to step into focus.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (CAUSE P3 P7) P3 (AND P4 P5) P4 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETT SLOGEN) P5 (INTRODUCE SUFFRAGETTE COLOUR-SCHEME) P6 (STEP-INTO MOVEMET FOCUS)	Part of CP1 and part of CP2
S2	Moreover, they had a newspaper factory, called the Women's Press Shop, which had a significant role in the communication.	P1 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETT FACTORY) P2 (MOD FACTORY NEWSPAPER) P3 (LABEL FACTORY WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP) P4 (POSSESS FACTORY ROLE) P5 (DEGREE-OF ROLE SIGNIFICANT) P6 (IN P4 COMMUNICATION)	Added information
S3	Additionally, they sold playing cards, board games, Christmas and greeting cards, and other merchandise with green, white, and purple colours.	P1 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/MERCHANDISE) P2 (MOD MERCHANDISE OTHER) P9 (MOD P1 COLOR) P10 (MOD COLOR GREEN/WHITE/PURPLE)	Part of CP2

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Secondly, they had official uniforms to promote their movement, which was a white frock with white, green and purple accessories.	P1 (MOD P2 SECOND) P2 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE UNIFORM) P3 (MOD UNIFORM OFFICIAL) P4 (IN-ORDER-TO P2 P5) P5 (PROMOTE SUFFRAGETTE MOVEMENT) P6 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE MOVEMENT) P7 (REF UNIFORM FROCK) P8 (MOD FROCK WHITE) P9 (WITH FROCK ACCESSORY) P10 (MOD ACCESSORY WHITE/GREEN/PURPLE)	Part of CP2
S5	Finally, their newspaper had an advertisement page where big companies advertised their goods to show their sympathy to the suffragette cause.	P1 (MOD P2 FINAL) P2 (POSSESS NEWSPAPER PAGE) P3 (MOD PAGE ADVERTISEMENT) P4 (WHERE P5) P5 (ADVERTISE COMPANY GOODS) P6 (MOD COMPANY BIG) P7 (POSSESS COMPANY GOODS) P8 (IN-ORDER-TO P5 P9) P9 (SHOW COMPANY SYMPATHY) P10 (POSSESS COMPANY SYMPATHY) P11 (TO P9 CAUSE) P12 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE CAUSE)	Irrelevant information

During the first data collection phase, Anita initially formulated the appropriate reading purpose (“I have to focus on the difficulties of collecting data from children” – Anita, first phase think-aloud), but her final product resembles a global summary (cf. Table 24) where only those task-relevant propositions are reproduced which coincide with main ideas of the source text. Her summary contains five pieces of irrelevant information and one piece of added information. The added piece of information reflects Anita’s own assumption about source text information, and the irrelevant pieces of information were most likely added to provide context for the task-relevant pieces of information presented in the summary. This shows that despite correctly defining the reading purpose, just as Ibolya, Anita was also unable to stay on task because she transferred task solving processes applied in reading and writing tasks she encountered during high school. Regardless of verbalising the correct reading purpose, Anita did not manage to control her reading processes appropriately for the task. Nevertheless, out of all the B2 level participants, Anita included the least amount of added information into her first phase summary. Regarding her language proficiency level, on the placement test, Anita achieved 140 points out of 200, which placed her into the middle section of the B2 level on the scale used by the Oxford placement test, and she also achieved a high score on the reading test component (i.e., 10 points out of 14). These scores might imply that Anita’s language proficiency was closer to the threshold indicated by the Short-Circuit Hypothesis (Clarke, 1988), so she could transfer her L1 reading strategies to the L2 context more successfully than the previously discussed participants (cf. Pichette, Segalowitz & Connors, 2003; Yamashita, 2002).

As opposed to her first phase summary, her second phase summary (cf. Table 25) is more focussed on the task, and the presence of irrelevant pieces of information in it can be explained by a misinterpretation of the task. Instead of just focussing on the ways the suffragettes promoted their movement, Anita’s summary also seems to include the ways the

suffragettes managed to earn money to sustain their movement. Nonetheless, compared to her first summary, during the second data collection phase, Anita managed to systematically implement her reading purpose and to deliver a guided summary written along the lines of that reading purpose.

Table 24

*The Propositions in Anita's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	Experts try to find out how little children learn to speak on their mother tongue.	P1 (TRY-TO-FIND-OUT EXPERT P2) P2 (HOW P1 P3) P3 (LEARN CHILD SPEAK) P4 (MOD CHILD LITTLE) P5 (ON P3 MOTHER-TONGUE) P6 (POSSESS CHILD MOTHER-TONGUE)	Irrelevant information
S2	However, the appearance of tape recorder made easier to study their speaking, there could be difficulties in the collection of data.	P1 (ALTHOUGH P4 P2) P2 (MAKE-EASIER TAPE-RECORDER-APPEARANCE P3) P3 (STUDY CHILD SPEAKING) P4 (EXIST DIFFICULTIES) P5 (MOD P4 POSSIBLE) P6 (IN P5 DATA-COLLECTION)	Irrelevant information
S3	Firstly, there are children who cannot speak when they are recorded.	P1 (MOD P1 FIRST) P2 (EXIST CHILD) P3 (MOD CHILD P6) P4 (ABLE-TO CHILD SPEAK) P5 (NEGATE P4) P6 (WHEN P5 P7) P7 (RECORD \$ CHILD)	Part of CP3
S4	Making easier to study them some linguists record their voice in the children's home.	P1 (RECORD LINGUIST VOICE) P2 (NUMBER-OF LINGUIST SOME) P3 (POSSESS CHILD VOICE) P4 (IN P1 HOME) P5 (POSSESS CHILD HOME) P6 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P7) P7 (MAKE-EASIER \$ P8) P8 (STUDY LINGUIST CHILD)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S5	However, the recorder could distract them and the recordings sometimes couldn't provide good quality and we couldn't hear the child's voice clearly.	P1 (ABLE-TO RECORDER P2) P2 (DISTRACT RECORDER CHILD) P3 (ABLE-TO RECORDING P4) P4 (PROVIDE RECORDING QUALITY) P5 (MOD QUALITY GOOD) P6 (NEGATE P3) P7 (ABLE-TO WE P8) P8 (HEAR WE VOICE) P9 (MOD HEAR CLEAR) P10 (NEGATE P7)	Part of CP3, CP4, and added information
S6	That's why some experts observe them in research centres where little children don't notice that they are filmed when they are playing.	P1 (OBSERVE EXPERT CHILD) P2 (NUMBER-OF EXPERT SOME) P3 (IN P1 CENTER) P4 (MOD CENTER RESEARCH) P5 (WHERE P3 P6) P6 (NOTICE CHILD P8) P7 (NEGATE P6) P8 (FILM \$ CHILD) P9 (WHEN P8 P10) P10 (PLAY CHILD)	Irrelevant information
S7	So they can record them with good acoustic quality while these children are speaking freely to their mates.	P1 (ABLE-TO EXPERT P2) P2 (RECORD EXPERT CHILD) P3 (WITH P1 QUALITY) P4 (MOD QUALITY ACOUSTIC) P5 (MOD P4 GOOD) P6 (WHILE P1 P7) P7 (SPEAK-TO CHILD MATE) P8 (MOD SPEAK FREE) P9 (POSSESS CHILD MATE)	Irrelevant information

Table 25

*The Propositions in Anita's Second Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	First of all, they had own newspapers.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE NEWSPAPER) P3 (MOD NEWSPAPER OWN)	Part of CP3
S2	Selling their own newspapers helped them not just financially but it also promoted their movement and their political ideas.	P1 (HELP P2 SUFFRAGETTE) P2 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE NEWSPAPER) P3 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE NEWSPAPER) P4 (MOD HELP FINANCIAL) P5 (HELP P2 P6) P6 (PROMOTE SUFFRAGETTE MOVEMENT/POLITICAL-IDEA) P7 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE MOVEMENT) P8 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE POLITICAL-IDEA)	Irrelevant information and part of CP3
S3	Moreover, selling things in the colours of their movement was also financially beneficial for them.	P1 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE THING) P2 (IN THING COLOUR) P3 (POSSESS MOVEMENT COLOUR) P4 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE MOVEMENT) P5 (MOD P1 BENEFICIAL) P6 (MOD BENEFICIAL FINANCIAL) P7 (FOR P5 SUFFRAGETTE)	CP2 and irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Furthermore, they organised programmes which income promoted them financially too.	P1 (ORGANISE SUFFRAGETTE PROGRAMME) P2 (PROMOTE INCOME SUFFRAGETTE) P3 (POSSESS PROGRAMME INCOME) P4 (MOD PROMOTE FINANCIAL)	Irrelevant information
S5	In addition to this, they advertised the movement by marching through the streets in the colours of the suffragettes.	P1 (ADVERTISE SUFFRAGETTE MOVEMENT) P2 (BY P1 MARCH) P3 (THROUGH MARCH STREET) P4 (IN MARCH COLOUR) P5 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE COLOUR)	Part of CP2
S6	Moreover, some of the members of the movement designed postcards which had high artistic value, which was a good promotion too.	P1 (DESIGN MEMBER POSTCARD) P2 (NUMBER-OF MEMBER SOME) P3 (POSSESS MOVEMENT MEMBER) P4 (POSSESS POSTCARD VALUE) P5 (MOD VALUE ARTISTIC) P6 (DEGREE-OF VALUE HIGH) P7 (ISA P1 PROMOTION) P8 (MOD PROMOTION GOOD)	Part of CP2



During the first data collection session, Dia's first reading purpose was to summarise all the main ideas of the text. However, upon revising the task instruction, she realised that she only needed to focus on the difficulties of collecting data from children. Nevertheless, when realising that her final product is too short, she started adding further ideas to the summary to achieve the necessary length. In her think-aloud, she claimed that she found it difficult to decide what to add to her summary to increase its length, so she decided to add her own assumptions about the source text information. The last sentence of the summary, which contains task-irrelevant information, was added to provide a conclusion for the summary (cf. Table 26). The addition of the irrelevant and added pieces of information shows that when faced with an unfamiliar task, despite initially having the appropriate reading purpose in mind, Dia transferred task solving strategies successfully used in reading tasks executed in high school in order to solve the encountered difficulty (i.e., low word count). Nevertheless, based on her placement test results, Dia was a B2 level participant, and similarly to Anita, she managed to more successfully execute the task even during the first data collection phase than the first four participants.

Dia's second guided summary (cf. Table 27) contains much less added information, and she managed to stay on task more successfully than during the first data collection phase, which indicates that she was more in control of her reading processes because she managed to systematically implement the language activity set by her reading goal. This was probably the result of being more familiar with the task type and being able to tailor her reading strategy use more closely to her reading purpose.

Table 26

*The Propositions in Dia's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	It is really hard to get information about this topic from children because they sometimes can't pay attention or don't remember instructions.	P1 (GET \$ INFORMATION) P2 (ABOUT INFORMATION TOPIC) P3 (FROM INFORMATION CHILD) P4 (MOD P1 DIFFICULT) P5 (BECAUSE P4 P9) P6 (ABLE-TO CHILD PAY-ATTENTION) P7 (TIME P6 SOMETIMES) P8 (NEGATE P6) P9 (OR P8 P11) P10 (REMEMBER CHILD INSTRUCTION) P11 (NEGATE P10)	Part of CP1
S2	Researchers need to find another way to get information from children than from adults.	P1 (NEED-TO-FIND RESEACHER WAY-TO-GET-INFORMATION) P2 (MOD WAY ANOTHER) P3 (FROM WAY-TO-GET-INFORMATION CHILD) P4 (OVERLAP P3 P6) P5 (NEGATE P4) P6 (FROM WAY-TO-GET-INFORMATION ADULT)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S3	It is also not so easy to get certain opinion and judgment about language from them.	P1 (GET \$ OPINION/JUDGEMENT) P2 (FROM P1 CHILD) P3 (ABOUT LANGUAGE OPINION/JUDGEMENT) P4 (MOD P1 DIFFICULT)	Part of CP2 and added information
S4	Researchers think these studies should take place at home or somewhere familiar and comfortable for children, for example at a place where they are allowed to play and have fun.	P1 (THINK RESEARCHER P2) P2 (SHOULD STUDY TAKE-PLACE) P3 (AT P2 HOME) P4 (AT P2 PLACE) P5 (OR P2 P4) P6 (MOD PLACE FAMILIAR) P7 (MOD PLACE COMFORTABLE) P8 (FOR COMFORTABLE CHILD) P9 (EXAMPLE-OF PLACE P10) P10 (WHERE P11) P11 (ALLOWED-TO CHILD PLAY/HAVE-FUN)	Irrelevant information

Table 27

*The Propositions in Dia's Second Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	Firstly, the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) leaders created the Women's Press Shop and with this they spread their message and they used limited communications.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (CREATE LEADER WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP) P3 (POSSESS WSPU LEADER) P4 (SPREAD WSPU MESSAGE) P5 (POSSESS WSPU MESSAGE) P6 (WITH P4 WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP) P7 (USE WSPU COMMUNICATION) P8 (MOD COMMUNICATION LIMITED)	Irrelevant information and added information
S2	Secondly, the WSPU published a newspaper, which they could sell through the whole country.	P1 (MOD P2 SECOND) P2 (PUBLISH WSPU NEWSPAPER) P3 (ABLE-TO WSPU P4) P4 (SELL WSPU NEWSPAPER) P5 (THROUGH P4 COUNTRY) P6 (MOD COUNTRY WHOLE)	Part of CP3
S3	Moreover, the WSPU created a colour scheme for the suffragette movement, which also made it easier to spread the message.	P1 (CREATE WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME) P2 (FOR COLOUR-SCHEME SUFFRAGETTE-MOVEMENT) P3 (SPREAD \$ MESSAGE) P4 (MOD SPREAD EASIER) P5 (BECAUSE-OF P4 COLOUR-SCHEME)	Part of CP2

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Furthermore, the WSPU made some fund-raising events combined with the 'war chest' so they could make the movement popular.	P1 (MAKE WSPU FUND-RAISING-EVENT) P2 (NUMBER-OF FUND-RAISING-EVENT SOME) P3 (COMBINE-WITH P1 WAR-CHEST) P4 (IN-ORDER-TO P3 P5) P5 (MAKE-POPULAR WSPU MOVEMENT)	Part of CP4 and added information
S5	WSPU members were wearing same coloured dresses and jewelleries, this was their official uniform.	P1 (WEAR MEMBER DRESS/JEWELLERY) P2 (POSSESS WSPU MEMBER) P3 (IN P1 COLOUR) P4 (MOD COLOUR SAME) P5 (REF P1 UNIFORM) P6 (MOD UNIFORM OFFICIAL) P7 (POSSESS WSPU UNIFORM)	Part of CP2
S6	In addition, women artists created greeting cards and post cards to promote the movement.	P1 (CREATE ARTIST GREETING-CARD/POST-CARD) P2 (MOD ARTIST WOMAN) P3 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P4) P4 (PROMOTE ARTIST MOVEMENT)	Part of CP2

In Lilla's case, both the first (cf. Table 28) and the second summary (cf. Table 29) contain only a fraction of the task-relevant propositions. The first summary contains several ideas that were main ideas in the original source text but irrelevant for the task, which shows that Lilla processed the source text with the wrong reading purpose in mind. As she had received some instruction regarding reading strategies in high school, when encountering the unfamiliar reading task, she relied on those instructions, thus creating a negative transfer of reading strategies (cf. Grabe & Stoller, 2013). In her think-aloud, she claimed that she added a general introduction and a general conclusion to her summary as she was instructed in high school to always start writing assignments with a general introduction and finish them with a general conclusion.

In contrast, Lilla's second summary contains several pieces of added information which are Lilla's own assumptions about the source text information. Based on the guiding question she formulated for herself in the think-aloud, she started to process the source text with the appropriate reading purpose in mind, but instead of incorporating the relevant pieces of information into her source text, she incorporated her own assumptions about those pieces of information. This indicates a lack of reading control and inability to process the text as required by the task. As all participants in the present study had received an intensive training in reading strategy use and summarisation during the time period between the first and the second data collection occasions, Lilla's lack of familiarity with the data collection task can be excluded as an explanation for not being able to process the text as required by the task. Since her language proficiency level was at B2 level based on her placement test results, not having a high enough language proficiency can probably also be excluded as a reason behind the problem. There are two potential explanations for her failure to execute the task. First, her lack of background knowledge in the topic of conducting research might have made the text conceptually difficult for her to interpret properly (cf. Koda, 2007).

Second, she mentioned in her think-aloud that she felt tired on the day of the data collection and that she found it difficult to concentrate; therefore, her fatigue might have been responsible for her inability to stay on task.

Table 28

*The Propositions in Lilla's First Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	The suffragette movement started in the beginning of the 20th century, in 1903.	P1 (START \$ SUFFRAGETTE-MOVEMENT) P2 (TIME P1 BEGINNING-OF-THE-20TH-CENTURY) P3 (TIME P1 1903)	Irrelevant information
S2	Their slogan was simple but it said the main point: 'Deeds not words'.	P1 (MOD SLOGAN SIMPLE) P2 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE SLOGEN) P3 (BUT P1 P4) P4 (SAY SLOGAN MAIN-POINT) P5 (REF MAIN-POINT DEEDS-NOT-WORDS)	Added information and CP1
S3	Many women joined to this campaign, so ladies' suffrage became a political issue.	P1 (JOIN WOMAN CAMPAIGN) P2 (SO P1 P3) P3 (BECOME SUFFRAGE POLITICAL-ISSUE) P4 (POSSESS LADY SUFFRAGE)	Irrelevant information
S4	But how could it happen in a world without media?	P1 (HOW-IS-POSSIBLE P2) P2 (HAPPEN S3:P3) P3 (IN P2 WORLD) P4 (MOD WORLD WITHOUT-MEDIA)	Added information
S5	The newspaper was a good opportunity to earn money, but it wasn't the only thing that made profit for them.	P1 (ISA NEWSPAPER OPPORTUNITY) P2 (MOD OPPORTUNITY GOOD) P3 (TO OPPOTUNITY P4) P4 (EARN \$ MONEY) P5 (BUT P1 P9) P6 (MAKE NEWSPAPER PROFIT) P8 (MOD P6 ONLY) P9 (NEGATE P8)	Irrelevant information



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S6	They started to sell games for children and greeting cards.	P1 (START-TO SUFFRAGETTE P2) P2 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE GAME/GREETING-CARD) P3 (FOR GAME CHILD)	Part of CP2
S7	They also wore something in the colours of the movement (purple, white, green).	P1 (WEAR SUFFRAGETTE SOMETHING) P2 (IN SOMETHING COLOUR) P3 (POSSESS MOVEMENT COLOUR) P4 (MOD COLOUR PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)	Part of CP2
S8	And they organised special events for example fund-raising or marching too.	P1 (ORGANISE SUFFRAGETTE EVENT) P2 (MOD EVENT SPECIAL) P3 (EXAMPLE-OF EVENT FUND-RAISING) P4 (EXAMPLE-OF EVENT MARCH)	Part of CP4 and irrelevant information

Table 29

*The Propositions in Lilla's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	First of all, children aren't listening to the researcher, who usually has to remind them about the instructions.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (LISTEN-TO CHILD RESEARCHER) P3 (NEGATE P2) P4 (MUST RESEARCHER P5) P5 (REMIND RESEARCHER CHILD) P6 (ABOUR P5 INSTRUCTION)	Added information
S2	Some children turn off the recorder when they realise it's being turned on.	P1 (TURN-OFF CHILD RECORDER) P2 (NUMBER-OF CHILD SOME) P3 (WHEN P1 P4) P4 (REALISE CHILD P5) P5 (TURN-ON \$ RECORDER)	Added information
S3	Another fact, that could make the researching difficult is the acoustic quality of the room.	P1 (MAKE-DIFFICULT ACOUSTIC-QUALITY RESEARCH) P2 (POSSESS ROOM ACOUSTIC-QUALITY) P3 (ISA P1 FACT) P4 (MOD FACT OTHER) P5 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	The presence of the researcher or the recording tool can frustrate children too.	P1 (FRUSTRATE PRESENCE CHILD) P2 (POSSESS RESEARCHER PRESENCE) P3 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE) P4 (FRUSTRATE RECORDING-TOOL CHILD) P5 (MOD P4 POSSIBLE)	Part of CP3
S5	Moreover, the observed children cannot provide information that is necessary for the research, so the observer can't get a clear picture about the way how children are learning.	P1 (ABLE-TO CHILD P2) P2 (PROVIDE CHILD INFORMATION) P3 (MOD CHILD OBSERVE) P4 (MOD INFORMATION NECESSARY) P5 (FOR NECESSARY RESEARCH) P6 (NEGATE P1) P7 (SO P1 P13) P8 (ABLE-TO OBSERVER P9) P9 (GET OBSERVER PICTURE) P10 (ABOUT P9 LEARNING) P11 (POSSESS CHILD LEARNING) P12 (MOD PICTURE CLEAR) P13 (NEGATE P8)	Irrelevant information

Johanna's first guided summary (cf. Table 30) is also a global summary focusing on the main ideas of the source text, and the added pieces of information contain Johanna's own assumptions based on the source text information. As Johanna claimed in her think-aloud that she did not receive any formal instruction regarding reading strategy use or summarisation, and yet she had to solve several reading comprehension tasks during high school, when she encountered the unfamiliar task, she transferred a reading purpose successfully applied in previous reading situations instead of aligning her reading purpose with the task requirements. It is unlikely that not being able to set the appropriate reading purpose was a result of a lack of appropriate language knowledge because based on her placement test results, Johanna had B2 level language knowledge at the beginning of the data collection, and she also achieved one of the highest scores on the reading comprehension component of the placement test (i.e., 12 out of 14 points). Based on the think-aloud, Johanna's inability to stay on task was caused by the transfer of inappropriate reading strategies and reading purpose as upon seeing the data collection task, she immediately likened it to the tasks she had to solve during her high school studies.

The contrast with her second guided summary (cf. Table 31) is notable because Johanna's second summary was written with a very clear reading purpose in mind, and it is highly focussed on the requirements of the task. The only two sentences which contain irrelevant pieces of information are the results of including information referring to the money-making opportunities of the suffragettes, a tendency also observed in Anita's second guided summary.

Table 30

*The Propositions in Johanna's First Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	Researches were started in the 19th century, however the 20th century brought a change: the tape recorder.	P1 (START \$ RESEARCH) P2 (TIME P1 19TH-CENTURY) P3 (HOWEVER P1 P4) P4 (BRING 20TH-CENTURY CHANGE) P5 (REF CHANGE TAPE-RECORDER)	Irrelevant information
S2	Researchers could listen repeatedly to the records and study the field deeply.	P1 (ABLE-TO RESEARCHER P2) P2 (LISTEN RESEARCHER RECORD) P3 (MOD LISTEN REPEATED) P4 (ABLE-TO RESEARCHER P5) P5 (STUDY RESEARCHER FIELD) P6 (MOD RESEARCH DEEP)	Irrelevant information
S3	However, researchers have to face a lot of difficulties.	P1 (HOWEVER S2P1/S2P4 P2) P2 (MUST RESEARCHER P3) P3 (FACE RESEARCHER DIFFICULTY) P4 (AMOUNT-OF DIFFICULTY LOT)	Irrelevant information
S4	Children cannot be forced to cooperate.	P1 (FORCE \$ CHILD) P2 (TO P1 COOPERATE) P3 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE) P4 (NEGATE P3)	Added information
S5	This leads to further troubles.	P1 (LEAD-TO S4 TROUBLE) P2 (MOD TROUBLE FURTHER)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S6	There are several researching methods yet two main research paradigms are found.	P1 (EXIST RESEARCH-METHOD) P2 (NUMBER-OF RESEARCH-METHOD SEVERAL) P3 (YET P1 P4) P4 (FIND \$ RESEARCH-PARADIGM) P5 (MOD RESEARCH-PARADIGM MAIN) P6 (NUMBER-OF RESEARCH PARADIGM TWO)	Irrelevant information
S7	'Naturalistic sampling' studies the spontaneous speech.	P1 (STUDY NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING SPEECH) P2 (MOD SPEECH SPONTANEOUS)	Irrelevant information
S8	This method carries several risks for example missing important features of a child's linguistic ability.	P1 (CARRY NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING RISK) P2 (NUMBER-OF RISK SEVERAL) P3 (EXAMPLE-OF RISK P4) P4 (MISS \$ FEATURE) P5 (MOD FEATURE IMPORTANT) P6 (POSSESS LINGUISTIC-ABILITY FEATURE) P7 (POSSESS LINGUISTIC-ABILITY CHILD)	Irrelevant information
S9	On the other hand, there is experimental psychology which is based on hypothesises.	P1 (ON-THE-OTHER-HAND S8 P2) P2 (EXIST EXPERIMENTAL-PSYCHOLOGY) P3 (BASED-ON EXPERIMENTAL-PSYCHOLOGY HYPOTHESIS)	Added information
S10	It requires a group of subjects and a statistical analyser who will prove or falsifies the original hypothesis.	P1 (REQUIRE EXPERIMENTAL-PSYCHOLOGY SUBJECT) P2 (AMOUNT-OF SUBJECT GROUP) P3 (REQUIRE EXPERIMENTAL-PSYCHOLOGY ANALYSER) P4 (PROVE ANALYSER HYPOTHESIS) P5 (MOD HYPOTHESIS ORIGINAL) P6 (FALSIFY ANALYSER HYPOTHESIS) P7 (MOD HYPOTHESIS ORIGINAL) P8 (OR P4 P6)	Irrelevant information

Table 31

*The Propositions in Johanna's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	Firstly, they used slogans and set up the colour scheme, which lead to the growth of membership.	P1 (MOD P4 FIRST) P2 (USE SUFFRAGETTE SLOGAN) P3 (SET-UP SUFFRAGETTE COLOUR-SCHEME) P4 (AND P2 P3) P5 (LEAD-TO P4 P6) P6 (GROW MEMBERSHIP)	Part of CP1 and part of CP2
S2	Moreover, suffragettes opened their own press in 1906 that produced feminist newspaper.	P1 (OPEN SUFFRAGETTE PRESS) P2 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE PRESS) P3 (TIME P1 1906) P4 (PRODUCE PRESS NEWSPAPER) P5 (MOD NEWSPAPER FEMINIST)	Part of CP3
S3	This way they were able to send their message to every member of the movement.	P1 (BECAUSE-OF P2 S2:P1) P2 (ABLE-TO SUFFRAGETTE P3) P3 (SEND SUFFRAGETTE MESSAGE) P4 (TO P3 MEMBER) P5 (NUMBER-OF MEMBER EVERY) P6 (POSSESS MOVEMENT MEMBER)	Part of CP3
S4	In the paper they sold advertising space to be able to maintain their press.	P1 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE ADVERTISING-SPACE) P2 (IN P1 PAPER) P3 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P4 ) P4 (ABLE-TO SUFFRAGETTE P5) P5 (MAINTAIN SUFFRAGETTE PRESS) P6 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE PRESS)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S5	Furthermore, they sold games, cards and numerous other items in white, purple and green.	P1 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE GAME/CARD/ITEM) P2 (MOD ITEM OTHER) P3 (NUMBER-OF ITEM NUMEROUS) P4 (MOD GAME/CARD/ITEM WHITE/PURPLE/GREEN)	Part of CP2
S6	This was a new marketing concept.	P1 (REF S5P1 MARKETING-CONCEPT) P2 (MOD MARKETING-CONCEPT NEW)	Part of CP2
S7	Suffragettes also opened the Woman's Exhibition which was a great success.	P1 (OPEN SUFFRAGETTE WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION) P2 (ISA WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION SUCCESS) P3 (DEGREE-OF SUCCESS GREAT)	Part of CP4
S8	They raised 250000 pounds in ten days.	P1 (RAISE SUFFRAGETTE 250,000 POUNDS) P2 (DURATION-OF P1 TEN-DAYS)	Irrelevant information



In her first summary (cf. Table 32), Boglárka also produced a global summary of the source text instead of a guided summary based on the task. It is worth mentioning that her first summary is significantly longer than the required length, which shows that she was unable to appropriately condense the ideas and could not choose her focus appropriately. Her summary contains several pieces of irrelevant information, which represent the main ideas of the source text. There is one piece of added information, which appears to be Boglárka's own comment about the topic (i.e., "[...] children develop cognitively as time goes by"). Her first phase guided summary shows that Boglárka, like the other participants, adopted an inappropriate reading purpose for the task at hand. Those three pieces of task-relevant information which are included into her first phase summary coincide with main ideas of the original source text. In her think-aloud, she likened the data collection task to those reading tasks she had to execute in high school. As Boglárka was a participant who had B2 level language proficiency in English, her inability to set the appropriate reading purpose is explained by the negative effects of transferring inappropriate reading purposes and reading strategies from her previous experience with reading tasks (cf. Grabe & Stoller, 2013), and it is not a sign of not having the appropriate language proficiency level to comprehend the task or the source text.

Even though Boglárka's second guided summary (cf. Table 33) also contains some irrelevant pieces of information, it provides more evidence of task-appropriate reading purpose use, and it is more successful in condensing the necessary pieces of information. The irrelevant pieces of information refer to the money-making opportunities of the suffragettes, which tendency could already be observed in Johanna and Anita's summaries.

Table 32

*The Propositions in Boglárka's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	At the beginning, they used parents' diaries and from the middle decades of the 20th century when tape recorders came into routine, they began doing systematic investigations.	P1 (USE RESEARCHER DIARY) P2 (POSSESS PARENT DIARY) P3 (TIME P1 AT-THE-BEGINNING) P4 (BEGIN RESEARCHER INVESTIGATION) P5 (MOD INVESTIGATION SYSTEMATIC) P6 (WHEN P4 P7) P7 (COME-INTO TAPE-RECORDER ROUTINE) P8 (TIME P7 MIDDLE-DECADES-OF-THE-20TH-CENTURY)	Irrelevant information
S2	It was possible because of the fact that with the help of these tapes, analysts could listen to them repeatedly.	P1 (MOD S1:P4 POSSIBLE) P2 (BECAUSE P1 P3) P3 (ABLE-TO ANALYST P4) P4 (LISTEN-TO ANALYST INVESTIGATION) P5 (MOD LISTEN REPEATED) P6 (WITH P4 TAPE)	Irrelevant information
S3	Since then, linguists and psychologists have also started to do experimentations to study deeply the process of language acquisition.	P1 (SINCE S1:P8 P2) P2 (START-TO-DO LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST EXPERIMENTATION) P3 (IN-ORDER-TO P2 P4) P4 (STUDY RESEARCHER PROCESS) P5 (MOD STUDY DEEP) P6 (POSSESS LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION PROCESS)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Doing these experimentations are much more harder with kids, than adults, because there are some routines that cannot be used with children.	P1 (MORE-DIFFICULT-THAN P2 P4) P2 (DO \$ EXPERIMENT) P3 (WITH EXPERIMENT CHILD) P4 (DO \$ EXPERIMENT) P5 (WITH EXPERIMENT ADULT) P6 (BECAUSE P1 P11) P7 (ABLE-TO \$ P8) P8 (USE \$ ROUTINE) P9 (NUMBER-OF ROUTINE SOME) P10 (WITH P8 CHILD) P11 (NEGATE P7)	Part of CP1
S5	However, children develop cognitively as time goes by, some tasks can't be made with children below the age of 3.	P1 (EVEN-THOUGH P1 P8) P2 (DEVELOP CHILD COGNITIVELY) P3 (TIME P2 AS-TIME-GOES-BY) P4 (MAKE \$ TASK) P5 (WITH P4 CHILD) P6 (MOD CHILD BELOW-THE-AGE-OF-THREE) P7 (MOD P4 POSSIBLE) P8 (NEGATE P7)	Added information and part of CP2
S6	There are more than one way to study children's language, for example from the aspects of linguists and psychologists.	P1 (EXIST WAY) P2 (NUMBER-OF WAY SEVERAL) P3 (TO WAY P4) P4 (STUDY \$ LANGUAGE) P5 (POSSESS LANGUAGE CHILD) P6 (EXAMPLE-OF WAY P7) P7 (FROM WAY ASPECT) P8 (POSSESS LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST ASPECT)	Irrelevant information
S7	There are two main paradigms for the samples, naturalistic and experimentation.	P1 (EXIST PARADIGM) P2 (FOR PARADIGM SAMPLE) P3 (MOD PARADIGM MAIN) P4 (NUMBER-OF PARADIGM TWO) P5 (REF PARADIGM NATURALISTIC/EXPERIMENTATION)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S8	Although, some children tend to switch off when they are being recorded, for many of them it is easier to do these experiments at their homes, because of the familiar surroundings, or in the studio where they are accompanied by their parents, some toys and other kids.	P1 (ALTHOUGH P2 P9) P2 (TEND-TO CHILD1 SWITCH-OFF) P3 (NUMBER-OF CHILD1 SOME) P4 (WHEN P2 P5) P5 (RECORD \$ CHILD1) P6 (DO CHILD1 EXPERIMENT) P7 (AT P6 HOME) P8 (POSSESS CHILD1 HOME) P9 (MOD P22 EASIER) P10 (FOR P9 CHILD1) P11 (NUMBER-OF CHILD1 MANY) P12 (BECAUSE-OF P9 SURROUNDINGS) P13 (MOD SURROUNDINGS FAMILIAR) P14 (AT P6 STUDIO) P15 (WHERE STUDIO P16) P16 (ACCOMPANY PARENT/TOY/CHILD2 CHILD1) P17 (NUMBER-OF TOY SOME) P18 (MOD CHILD2 OTHER) P19 (OR P7 P14)	Part of CP3 and irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S9	This is a good way to make samples for children's speech, but researchers have to face the limitations of this approach, for instance they can easily miss some important features of a child's linguistic ability, so the samples have to be supplemented by other methods.	P1 (ISA S8:P22 WAY) P2 (MOD WAY GOOD) P3 (TO WAY P4) P4 (MAKE \$ SAMPLE) P5 (FOR SAMPLE SPEECH) P6 (POSSESS CHILD SPEECH) P7 (BUT P1 P8) P8 (MUST RESEARCHER P9) P9 (FACE RESEARCHER LIMITATION) P10 (POSSESS APPROACH LIMITATION) P11 (EXAMPLE-OF LIMITATION P12) P12 (MISS RESEARCHER FEATURE) P13 (MOD P12 POSSIBLE) P14 (MOD FEATURE IMPORTANT) P15 (POSSESS LINGUISTIC-ABILITY FEATURE) P16 (POSSESS CHILD LINGUISTIC ABILITY) P17 (SO P13 P18) P18 (MUST \$ P19) P19 (SUPPLEMENT \$ SAMPLE) P20 (WITH P19 METHOD) P21 (MOD METHOD OTHER)	Irrelevant information
S10	The other main paradigm is experimentation.	P1 (REF PARADIGM EXPERIMENTATION) P2 (MOD PARADIGM MAIN) P3 (MOD PARADIGM OTHER)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S11	Here the investigator sets up a hypothesis and kind of manipulates or gives instructions to the child through tasks to be able to make an analysis of their behaviour.	P1 (SET-UP INVESTIGATOR HYPOTHESIS) P2 (IN P1 EXPERIMENTATION) P3 (MANIPULATE INVESTIGATOR CHILD) P4 (INSTRUCT INVESTIGATOR CHILD) P5 (OR P3 P4) P6 (THROUGH P5 TASK) P7 (IN-ORDER-TO P6 P8) P8 (ABLE-TO INVESTIGATOR) P9 (ANALYSE INVESTIGATOR BEHAVIOUR) P10 (POSSESS CHILD BEHAVIOUR)	Irrelevant information and added information
S12	Then this analysis can support or falsify the original hypothesis.	P1 (THEN S11:P9 P2) P2 (ABLE-TO ANALYSIS P5) P3 (SUPPORT ANALYSIS HYPOTHESIS) P4 (FALSIFY ANALYSIS HYPOTHESIS) P5 (OR P3 P4) P6 (MOD HYPOTHESIS ORIGINAL)	Irrelevant information
S13	With this method researchers could make many detailed findings, but it's hard to generalise them.	P1 (ABLE-TO RESEARCHER P2) P2 (MAKE RESEARCHER FINDING) P3 (MOD FINDING DETAILED) P4 (NUMBER-OF FINDING MANY) P5 (WITH P1 EXPERIMENTATION) P6 (BUT P1 P8) P7 (GENERALISE \$ FINDING) P8 (MOD P7 HARD)	Irrelevant information
S14	Both methods have their own pros and cons.	P1 (POSSESS METHOD PRO) P2 (POSSESS METHOD CON) P3 (MOD METHOD BOTH)	Irrelevant information

Table 33

*The Propositions in Boglárka's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	Firstly, the Women's Social and Political Union had members from all around the world which provided better possibility to share their voice.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (POSSESS WSPU MEMBER) P3 (MOD MEMBER FROM-ALL-AROUND-THE-WORLD) P4 (PROVIDE P2 POSSIBILITY) P5 (MOD POSSIBILITY BETTER) P6 (TO POSSIBILITY P7) P7 (SHARE WSPU VOICE) P8 (POSSESS WSPU VOICE)	Added information
S2	Secondly, the Union published its own newspaper The Suffragette which had significantly important role in informing members about the various events.	P1 (MOD P2 SECOND) P2 (PUBLISH UNION NEWSPAPER) P3 (POSSESS UNION NEWSPAPER) P4 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P5 (PLAY NEWSPAPER ROLE) P6 (MOD ROLE IMPORTANT) P7 (DEGREE-OF IMPORTANT SIGNIFICANT) P8 (IN ROLE P9 ) P9 (INFORM UNION MEMBER) P10 (ABOUT INFORM EVENT) P11 (MOD EVENT VARIOUS)	Part of CP3
S3	Besides, department store bought advertising space in the newspaper, thus reaching a wider range of women.	P1 (BUY DEPARTMENT-STORE ADVERTISING-SPACE) P2 (IN P1 NEWSPAPER) P3 (THUS P1 P4) P4 (REACH DEPARTMENT-STORE WOMAN) P5 (AMOUNT-OF WOMEN RANGE) P6 (MOD RANGE WIDE)	Irrelevant information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Thirdly, they created a colour scheme of white, purple and green.	P1 (MOD P2 THIRD) P2 (CREATE WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME) P3 (MOD COLOUR-SCHEME WHITE/PURPLE/GREEN)	Part of CP2
S5	They used them as another marketing concept from which they could get money as well.	P1 (USE WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME) P2 (ISA COLOUR-SCHEM MARKETING-CONCEPT) P3 (MOD MARKETING-CONCEPT ANOTHER) P4 (FROM MARKETING-CONCEPT P5) P5 (ABLE-TO WSPU P6) P6 (GET WSPU MONEY)	Part of CP2 and irrelevant information
S6	Lastly, the Union had number of other fund-raising oriented activities such as Women's Exhibition which also meant popularity and money.	P1 (MOD P2 LAST) P2 (POSSESS WSPU FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY) P3 (MOD FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY OTHER) P4 (EXAMPLE OF FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY WOMEN'S-EXHIBITION) P5 (MEAN WOMEN'S EXHIBITION POPULARITY/MONEY)	Part of CP4 and irrelevant information



In Pálma's case, both summaries were written with a mostly appropriate reading purpose in mind, and in the first guided summary (cf. Table 34), the irrelevant pieces of information are present only to create a context for the rest of the information. Therefore, they should be interpreted as a production related problem rather than a reception related one. This need for creating a context is caused by the lack of familiarity with summarisation tasks, and based on Pálma's think-aloud, it is the mark of the influence of previously executed high school writing tasks. Because of the unfamiliar nature of the task, despite having high language proficiency in English (i.e., C1), Pálma appears to have transferred some of the task execution strategies she had used in other contexts.

Pálma's second summary (cf. Table 35) only contains one piece of irrelevant information which must have been included because she could not clearly differentiate between the difficulties of collecting data from children and the disadvantages of different research paradigms; therefore, she could not set the task-appropriate reading purpose. Her second summary also contains several pieces of added information, which indicate that she was not fully in control of her reading process, and she did not manage to stay on task. Her inability to set the proper reading purpose and to stay on task was probably caused by the lack of background knowledge about conducting research. She even mentioned it in her think-aloud that she found the source text "conceptually difficult and very complex" (Pálma, second think-aloud). As a participant with C1 level language proficiency, Pálma had no difficulty understanding the language of the text, but because of the lack of the necessary background knowledge, she was experiencing difficulties in understanding the concepts presented in the text.

Table 34

*The Propositions in Pálma's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	A politician and her daughters founded the Women's Social and Political Union.	P1 (FOUND POLITICIAN WOMEN'S-SOCIAL-AND-POLITICAL-UNION) P2 (FOUND DAUGHTER WOMEN'S-SOCIAL-AND-POLITICAL-UNION) P3 (POSSESS POLITICIAN DAUGHTER)	Irrelevant information
S2	They wanted to spread it all over the world, so they started a campaign.	P1 (WANT-TO POLITICIAN/DAUGHTER P2) P2 (SPREAD FOUNDER WOMEN'S-SOCIAL-AND-POLITICAL-UNION) P3 (ALL-OVER P2 WORLD) P4 (SO P1 P5) P5 (START FOUNDER CAMPAIGN)	Irrelevant information
S3	They created a colour scheme and a slogan too.	P1 (CREATE FOUNDER COLOUR-SCHEME) P2 (CREATE FOUNDER SLOGAN)	Part of CP1 and part of CP2
S4	In those days, they didn't have Internet, television nor radio just a minimal use of telephone.	P1 (EXIST INTERNET/TELEVISION/RADIO) P2 (NEGATE P1) P3 (EXIST USE-OF-TELEPHONE) P4 (DEGREE-OF USE-OF-TELEPHONE MINIMAL) P5 (TIME-OF P2 IN-THOSE-DAYS) P6 (TIME-OF P4 IN-THOSE-DAYS)	Irrelevant information
S5	They started to produce newspapers, so the word could spread quickly as it was the best way to communicate.	P1 (START-TO FOUNDER P2) P2 (PRODUCE FOUNDER NEWSPAPER) P3 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P4) P4 (SPREAD \$ WORD) P5 (MOD SPREAD QUICK) P6 (MOD P4 POSSIBLE) P7 (BECAUSE P6 P8) P9 (REF NEWSPAPER WAY) P10 (TO WAY COMMUNICATE) P11 (MOD P10 BEST)	Part of CP3

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S6	In addition, the creation of the colours for this movement was a great idea because the WSPU started selling things like board games, gift cards, Christmas cards in their colours: purple, white and green.	P1 (ISA CREATION IDEA) P2 (MOD IDEA GREAT) P3 (POSSESS COLOUR CREATION) P4 (FOR P3 MOVEMENT) P5 (BECAUSE P1 P6) P6 (STARTED-TO WSPU P7) P7 (SELL WSPU THING) P8 (EXAMPLE-OF THING BOARD-GAME/GIFT-CARD/CHRISTMAS-CARD) P9 (IN P8 COLOUR) P10 (EXAMPLE-OF COLOUR PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN) P11 (POSSESS WSPU COLOUR)	Part of CP2
S7	This was a whole new marketing back then.	P1 (ISA S6:P7 MARKETING) P2 (MOD MARKETING NEW) P3 (MOD NEW WHOLE) P4 (TIME-OF P1 BACK-THEN)	Part of CP2
S8	They also organised some exhibitions or money raising programmes.	P1 (ORGANISE WSPU EXHIBITION) P2 (NUMBER-OF EXHIBITION SOME) P3 (OR P1 P4) P4 (ORGANISE WSP PROGRAMME) P5 (MOD PROGRAMME MONEY-RAISING)	Part of CP4

Table 35

*The Propositions in Pálma's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	First of all, children cannot pay attention for a long period of time or to recall something they have been told.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (ABLE-TO CHILD PAY-ATTENTION) P3 (FOR PAY-ATTENTION PERIOD-OF-TIME) P4 (MOD PERIO-OF-TIME LONG) P5 (ABLE-TO CHILD P6) P6 (RECALL CHILD P7) P7 (TELL CHILD SOMETHING)	Part of CP1
S2	Second of all, they have also difficulties to do some judgements about a task and under the age of 3 is not possible.	P1 (MOD P2 SECOND) P2 (POSSESS CHILD DIFFICULTY) P3 (WITH DIFFICULTY P4) P4 (MAKE CHILD JUDGEMENT) P5 (NUMBER-OF JUDGEMENT SOME) P6 (WITH DIFFICULTY TASK) P7 (AND P4 P10) P8 (CHILD MAKE JUDGEMENT) P9 (MOD CHILD UNDER-THE-AGE-OF-THREE) P10 (MOD P8 IMPOSSIBLE)	Added information and part of CP2
S3	Moreover, they will not act like themselves when they see a recorder or a videomaker.	P1 (ACT CHILD LIKE-THEMSELVES) P2 (NEGATE P1) P3 (WHEN P2 P6) P4 (SEE CHILD RECORDER) P5 (SEE CHILD VIDEOMAKER) P6 (OR P4 P5)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Furthermore, if the researchers make a video about them in the children's home, they will not get the good quality.	P1 (IF P8 P2) P2 (MAKE RESEARCHER VIDEO) P3 (ABOUT P2 CHILD) P4 (IN P2 HOME) P5 (POSSESS CHILD HOME) P6 (GET RESEARCHER QUALITY) P7 (MOD QUALITY GOOD) P8 (NEGATE P6)	Added information
S5	Finally, the samples give a very few data about what the child understand.	P1 (MOD P2 FINAL) P2 (GIVE SAMPLE DATA) P3 (NUMBER-OF DATA FEW) P4 (MOD FEW VERY) P5 (ABOUT P2 P6) P6 (UNDERSTAND CHILD THING)	Irrelevant information

In Tamás' case, the first guided summary (cf. Table 36) is also closer to a global summary than to a guided summary, and it contains several pieces of irrelevant information. Even though Tamás had C1 level language proficiency in English, he did not manage to establish the correct reading purpose for his task execution process in the first phase. The irrelevant pieces of information are present because the aim of this summary is to give an equal representation of all the main ideas in the source text, and the additional ideas are Tamás' own assumptions from the source text. Similarly to the earlier discussed participants, Tamás had no previous experience with reading-into-writing tasks similar to the data collection instrument, so he transferred the reading goals and reading strategies he had successfully used during his high school studies to execute other types of reading tasks. As he only had previous experience with tasks involving global summaries, the transfer had a negative impact on his task solving processes (cf. Grabe & Stoller, 2013).

Tamás' second summary (cf. Table 37) is more focused and guided by the reading purpose set by the task. The presence of added information is probably due to an overgeneralisation of the summarised idea. The source text information "[s]ome children, it seems, are innately programmed to switch off as soon as they notice a tape recorder being switched on" is probably overgeneralised into "[i]n addition to this, children behaviour can cause problems in conducting a research" in Tamás' summary. The presence of the irrelevant pieces of information is caused by also including the disadvantages of different research paradigms. Just as in Pálma's case, this indicates that Tamás was not fully in control of the reading process because he did not manage to stay on task. As a participant with C1 level language proficiency, Tamás was probably unable to set the correct reading purpose because he lacked the necessary background knowledge to fully understand the concept of conducting research and not because he did not have the necessary language proficiency to comprehend the text.

Table 36

*The Propositions in Tamás's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	The suffrage movement was a movement led by women, to achieve voting rights for woman.	P1 (LEAD WOMAN MOVEMENT) P2 (MOD MOVEMENT SUFFRAGE) P3 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P4) P4 (ACHIEVE \$ VOTING-RIGHT) P5 (FOR VOTING-RIGHT WOMAN)	Irrelevant information
S2	Several groups were pursuing this, but the most potent one was WSPU, which was formed by Mrs Emmeline Parkhurst.	P1 (PURSUE GROUP S1:P4) P2 (NUMBER-OF GROUP SEVERAL) P3 (BUT P1 P4) P4 (REF WSPU GROUP) P5 (MOD GROUP MOST-POTENT) P6 (FORM MRS-EMMELINE-PARKHURST WSPU)	Irrelevant information
S3	The group became cohesive and dragged women from similar groups to their, because it had a recognisable system.	P1 (BECOME GROUP COHESIVE) P2 (DRAG GROUP WOMAN) P3 (FROM WOMAN GROUP2) P4 (MOD GROUP2 SIMILAR) P5 (BECAUSE P2 P6) P6 (POSSESS GROUP SYSTEM) P7 (MOD SYSTEM RECOGNISABLE)	Added information
S4	For example, a colour scheme of purple white and green.	P1 (EXAMPLE-OF SYSTEM COLOUR-SCHEME) P2 (MOD COLOUR-SCHEME PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)	Part of CP2

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S5	The produced newspapers which places for advertisement thus earned a profit as well as spreading their ideas.	P1 (POSSESS NEWSPAPER PLACES-FOR-ADVERTISEMENT) P2 (MOD NEWSPAPER PRODUCED) P3 (THUS P1 P7) P4 (EARN NEWSPAPER PROFIT) P5 (SPREAD NEWSPAPER IDEA) P6 (POSSESS WSPU IDEA) P7 (AND P4 P5)	Irrelevant information and part of CP3
S6	It was a good advertising place for companies who sold woman's products.	P1 (ISA NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING-PLACE) P2 (MOD ADVERTISING-PLACE GOOD) P3 (FOR P2 COMPANY) P4 (SELL COMPANY PRODUCT) P5 (MOD PRODUCT WOMAN'S)	Irrelevant information
S7	Later, they started selling greeting cards, and other merchandises in their official colour scheme.	P1 (TIME P2 LATER) P2 (START WSPU P3) P3 (SELL WSPU GREETING-CARD/MERCHANDISE) P4 (MOD MERCHANDISE OTHER) P6 (IN P4 COLOUR-SCHEME) P7 (MOD COLOUR-SCHEME OFFICIAL) P8 (POSSESS WSPU COLOUR-SCHEME)	Part of CP2
S8	All of these actions made them so popular and well-known, that they decided to start fund-raising activities.	P1 (MAKE-POPULAR S7:P1 WSPU) P2 (MAKE-WELL-KNOWN S7:P1 WSPU) P3 (AND P1 P2) P4 (SO P3 P5) P5 (DECIDE WSPU P6) P6 (START WSPU ACTIVITY) P7 (MOD ACTIVITY FUND-RAISING)	Added information and part of CP4



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S9	The most notable one was 1909's Woman's Exhibition.	P1 (REF WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY) P2 (MOD FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY MOST-NOTABLE) P3 (TIME WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION 1909)	Part of CP4 and irrelevant idea
S10	The movement became a lifestyle over the years.	P1 (BECOME MOVEMENT LIFESTYLE) P2 (DURATION-OF P1 OVER-THE-YEARS)	Added information
S11	The museum of London today depicts the movement with a huge collection, as vivid and action packed but really controversial era.	P1 (DEPICT MUSEUM P2) P2 (REF MOVEMENT ERA) P3 (LABLE MUSEUM MUSEUM-OF-LONDON) P4 (TIME P1 TODAY) P5 (WITH P1 COLLECTION) P6 (MOD COLLECTION HUGE) P7 (MOD ERA VIVID) P8 (MOD ERA ACTION-PACKED) P9 (MOD ERA CONTROVERSIAL) P10 (MOD CONTROVERSIAL REALLY)	Irrelevant information
S12	By 1918 and 1928 voting rights were achieved by this movement for woman.	P1 (ACHIEVE MOVEMENT VOTING-RIGHT) P2 (FOR VOTING-RIGHT WOMAN) P3 (TIME P1 BY-1918-AND-1928)	Irrelevant information
S13	All thanks to the brilliant ahead of their time group leaders.	P1 (THANK-TO GROUP-LEADER S12:P1) P2 (POSSESS WSPU GROUP-LEADER) P3 (MOD GROUPELEADER BRILLIANT) P4 (MOD GROUP-LEADER AHEAD-OF-THEIR-TIME)	Irrelevant information

Table 37

*The Propositions in Tamás's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	Firstly, a good range of research methods are not suitable to research children with.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (MOD RESEARCH-METHOD SUITABLE) P3 (AMOUNT-OF RESEARCH-METHOD RANGE) P4 (AMOUNT-OF RANGE GOOD) P5 (NEGATE P2) P6 (TO P5 P7) P7 (RESEARCH-WITH \$ CHILD)	Part of CP1
S2	In addition to this, children behaviour can cause problems in conducting a research.	P1 (IN-ADDITION S1 S2) P2 (CAUSE BEHAVIOUR PROBLEM) P3 (MOD P2 POSSIBLE) P4 (POSSESS CHILD BEHAVIOUR) P5 (IN P2 P6) P6 (CONDUCT \$ RESEARCH)	Added information
S3	Furthermore, conducting a recording in a children's home can cause negative effects on the quality of sound.	P1 (CONDUCT \$ RECORDING) P2 (IN P1 HOME) P3 (POSSESS CHILD HOME) P4 (ABLE-TO P1 P5) P5 (CAUSE P1 EFFECT) P6 (MOD EFFECT NEGATIVE) P7 (ON P6 QUALITY) P8 (POSSESS SOUND QUALITY)	CP4
S4	Additionally, the researcher can cause distraction in the children.	P1 (ADDITIONAL S3 S4) P2 (CAUSE RESEARCHER DISTRACTION) P3 (MOD P2 POSSIBLE) P4 (IN DISTRACTION CHILD)	Part of CP3

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S5	Even the good quality material give false picture about the children's real knowledge.	P1 (GIVE MATERIAL PICTURE) P2 (MOD MATERIAL QUALITY) P3 (MOD QUALITY GOOD) P4 (MOD PICTURE FALSE) P5 (ABOUT P1 KNOWLEDGE) P6 (MOD KNOWLEDGE REAL) P7 (POSSESS CHILD P6)	Irrelevant information
S6	Furthermore, they might not be extensive enough to enable decision making.	P1 (MOD MATERIAL EXTENSIVE) P2 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE) P3 (DEGREE-OF EXTENSIVE ENOUGH) P4 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P5) P5 (ENABLE MATERIAL DECISION-MAKING)	Irrelevant information
S7	Lastly, a result of an experiment might differ from the real-life behaviour of the same children.	P1 (MOD P2 LAST) P2 (DIFFER-FROM RESULT BEHAVIOUR) P3 (MOD P2 POSSIBLE) P4 (POSSESS EXPERIMENT RESULT) P5 (MOD BEHAVIOUR REAL-LIFE) P6 (POSSESS CHILD P5) P7 (MOD CHILD SAME)	Irrelevant information

Similarly to Tamás, in the first phase Beáta also wrote a summary resembling a global summary rather than a task-appropriate guided summary. In her think-aloud, she formulated the reading purpose to summarise all the main ideas of the text. This shows that despite being a participant with C1 level language proficiency, she did not manage to set the task-appropriate reading purpose. Her first phase summary (cf. Table 38) only contains added and irrelevant pieces of information, the added information presenting Beáta's own assumptions about the source text information, and the irrelevant pieces of information being main ideas taken from the source text.

Beáta's second summary (cf. Table 39) is notably more focussed, and there is a more task-appropriate reading purpose underlying it. Similarly to the previous participants, the presence of the irrelevant pieces of information is due to the inclusion of the financial aspects of sustaining the suffragette movement, which indicates a lapse in adhering to the set reading goal. Both pieces of added information represent Beáta's own assumptions about the source text information, and their presence in the summary indicates that during the second data collection phase, Beáta still experienced difficulties with staying on task.

Table 38

*The Propositions in Beáta's First Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	With the appearance of the tape recorder, they could actually start their investigation.	P1 (ABLE-TO SCHOLARS P2) P2 (START SCHOLAR INVESTIGATION) P3 (POSSESS SCHOLAR INVESTIGATION) P4 (MOD START ACTUAL) P5 (WITH P1 APPEARANCE) P6 (POSSESS TAPE-RECORDER APPEARANCE)	Irrelevant information
S2	Although being a popular theme, scientists had to face several difficulties.	P1 (ALTHOUGH P4 P2) P2 (ISA CHILD-SPEECH THEME) P3 (MOD THEME POPULAR) P4 (MUST SCIENTIST P5) P6 (FACE SCIENTIST DIFFICULTY) P7 (NUMBER-OF DIFFICULTY SEVERAL)	Added information
S3	Due to their lack of ability to keep focus on expressing their own opinions, these experiments were mainly uncreditable.	P1 (BECAUSE P7 P6) P2 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN P3) P3 (KEEP-FOCUS-ON CHILDREN P4) P4 (EXPRESS CHILDREN OPINION) P5 (POSSESS CHILDREN OPINION) P6 (NEGATE P2) P7 (MOD EXPERIMENT UNCREDITABLE) P8 (DEGREE-OF UNCREDITABLE MAINLY)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Although there are no rules of studying them, naturalistic sampling and some experimentations (two paradigms) might help us.	P1 (ALTHOUGH P6 P2) P2 (EXIST RULE) P3 (POSSESS STUDYING-CHILDREN RULE) P4 (NEGATE P2) P5 (HELP PARADIGM SCIENTIST) P6 (MOD P5 POSSIBLE) P7 (NUMBER-OF PARADIGM TWO) P8 (EXAMPLE-OF PARADIGM NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING/EXPERIMENTATION) P9 (NUMBER-OF EXPERIMENTATION SOME)	Added information and irrelevant information
S5	The first one focuses on recording the child's speech.	P1 (FOCUS-ON NATURALISTIC-SAMPLING P2) P2 (RECORD \$ CHILD-SPEECH)	Irrelevant information
S6	Taking into consideration the possible site (home, foreign place) and the child's speaking ability, several problems are to be faced.	P1 (IF P7 P6) P2 (CONSIDER \$ SITE) P3 (EXAMPLE-OF SITE HOME/ FOREIGN-PLACE) P4 (CONSIDER \$ SPEAKING-ABILITY) P5 (POSSESS CILD SPEAKING-ABILITY) P6 (AND P2 P4) P7 (FACE \$ PROBLEM) P8 (NUMBER-OF PROBLEM SEVERAL)	Irrelevant information
S7	The second one prefers experimental methods, while agreeing or disagreeing the given hypothesis.	P1 (PREFER PARADIGM EXPERIMENTAL-METHOD) P2 (MOD PARADIGM SECOND) P3 (WHILE P1 P4) P4 (OR P5 P6) P5 (AGREE-WITH PARADIGM HYPOTHESIS) P6 (DISAGREE-WITH PARADIGM HYPOTHESIS) P7 (MOD HYPOTHESIS GIVEN)	Irrelevant information

Table 39

*The Propositions in Beáta's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	Established in 1906, the Women's Press Shop – headquarter of WSPU – started its promotion.	P1 (ESTABLISH \$ WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP) P2 (TIME P1 1906) P3 (REF WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP HEADQUARTER-OF-WSPU) P3 (START WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP PROMOTION) P4 (POSSESS WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP PROMOTION)	Irrelevant information
S2	First of all, its newspaper was sold all over the country, so the organisation soon became well-known.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (SELL WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP NEWSPAPER) P3 (ALL-OVER P2 COUNTRY) P4 (SO P2 P5) P5 (BECOME ORGANISATION WELL-KNOWN) P6 (TIME P5 SOON)	Part of CP3 and added information
S3	Moreover, followers were constantly informed about different group events.	P1 (INFORM NEWSPAPER FOLLOWER) P2 (MOD INFORM CONSTANT) P3 (ABOUT P1 GROUP-EVENT) P4 (MOD GROUP-EVENT DIFFERENT)	Part of CP3
S4	The newspaper was mostly sold in two large companies, which sympathised with WSPU.	P1 (SELL \$ NEWSPAPER) P2 (MOD SELL MOSTLY) P3 (IN SELL COMPANY) P4 (NUMBER-OF COMPANY TWO) P5 (MOD COMPANY LARGE) P6 (SYMPAHISE-WITH COMPANY WSPU)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S5	Furthermore, the colour system – consisting of three members: purple, white, green – also played an important role.	P1 (MOD COLOUR-SYSTEM IMPORTANT) P2 (CONSIST-OF COLOUR-SYSTEM MEMBER) P3 (NUMBER-OF MEMBER THREE) P4 (REF MEMBER PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)	Part of CP2
S6	Different goods such as board games and greeting cards were sold.	P1 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE GOODS) P2 (MOD GOODS DIFFERENT) P3 (EXAMPLE-OF GOODS BOARD-GAME/GREETING-CARD)	Part of CP2
S7	Still, their most successful fund-raising event was at the Woman’s Exhibition, raising 25.000 pounds in ten days.	P1 (REF WOMAN’S-EXHIBITION FUND-RAISING-EVENT) P2 (MOD FUND-RAISING-EVENT MOST-SUCCESSFUL) P3 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE FUND-RAISING-EVENT) P4 (RAISE WOMAN’S-EXHIBITION 25,000-POUNDS) P5 (IN P4 TEN-DAYS)	Part of CP4 and irrelevant information
S8	Wearing uniforms also helped their promotion.	P1 (WEAR SUFFRAGETTE UNIFORM) P2 (HELP P1 PROMOTION) P3 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE PROMOTION)	Part of CP2



In Judit's case, both summaries were written with the appropriate reading purpose in mind; however, during the first data collection session, Judit decided to also add some task-irrelevant information to create a context for the rest of the ideas. This is a production related problem in Judit's case as her think-aloud shows that she was aware of the fact that those pieces of information were not strictly relevant to the task. She decided to add them based on the instruction she received in high school regarding writing tasks, namely to always provide enough context for the ideas presented in a writing assignment. The added information she included into her first summary (cf. Table 40) are her own assumptions based on the source text information.

Judit's second summary (cf. Table 41) is even more focussed than the first one, and the presence of the added and irrelevant information is probably caused by not being able to differentiate between the difficulties of collecting data from children and the drawbacks of certain research paradigms. This shows that despite having C2 level language proficiency, Judit still experienced some difficulties with fully adhering to the reading purpose, and her lack of background knowledge on the topic of the source text made it difficult for her to appropriately differentiate between task-relevant and task-irrelevant pieces of information. The added piece of information is Judit's own assumption about the topic, and the irrelevant piece of information is a drawback of naturalistic sampling (i.e., one of the research paradigms presented in the text), and it is not presented as a difficulty of collecting data from children in the source text.

Table 40

*The Propositions in Judit's First Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	It was vital for them to inform women about meetings and to get their message across to people in the government.	P1 (INFORM SUFFRAGETTE WOMEN) P2 (ABOUT P1 MEETING) P3 (MOD P1 VITAL) P4 (GET-ACROSS SUFFRAGETTE MESSAGE) P5 (MOD P4 VITAL) P6 (TO P4 PEOPLE) P7 (IN PEOPLE GOVERNMENT)	Irrelevant information
S2	They produced newspapers (i.e., Votes for Women, The Suffragette) to inform members about upcoming events.	P1 (PRODUCE SUFFRAGETTE NEWSPAPER) P2 (EXAMPLE OF NEWSPAPER VOTES-FOR-WOMEN) P3 (EXAMPLE OF NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P4 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P5) P5 (INFORM SUFFRAGETTE MEMBER) P6 (ABOUT P5 EVENT) P7 (MOD EVET UPCOMING)	Part of CP3
S3	Another major way of communication was spreading the message around by other members.	P1 (ISA P3 WAY-OF-COMMUNICATION) P2 (MOD WAY-OF-COMMUNICATION MAJOR) P3 (MOD WAY-OF-COMMUNICATION ANOTHER) P4 (SPREAD-AROUND MEMBER MESSAGE) P5 (MOD MEMBER OTHER)	Added information

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	They created merchandise (e.g., greeting cards, board games and other goods), not only to spread the word, but to raise money for future projects.	P1 (CREATE SUFFRAGETTE MERCHANDISE) P2 (EXAMPLE-OF MERCHANDISE GREETING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/GOODS) P3 (MOD GOODS OTHER) P4 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P9) P5 (SPREAD SUFFRAGETTE WORD) P6 (RAISE SUFFRAGETTE MONEY) P7 (FOR P6 PROJECT) P8 (MOD PROJECT FUTURE) P9 (AND P5 P6)	Part of CP2 and irrelevant information
S5	Their most important way of promoting their ideas was organising marches to reach people in higher positions.	P1 (ORGANISE SUFFRAGETTE MARCH) P2 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P3) P3 (REACH SUFFRAGETTE PEOPLE) P4 (MOD PEOPLE IN-HIGHER-POSITION) P5 (ISA P1 P6) P6 (PROMOTE-IN-A-WAY SUFFRAGETTE IDEA) P7 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE IDEA) P8 (MOD P6 MOST-IMPORTANT)	Added information

Table 41

*The Propositions in Judit's Second Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	First of all, some experiments used for studying adults cannot be used with children, because their cognitive skills have not developed fully.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (USE RESEARCHER EXPERIMENT) P3 (WITH P2 ADULT) P4 (ABLE-TO RESEARCHER P5) P5 (USE RESEARCHER P3) P6 (WITH P5 CHILD) P7 (NEGATE P6) P8 (BECAUSE P7 P11) P9 (DEVELOP COGNITIVE-SKILL) P10 (DEGREE-OF DEVELOP FULL) P11 (NEGATE P10) P12 (POSSESS CHILD COGNITIVE-SKILL)	Part of CP1
S2	Another difficulty is that children may have problems thinking about language systematically.	P1 (ISA P4 DIFFICULTY) P2 (MOD DIFFICULTY ANOTHER) P3 (HAVE CHILD PROBLEM) P4 (MOD P3 POSSIBLE) P5 (WITH PROBLEM P6) P6 (THINK-ABOUT CHILD LANGUAGE) P7 (MOD THINK SYSTEMATIC)	Part of CP2
S3	Furthermore, children may find it difficult to focus if they know they are being recorded or even just watched.	P1 (FOCUS CHILD) P2 (MOD P1 DIFFICULT) P3 (MOD P2 POSSIBLE) P4 (IF P3 P5) P5 (KNOW CHILD P8) P6 (RECORD \$ CHILD) P7 (WATCH \$ CHILD) P8 (OR P6 P7)	Part of CP3

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	Moreover, if the data is collected in comfortable atmosphere, it cannot provide information on how children may react to their surroundings.	P1 (IF P11 P3) P2 (COLLECT \$ DATA) P3 (IN P2 ATMOSPHERE) P4 (MOD ATMOSPHERE COMFORTABLE) P5 (ABLE-TO DATA P6) P6 (PROVIDE DATA INFORMATION) P7 (ABOUT INFORMATION P8) P8 (REACT-TO CHILD SURROUNDING) P9 (POSSESS CHILD SURROUNDING) P10 (MOD P8 POSSIBLE) P11 (NEGATE P5)	Added information
S5	Lastly, important information on children's linguistic abilities can easily be missed while collecting data.	P1 (MOD P2 LAST) P2 (MISS \$ INFORMATION) P3 (MOD INFORMATION IMPORTANT) P4 (ABOUT INFORMATION LINGUISTIC-ABILITY) P5 (POSSESS CHILD LINGUISTIC-ABILITY) P6 (MOD P2 POSSIBLE) P7 (MOD MISS EASY) P8 (WHILE P2 P9) P9 (COLLECT \$ DATA)	Irrelevant information

During the first data collection phase, based on her think-aloud, Adél managed to formulate the task-appropriate reading purpose, but her final product still resembles a global summary more than a guided summary as it includes the majority of the main ideas from the source text (cf. Table 42). The first three sentences aim to provide a general introduction to the topic, the added piece of information is probably the result of a wrongly applied generalisation rule (c.f., Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978), where the term ‘systematic judgement’ is overgeneralised into ‘accurate judgements’, and the rest of the irrelevant pieces of information coincide with the main ideas of the source text. Similarly to Judit’s case, these problems seem to be rather the results of production related issues than the results of reception issues. Adél’s think-aloud suggests that she managed to correctly understand what the task was: “I have to summarise from this text what the difficulties of collecting data from children are” (Adél, first phase think-aloud); nevertheless, she decided to write a general introduction and a general conclusion for her summary as she was told in high school that compositions must have a general introduction and conclusion. After writing the first version of her summary, she decided to add other main ideas from the text which were not strictly related to the original reading purpose she had set because she felt the need to cover all the main ideas in her composition. The fact that she labelled the data collection task as a composition and not as a summary shows that despite her high L2 language proficiency (i.e., C2 level), when facing an unfamiliar task, she decided to transfer metacognitive knowledge used in previously encountered reading and writing tasks. This tendency stands in opposition to the idea proposed by Grabe and Stoller (2013), which suggests that transfer is more likely to cause interference on low L2 language proficiency levels.

Adél’s second summary (cf. Table 43) is notably more focussed. This indicates that a task-appropriate reading purpose was used to create it, and the only pieces of irrelevant information included into it are the results of also including the ways the suffragettes

managed to financially support their movement, a tendency which could also be observed in Anita's, Johanna's, Boglárka's, and Beáta's summaries. This suggests that even though Adél did not manage to set a fully task-appropriate reading purpose in the second phase, she did manage to stay on task and execute her reading processes along the lines of the set reading purpose.

Table 42

*The Propositions in Adél's First Phase Guided Summary*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S1	For a long time, people have been interested in how kids acquire their first language and learn how to speak.	P1 (INTERESTED-IN PEOPLE P3) P2 (DURATION-OF P1 LONG-TIME) P3 (ACQUIRE KID LANGUAGE) P4 (MOD LANGUAGE FIRST) P5 (INTERESTED-IN PEOPLE P7) P6 (DURATION-OF P5 LONG-TIME) P7 (LEARN KID SPEAK)	Irrelevant information
S2	Researchers have tried many methods, but they faced some difficulties.	P1 (TRY RESEARCHER METHOD) P2 (NUMBER-OF METRHOD MANY) P3 (BUT P1 P4) P4 (FACE RESEARCHER DIFFICULTY) P5 (NUMBER-OF DIFFICULTY SOME)	Irrelevant information
S3	Firstly, working with children is not the same as dealing with adults.	P1 (MOD P2 FIRST) P2 (NEGATE P3) P3 (SAME-AS P4 P5) P4 (WORK-WITH \$ CHILD) P5 (DEAL-WITH \$ ADULT)	Irrelevant information
S4	Their ability to pay attention and remember certain things is not on the same level.	P1 (SAME-AS P3 P4) P2 (NEGATE P1) P3 (ABLE-TO CHILD PAY-ATTENTION) P4 (ABLE-TO ADULT PAY-ATTENTION) P5 (SAME-AS P7 P10) P6 (NEGATE P5) P7 (ABLE-TO CHILD P8) P8 (REMEMBER CHILD THING) P9 (MOD THING CERTAIN) P10 (ABLE-TO ADULT P11) P11 (REMEMBER ADULT THING) P12 (MOD THING CERTAIN)	Part of CP1



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S5	Children cannot make accurate judgements about a language and they switch off while being recorded.	P1 (ABLE-TO CHILD P3) P2 (NEGATE P1) P3 (MAKE CHILD JUDGEMENT) P4 (MOD JUDGEMENT ACCURATE) P5 (ABOUT P3 LANGUAGE) P6 (SWITCH-OFF CHILD) P7 (WHILE P8) P8 (RECORD \$ CHILD)	Added information and part of CP3
S6	There are two ways of research, but neither are perfect.	P1 (EXIST WAY) P2 (NUMBER-OF WAY TWO) P3 (POSSESS RESEARCH WAY) P4 (BUT P1 P6) P5 (MOD WAY PERFECT) P6 (NEGATE P5)	Irrelevant information
S7	Naturalistic sampling collects data from observing the everyday use of language	P1 (COLLECT SAMPLING DATA) P2 (MOD SAMPLING NATURALISTIC) P3 (FROM P1 P4) P4 (OBSERVE \$ LANGUAGE-USE) P5 (MOD LANGUAGE-USE EVERYDAY)	Irrelevant information
S8	But it is not easy to maintain a good sound quality and the equipment can be distracting.	P1 (MANTAIN \$ SOUND-QUALITY) P2 (MOD SOUND-QUALITY GOOD) P3 (MOD P1 EASY) P4 (NEGATE P3) P5 (ABLE-TO ECQUIPMENT P6) P6 (MOD ECQUIPMENT DISTRACTING)	CP4 and part of CP3
S9	Moreover, the samples do not contain everything.	P1 (CONTAIN SAMPLE EVERYTHING) P2 (NEGATE P1)	Irrelevant information
S10	The other way is by experimentation, but it might not apply to daily interaction.	P1 (REF WAY EXPERIMENTATION) P2 (MOD WAY OTHER) P3 (BUT P1 P) P4 (ABLE-TO \$ P5) P5 (USE \$ EXPERIMENTATION) P6 (APPLY-TO P5 INTERACTION) P7 (MOD INTERACTION DAILY) P8 (MOD P5 POSSIBLE)	Irrelevant information

Table 43

*The Propositions in Adél's Second Phase Guided Summary*

<b>Sentence number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Propositional analysis</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
S1	First of all, they introduced a slogan that many women could identify with and because of this more people started to join them.	P1 (MOD P1 FIRST) P2 (INTRODUCE SUFFRAGETTE SLOGAN) P3 (ISA SLOGAN P4) P4 (ABLE-TO WOMAN IDENTIFY-WITH) P5 (BECAUSE-OF P2 P6) P6 (START-TO PEOPLE P7) P7 (JOIN PEOPLE SUFFRAGETTE) P8 (NUMBER-OF PEOPLE MORE)	Part of CP1
S2	They also began to sell trinkets and other things with their unique color-coding.	P1 (BEGIN SUFFRAGETTE P2) P2 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE TRINKETS) P3 (BEGIN SUFFRAGETTE P4) P4 (SELL SUFFRAGETTE THINGS) P5 (MOD THINGS OTHER) P5 (POSSESS THINGS COLOR-CODING) P6 (MOD COLOR-CODING UNIQUE) P7 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE P6)	Part of CP2
S3	Adding to that, they made their own newspaper to inform members of the new events of the group.	P1 (MAKE SUFFRAGETTE NEWSPAPER) P2 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE NEWSPAPER) P3 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P4) P4 (INFORM-OF SUFFRAGETTE MEMBER EVENT) P5 (MOD ENVENT NEW) P6 (POSSESS GROUP EVENT)	Part of CP3

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis	Evaluation
S4	After that, large department stores also began to buy advertising space in the magazine, therefore reaching a lot of wealthy women, who would then contribute money to the group.	P1 (AFTER S3:P1 P2) P2 (BEGIN DEPARTMENT-STORE P3) P3 (BUY DEPARTMENT-STORE ADVERTISING-SPACE) P4 (MOD DEPARTMENT-STORE LARGE) P5 (IN P2 MAGAZINE) P6 (THEREFORE P2 P7) P7 (REACH DEPARTMENT-STORE WOMAN) P8 (MOD WOMAN WEALTHY) P9 (NUMBER-OF P8 A-LOT) P10 (CONTRIBUTE WOMAN MONEY) P11 (TO P10 GROUP)	Irrelevant information
S5	They would also organise numerous events to raise a large amount of money for their cause.	P1 (ORGANISE SUFFRAGETTE EVENT) P2 (NUMBER-OF EVENT NUMEROUS) P3 (IN-ORDER-TO P1 P4) P4 (RAISE SUFFRAGETTE MONEY) P5 (RATE-OF MONEY AMOUNT) P6 (DEGREE-OF AMOUNT LARGE) P7 (FOR P4 CAUSE) P8 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE CAUSE)	Part of CP4 and irrelevant information

## **5 The discussion of the outcomes**

The aim of the present section is to answer the research questions proposed in this study based on the outcomes presented in the previous section. As some of the research questions are referring to the same processes at different points in the data collection, Research Questions 1 and 2, 3 and 4, as well as 5 and 6 are discussed jointly in the same sub-sections below.

### **5.1 RQ1 and RQ2**

The first two research questions of the study were the following: (1) *What characterizes the reading processes of first-year students before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies?* and (2) *What characterizes the reading processes of first-year students after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies?* As reading strategies are defined as “abilities that are potentially open to conscious reflection and reflect a reader’s intention to address a problem or a specific goal while reading” (Grabe & Stoller, 2013, p. 10), the present dissertation study discusses the reading processes of the participants through examining their reading strategy use while solving the data collection task.

Considering their background knowledge in reading strategies at the beginning of the first data collection phase, all participants except for Ibolya, Lilla, and Judit claimed that they had not received any explicit instruction related to reading strategy use in high school or in any other formal education institution. Out of the three of them, Ibolya and Lilla said that they received some instruction on reading strategies in high school as part of their Hungarian Language and Communication course. They added that they also had to produce one-sentence oral global summaries of short texts in high school even though they did not receive any instruction regarding how summarisation should be done. The way these two

participants approached the data collection task during the first phase reflects the ways they were instructed by their high school language teachers: both participants first read the task instruction and then the text carefully once to get an idea about the topic. Then, they re-read the text again and underlined the main ideas in the text. Even though initially both participants set the incorrect reading purpose of summarising all the main ideas, when re-reading the task instruction, Ibolya eventually realised that she only had to focus on the ways the suffragettes managed to promote their movement. Nonetheless, she kept the irrelevant pieces of information in her final written product because she was instructed in high school to always create context for the information presented in a composition. This shows that even though Ibolya and Lilla both had the necessary English language proficiency level to appropriately execute the data collection task, when faced with the unfamiliar task, they transferred reading and task-solving strategies from their previous experience with L1 reading tasks. This transfer had a negative effect on their task-solving processes (cf. Grabe & Stoller, 2013).

Similarly to Ibolya and Lilla, Judit also claimed that she had received some instruction about reading strategies. In contrast with the previously discussed two participants, however, Judit received explicit reading strategy instruction not only related to L1 reading tasks in high school but also at a British language teaching institution when she prepared for her advanced level English language proficiency examination. At this institution, she had also received some limited instruction on creating short, one-sentence global summaries, and she also had to execute such tasks during her preparation for the language examination. The effect of the training was visible in her task-solving strategies because she appeared to approach the task in a more focussed and deliberate way even during the first data collection phase. Right from the beginning, she interpreted the task instruction correctly and managed to set the appropriate reading purpose for herself. Following that, she

consciously planned her task execution method by claiming that she wanted to read the text twice: once carefully and once again by only focussing on finding the relevant ideas. However, regardless of the correct reading purpose, Judit also decided to include irrelevant information into her summary to create context for the presented relevant information based on the instruction related to written compositions she received in high school. This suggests that even very high language proficiency (i.e., C2 level language proficiency) and explicit instruction about the different types of reading strategies are not enough on their own if students are not made aware of a variety of different reading goals. Without this awareness, the final written product is still an incorrect execution of the task. The need for familiarising students with several different reading goals was also proposed by Koda (2007), who claimed that in order for students to effectively improve their reading strategy use, they need to explore many different L2 reading goals. The results of the present study also seem to point towards the same direction.

Panni, Emma, Dia, and Tamás claimed that they did not receive any formal instruction in reading strategies or summarisation, but they had to do short oral or written one-sentence-long global summaries of texts in addition to solving reading tasks as a preparation for their Hungarian Language and Communication final school leaving examinations. When formulating their reading purpose, these participants claimed that they had to do a global summary of the main ideas presented in the source text in the data collection task, except for Panni, who claimed that she was required to write down her own opinion about the topic of the source text. The approach of these participants shows that when encountering the unfamiliar task type, they automatically transferred reading purposes and reading strategies from previously encountered L1 reading contexts, and they did not manage to flexibly adapt these purposes and strategies to the data collection task. This shows

that even by reading the task instruction multiple times, these participants did not manage to set the task-appropriate reading purpose.

Ádám, Johanna, Boglárka, Pálma, Beáta, and Adél had no previous experience with summarisation tasks, and they claimed that they did not receive any formal explicit instruction in summarisation or reading strategy use during their high school studies. All of these participants except for Adél claimed during the first phase data collection that their task was to summarise all the main ideas from the source text of the data collection task. Even though Adél initially managed to define the reading purpose correctly, during the task-solving process she started to also include irrelevant pieces of information because she claimed that she was taught in high school to always provide a context for her ideas in a writing task. The aforementioned approaches suggest that at the beginning of the semester, during the first data collection phase, the participants had been heavily influenced by the task-solving strategies acquired in high school, and they were applying these even when these strategies did not fit the task requirements.

During the second data collection phase, the contrast among the different participants' task-solving strategies blurred, and they all seemed to have improved the appropriateness of their strategy use regardless of their previous educational background or their first phase performance. The results suggest that even though there were still several participants who did not manage to set a fully task-appropriate reading purpose, all the participants managed to set their reading purpose more appropriately during the second data collection phase. Furthermore, the reading processes of the participants became faster, more efficient, and more focussed based on their reading purpose, as far as the data collection task is concerned.

In conclusion, it can be claimed that the ways the participants used reading strategies had changed during the course of the semester when considering the execution of the data

collection task. In addition, it must be emphasised that the majority of the difficulties they encountered during the first data collection phase were not caused by the participants' lack of familiarity with reading strategies. Even those participants who claimed that they did not receive any instruction regarding the use of reading strategies at any point during their studies had a consciously applied method of solving reading tasks. During the first and the second data collection phase, the majority of the participants applied the same reading strategies, but in the second data collection phase they applied them in a more efficient way and more appropriately tailored to the correct reading purpose.

The difficulties of setting a task appropriate reading purpose and correctly tailoring the reading strategy use to that purpose during the first data collection phase were probably caused by the fact that the participants were trained in high school to execute only one type of reading task, and they were not thought to adapt their task-solving strategies to different reading situations and reading purposes. During the first data collection phase, some participants even compared the data collection task to those reading exercises they encountered during their high school studies when preparing for the final school leaving examinations, even though, by reading the task instruction carefully, it becomes clear that the task required the participants to only focus on certain pieces of information in the text, which often did not coincide with the main ideas.

## **5.2 RQ3 & RQ4**

Regarding Research Question 3 (i.e., *What propositions are included in the final guided summaries of first-year students before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies?*) and Research Question 4 (i.e., *What propositions are included in the final guided summaries of first-year students after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies?*), it can be claimed that during the first data collection phase none of the participants managed to produce a task-appropriate guided summary as their



final written product. However, based on the extent to which they managed to set the correct reading purpose and the degree to which they managed to recognize and include task-relevant content into their summaries during the first data collection phase, the participants can be organised into two groups. The first group contains Ibolya, Anita, Dia, Judit and Adél because they all managed to set a task-appropriate reading purpose at some point of their task-solving process. Ibolya and Dia initially defined their reading purpose as having to include all the main ideas of the source text into their summaries, but upon further inspection of the task instruction, they both managed to set the task-appropriate reading purpose. Anita, Judit and Adél managed to set the correct reading purpose right at the beginning of the data collection. Nevertheless, the final summaries of all five of these participants contain several pieces of irrelevant and added information. Based on their think-alouds, the reason behind including the task-irrelevant pieces of information was the negative effect of transferring reading and task-solving processes from the high school context (cf. Grabe & Stoller, 2013). They all mentioned in their think-alouds that they included the task-irrelevant pieces of information in order to create a general introduction, a general conclusion, and context for the task-relevant pieces of information as according to the instruction they received in high school, every written composition should possess these features. For this reason, in their cases, the inclusion of the added and irrelevant pieces of information might be considered as a problem related to the production component of the task rather than a problem related to text processing. For example, in the case of Dia, it is obvious from the think-aloud that she was aware of the irrelevance of certain pieces of information, yet she decided to include them into the summary in order to increase its length. Judit's think-aloud also suggests that she was aware of the fact that some of the information she included into her summary was irrelevant, and she only decided to include them to create a context for the relevant pieces of information.

The second group contains Panni, Emma, Ádám, Lilla, Johanna, Boglárka, Pálma, Tamás, and Beáta, who all set the summarisation of all the main ideas of the text as their reading purpose during the first data collection phase. In contrast with the previously discussed participants, Panni, Emma, Ádám, Lilla, Johanna, Boglárka, Pálma, Tamás, and Beáta included irrelevant and added pieces of information into their summaries because of text processing problems. By setting the wrong reading purpose for their reading process, they did not manage to extract the task-appropriate propositions from the text. Setting the wrong reading purpose can have two potential explanations: first, it might be the result of the negative effects of transferring reading purposes from previously encountered L1 reading contexts. This can be especially true in the cases of Panni, Emma, Lilla, and Tamás, who said in their think-alouds that they had to give short oral global summaries of texts in the Hungarian Language and Communication classes during their high school studies. As during the first phase, most of them explicitly likened the data collection task to reading tasks they had to execute during high school, it is likely that when they saw the word ‘summarise’ in the task instruction, they automatically transferred the reading purpose they used to set when executing summarisation tasks in high school. Research suggests that such transfer of L1 reading purposes is common, and that some amount of L1 transfer is always involved in L2 reading (Koda, 2007), and the negative effects of such transfers can be even more prominent in the cases of participants with lower language proficiency level (Grabe & Stoller, 2013).

As Ádám, Johanna, Boglárka, Pálma, and Beáta said in their think-alouds that they did not have to solve any summarisation tasks during their high school studies, another explanation for setting the wrong reading purpose despite reading the task instructions multiple times can be shallow processing. Research (e.g., Ackerman & Goldsmith, 2011; Dyson & Haselgrove, 2000; Schugar, Schugar & Penny, 2011) suggests that the

technological development of today's world has had a notable impact on people's reading habits, and that the gradual transfer of reading material from a paper-based platform to an on-screen platform (Baron, 2017) has resulted in a change in reading strategy use. According to Schugar, Schugar and Penny (2011), reading on a digital platform facilitates the use of scanning more readily than the use of careful reading, which results in a shallower understanding of a text. These changes seem to be especially prevalent in the case of the members of generation Z (Strauss & Howe, 1997), who are more exposed to reading on a digital platform from a young age than the members of older generations. Despite the fact that the participants of the present study had to solve the data collection task in a paper-based format, as members of generation Z, it can be assumed that they are exposed to reading on a digital platform on a daily basis. It can be hypothesised that this exposure could have had an effect on the reading habits of the participants, and for this reason their processing of written material became shallower and more focused on finding keywords only. Such an attitude could have led to a shallow processing of the task instruction, thus resulting in setting an incorrect reading purpose.

The results of the present study show that in the second phase many of the participants managed to include the task-relevant propositional content into their guided summaries more appropriately than during the first phase. Panni, Ádám, Dia, Johanna, Boglárka, Beáta, and Judit all reproduced notably more task-relevant propositions in their summaries during the second data collection phase. It is worth mentioning that all of these participants except for Judit worked with the *Investigating Children's Language* text during the first data collection phase and the *Votes for Women* text in the second data collection phase. It is possible that their improvement in the reproduction of propositional content was also influenced by the input text, and it can be assumed that the success of the participants was at least partly caused by their more extensive background knowledge about the

suffragette movements. Despite the fact that the readability indices suggested that the *Investigating Children's Language* text was less difficult than the *Votes for Women* one, it might be possible that the participants' lack of background knowledge on and experience with research negatively influenced their capabilities to appropriately comprehend the source text. This idea also seems to be supported by the results of Ibolya and Lilla, who managed to reproduce notably more task-relevant propositions in the first data collection phase, when they were working with the *Votes for Women* text, compared to the second data collection phase, when they were working with the *Investigating Children's Language* text.

There were also participants who could serve as counter-examples to the previously presented phenomenon. For instance, Emma, Pálma, and Tamás, who worked with the *Votes for Women* text during the first phase and the *Investigating Children's Language* text in the second phase, managed to reproduce almost the same amount of task-relevant propositional content during both phases. This may suggest that the improvement of their reading comprehension and summarisation skills could probably counteract the possible comprehension difficulties emerging from the lack of content related background knowledge. Similarly, Adél and Anita reproduced about the same amount of task-relevant propositional content during both phases, even though they worked with the *Investigating Children's Language* text during the first phase and the *Votes for Women* text in the second phase. Based on their think-aloud protocols, it can be assumed that they did not have more content related background knowledge in either of the topics than the other participants, so other factors must have been influencing their results. For instance, it can be assumed that just as the readability indices suggested, Adél and Anita perceived the *Investigating Children's Language* text easier to understand despite its topic.

Regarding the amount of irrelevant and added information included into the summaries, a positive change can be observed in the case of most participants. However, it

must be emphasised that participants still included added and irrelevant pieces of information into their summaries produced in the second data collection phase. In these cases, the presence of these added pieces of information can be explained by the participants' difficulties of distinguishing between the information actually presented in the text, and their own assumptions based on such information. In some of the cases (e.g., Tamás' second phase summary and Adél's first phase summary), the added information can be traced back to a wrongly applied generalisation rule (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978). As the generalisation rule entails the utilisation of a higher-level cognitive processing, its correct application requires an extensive amount of practice (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978). The fact that most participants managed to include less added information into their summaries during the second data collection phase suggests that with further practice, the participants' ability to avoid the inclusion of added information into their summaries eventually improves.

The presence of the irrelevant pieces of information in the summaries produced during the second data collection phase might have two possible explanations: on the one hand, it can be caused by the lack of background knowledge in the topic of the source text, which could lead to the setting of an incorrect reading purpose. For instance, Adél considered the financial aspect of supporting the movement as part of the promotion techniques of the suffragettes, which points to her lack of familiarity with the concept of 'promotion'. Another example illustrating the wrong reading purpose being set because of lack of background knowledge is Ibolya's second summary, which contains information not only about the difficulties of collecting data from children, but also about the difficulties of data analysis. This was probably the result of Ibolya's lack of background knowledge in conducting research. According to Koda (2007), being able to link the information presented in the text to their own background knowledge can greatly help L2 readers in setting the appropriate reading goal and choosing the appropriate reading strategies for L2 reading task

execution. Another possible explanation for the inclusion of irrelevant pieces of information can be the participants' inability to correctly apply the deletion rule while evaluating the relevance of certain pieces of information (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978). It can be assumed that the participants sometimes could not judge effectively whether a piece of information was relevant to the reading purpose or not. This could also explain why no participants managed to reproduce more than the 40% of the task-relevant propositions in either of the data collection phases. The fact that during the second data collection phase the participants still had difficulties with judging the relevance of source text information suggests that the development and improvement of the ability to make a distinction between relevant and irrelevant information should be more heavily emphasised during their education.

### **5.3 RQ5 & RQ6**

The aim of Research Question 5 (i.e., *Does the language proficiency level of the participants influence the efficiency of their reading processes in terms of identifying and including content points in their guided summaries before receiving explicit training in academic reading strategies? If yes, how?*) and Research Question 6 (i.e., *Does the language proficiency level of the participants influence the efficiency of their reading processes in terms of identifying and including content points in their guided summaries after having received explicit training in academic reading strategies? If yes, how?*) was to investigate the effect of the participants' initial language proficiency level on the efficiency of their reading processes. Based on the results of the present dissertation study, the initial language proficiency levels of the participants did not seem to have a distinctive effect on their efficiency of including task-relevant propositions into their summaries neither in the first, nor in the second data collection phase. During the first data collection phase, Tamás, one of the C1 language proficiency level participants, managed to reproduce most of the task-relevant propositional content out of the participants who were working with the *Votes for*

Women text, but Emma, the B1 level participant, reproduced almost as much as him. Regarding those who worked with the *Investigating Children's Language* text in the first phase, Adél, the C2 level participant, reproduced the most task-relevant propositional content, but Anita, a B2 level participant, reproduced almost exactly the same amount. In the case of the second data collection phase, the results of the participants seemed to be even less influenced by their language proficiency levels because there are examples of both positive and negative changes in the amount of task-relevant pieces of information included into the summaries for every proficiency level (cf. Table 44).

Table 44

*Summary of the Propositional Analysis and the Language Proficiency Levels of the Participants*

Name	Number of propositions found in the first phase (/53)	Percentage of propositions found in the first phase (/100)	Number of propositions found in the second phase (/53)	Percentage of propositions found in the second phase (/100)	Language proficiency level
<i>Panni</i>	1	1.89	16	30.18	A2
<i>Emma</i>	10	18.87	11	20.75	B1
<i>Ibolya</i>	8	15.09	2	3.77	B2
<i>Ádám</i>	4	7.55	14	26.42	B2
<i>Anita</i>	12	22.64	10	18.87	B2
<i>Dia</i>	7	13.21	14	26.42	B2
<i>Lilla</i>	5	9.43	2	3.77	B2
<i>Johanna</i>	0	0	16	30.19	B2
<i>Boglárka</i>	10	18.87	13	24.53	C1
<i>Pálma</i>	12	22.64	10	18.87	C1
<i>Tamás</i>	14	26.42	14	26.42	C1
<i>Beáta</i>	0	0	12	22.64	C1
<i>Judit</i>	8	15.09	19	35.85	C2
<i>Adél</i>	13	24.53	10	18.87	C2

Regarding the way participants managed to correctly identify the task-appropriate reading purpose, language proficiency did not seem to have a notable influence neither in the first data collection phase nor in the second data collection phase. Even though in the first data collection phase there were five participants, namely Ibolya (B2), Anita (B2), Dia

(B2), Judit (C2), and Adél (C2) who managed to identify the correct reading purpose, they did not manage to create a task-appropriate summary as a final product. Moreover, the rest of the participants, regardless of their language proficiency levels, all identified an incorrect reading purpose for their task solving processes. This indicates that the effects of negative transfer of reading goals and strategies from previously encountered reading tasks (Grabe & Stoller, 2013) could be observed in the cases of all participants, and the success of the transfer did not seem to be influenced by the language proficiency level of the participants. This finding is somewhat in opposition with the suggestions that transfer is more likely to cause interferences on lower language proficiency levels than on higher language proficiency levels (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). In the present sample, it can be argued that Ibolya, Anita, Dia, Judit, and Adél executed the reading comprehension part of the data collection task with the right reading purpose in mind, and they only added the irrelevant pieces of information because of the writing related instructions they received during their high school studies, thus the addition of the irrelevant information is a production related problem rather than a reception related one. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that their moderate to high language proficiency levels were not enough to help them properly solve an unfamiliar task type, even in the cases of Judit and Adél, who had C2 level English language proficiency.

In connection with setting the appropriate reading purpose, language proficiency did not seem to play a distinctive role during the second data collection phase either. In general, all the participants managed to create more task-appropriate final written products than in the first data collection phase. Nevertheless, most participants did not work with a fully task-appropriate reading purpose in mind. Ibolya, Pálma, Tamás, and Judit although managed to identify that their summaries had to focus on the difficulties of collecting data from children, they also included information related to other aspects of the text, such as the difficulties



related to data analysis or the characteristics of different research paradigms. Similarly, Anita, Johanna, Boglárka, Beáta, and Adél correctly identified that the summary should focus on the ways the suffragettes managed to promote their movement; however, they also included information about the suffragettes' money making opportunities into their final written product. This shows that despite their different language proficiency levels, several participants still struggled with setting the task-appropriate reading purpose during the second data collection phase.

In conclusion, based on the results of the present study, it can be argued that regardless of their language proficiency levels, first year university students can greatly benefit from explicit instruction in reading strategies because when they meet unfamiliar tasks, high language proficiency alone does not seem to be able to compensate for the lack of familiarity with the task type. The results of the present study suggest that the negative effects of transferring reading goals and reading strategies from previous L1 experience can be counteracted by familiarising students with many different reading goals and task types in order for them to develop more appropriate reading strategies for L2 reading task execution. This idea is also in line with the suggestions of Koda (2007).

## 6 Conclusions

Reading comprehension is a highly intricate process which necessitates the combined interaction of several complex cognitive processes. Being able to extract meaning from a text requires a deep engagement with the reading material, and it involves the activation of background knowledge and inferencing skills (Grabe, 2009).

Because having appropriate reading skills is indispensable in the academic context, gaining a deeper insight into the reading processes of young adults and devising appropriate reading strategy training methods is imminent. In the Hungarian context, reassessing the way reading comprehension is taught and practiced is especially important because Hungarian students appear to continuously underperform on the reading component of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) test compared to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) average (OECD, 2015). The findings of a previously conducted study with first-year English major BA students (Szűcs, 2017) also support the assumption that Hungarian students struggle with reading comprehension, even though reading strategies are part of the high school curriculum (Oktatási Hivatal, 2017). As students in higher education are constantly exposed to tasks requiring good reading comprehension skills, this problem needs to be addressed.

As the topic of the reading processes of first-year Hungarian university and college students is not a widely researched topic, the aim of the present study was to explore how students process information when they have to read for academic purposes. For this reason, the reading processes and reading skill development of 14 first-year English major BA students was examined. The students were all Hungarian native speakers studying at the same Hungarian university, and they all participated in the same academic skills course during the autumn semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. The participants' language

proficiency levels ranged from A2 to C2 level, and they all had been learning English for at least four years.

In order to be able to investigate the proposed problem, the study adopted an exploratory stance, and it utilized qualitative data collection instruments. The data collection was carried out in three phases: (1) in the preparatory phase, which took place in the summer of 2017, the data collection instruments were developed and piloted; (2) in the first data collection phase, the participants were asked to execute a guided summarisation task while performing a think-aloud on their task solving processes, and when they finished, they were asked about their educational background; (3) in the second data collection phase, the participants were asked to solve another guided summary task while performing a think-aloud on their task solving processes, and this was followed by a semi-structured interview about the participants' reflection on the academic skills course and on their reading skill development. The preparatory first data collection phase took place during the first weeks of the autumn semester of the 2017-2018 academic year, and the second data collection phase took place at the end of the same semester. The data analysis focused on the content analysis of the think-aloud procedures and semi-structured interviews and on the propositional analysis of the summaries produced by the participants during the think-aloud procedures.

The results of the analysis suggest that during the first phase of the data collection the majority of the participants approached the data collection task with inappropriate reading purposes in mind, which was probably the result of transferring L1 reading goals and reading strategies they successfully used during their high school studies. Setting the wrong reading purpose misguided the reading process, and the participants did not manage to create a task-appropriate summary as their final written product. Even in the cases of those participants who initially managed to set the correct reading purpose, transferring the L1

reading-into-writing task solving strategies they had learnt during high school had a negative impact on their task solving processes. During the second data collection phase, the participants were able to set their reading purposes more appropriately, and they could utilize their task solving strategies and reading strategies in a more flexible, adaptable, and efficient way.

Regarding the amount of relevant propositional content included into participants' guided summaries, it can be concluded that the majority of the participants managed to select the relevant pieces of information more appropriately during the second phase than in the first phase. This was probably caused by their ability to set more task-appropriate reading purposes. The presence of the relevant pieces of information in the guided summaries written in the second phase probably points towards a more complex underlying problem, namely, that the participants need further practice in order to be able to appropriately judge the relevance of information presented in a text. Regarding the effect of the initial language proficiency levels on the ability to include task-relevant pieces of information into a text, there seems to be no observable definitive influence or pattern.

## **7 Pedagogical implications**

As it has already been discussed in the introduction, Hungarian students enrolled in secondary and tertiary education in Hungary tend to face difficulties in connection with reading comprehension (OECD, 2015; Szűcs, 2017). Given that good reading comprehension skills are indispensable in the domain of higher education, the conscious development of reading comprehension skills should be among the primary aims of language education both in secondary and tertiary education institutions.

Several findings of the study support the importance of instruction in the development of reading comprehension skills. In the present study, providing the participants explicit training in the use of reading strategies had a positive effect on the

development of their reading comprehension skills. This result is in line with the findings of other researchers such as Macaro and Erler (2008), Olson (2003), Olson and Land (2007) and Pressley et al. (2006) among others. Therefore, educators working in secondary and tertiary education institutions should consider providing explicit reading strategy instruction to their students in order to better prepare them for their studies and future careers. As this can only be executed with the help of secondary and tertiary education institutions, the awareness of these institutions should also be raised about the benefits of such instruction.

Furthermore, the findings also suggest that teaching summarisation skills to students also has a beneficial effect on their reading abilities because it teaches students to read more efficiently, and it teaches them to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant pieces of information, thus encouraging the development of their critical thinking skills. These findings are in line with the results of the study conducted by Trabasso and Bouchard (2002). In addition, the habit of formulating a guiding question at the beginning of a guided summary to establish the reading purpose can also result in more efficient text comprehension, as it has also been found by Rosenshine, Meister and Chapman (1996).

Additionally, the semi-structured interviews conducted with the participants at the end of the second data collection phase suggest that the use of the think-aloud procedure can be taken into consideration as a useful method in helping students become more aware of their reading processes. In the present study, conscious awareness of their reading strategies and the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of those strategies helped the participants streamline their reading comprehension strategy use. As the use of reading strategies is a higher-level cognitive process (Grabe & Stoller, 2013), becoming conscious about the currently used reading strategies can be a useful first step in developing students' reading comprehension skills.

The previously mentioned suggestions only highlight the fact that reading comprehension skills can be improved through several different methods. The main pedagogical implication of the present dissertation study stems from the observation of the difficulties encountered by students during the data collection processes. During the first phase of the data collection, the majority of comprehension problems the participants faced were caused by their lack of critical thinking and critical reading skills. A critical mind-set, which is necessary for being able to judge the relevance of a piece of information, was almost completely absent from the reading process of the majority of the participants. Given that these participants all successfully accomplished their high school studies, their lack of critical thinking and critical reading abilities seems to indicate that acquiring a critical mind-set is not heavily emphasised during secondary education.

The ability to think and read critically is crucial in the tertiary education context because students have to become gradually more and more independent in their learning process as their studies progress. Evaluating the relevance and the truth value of information presented in research papers and other academic sources is essential for successfully accomplishing the academic requirements. Therefore, developing and improving the critical thinking and critical reading skills of college and university students at the beginning of their studies should be in focus of all tertiary education institutions. Regarding the improvement of critical reading, guided summarisation tasks could be a useful tool. However, the findings of the present study suggest that the first-year students arriving from a Hungarian secondary education background are heavily trained in executing specific types of reading tasks required at the final school leaving examination. The result of this targeted training seems to be that when encountering different task instruction, they still apply the same task execution blueprint they were trained into at high school, and they disregard the content of the task instruction. With such a mind-set, only using one single type of task (i.e., guided

summarisation task) to broaden the students' perspectives and teach them critical thinking and critical reading skill entails the danger of achieving the unwanted result of the students falling into another task execution blueprint, which is not more consciously utilized than the one they learnt in high school. Thus, using multiple task types (e.g., multiple choice, fill-in the gap, short answer, or multiple matching exercises), encouraging the development of critical thinking and critical reading skills might be a more productive approach to the issue.

Not acquiring a satisfactory critical mind-set is also highly problematic because there are countless everyday life situations which require critical thinking and critical reading skills (e.g., reading legally binding documents, evaluating the relevance and truth value of information encountered on the Internet, evaluating the relevance and truth value of daily news, forming informed opinions about different areas of life, and work related tasks). Such situations are not specific for certain careers or contexts; they are encountered by everybody on a daily basis. Considering the fact that several students decide not to continue their studies in tertiary education, many people have to face the aforementioned everyday life situations with the reading skills acquired during secondary education. For this reason, starting to teach critical reading and critical thinking skills already in secondary education is even more important for those who do not continue their studies in a tertiary education institution because possessing the appropriate critical mind-set can make the difference between being able to make informed and well-grounded decisions in life or becoming the victim of the unforeseen consequences of not properly deliberated actions.

In conclusion, having effective critical reading comprehension skills is fundamental for a successful private and professional life. Therefore, secondary and tertiary education institutions and teachers should take upon themselves the responsibility of including the explicit instruction and development of reading comprehension skills. Furthermore, students

in both secondary and tertiary education should be provided with ample opportunities to improve their understanding and use of reading strategies and their critical reading skills.



## **8 The limitations of the dissertation study and implications for further research**

As any research endeavour, the present dissertation study also has its limitations. Firstly, the present study only investigates the reading processes of the participants with the help of one single task type. For this reason, all the results can only be connected to this type of task, and no predictions can be proposed regarding the reading processes of participants when encountering a different academic task type. Investigating the participants' reading processes with several different reading task types (e.g., fill-in the gap, multiple-choice, or multiple matching tasks) could be a noteworthy future research endeavour providing valuable insights into the process.

Secondly, another limitation related to the data collection instruments and methods might be the drawbacks of the think-aloud method. As it has also been mentioned in Bowles (2010), the think-aloud method is a cognitively complex and challenging procedure, and it might have had some degree of influence on the task-solving processes of the participants. In order to counteract the possible negative effects, in the present study the participants received training in the use of the think-aloud method, and during their task solving processes they were not disturbed and reminded to verbalize their thoughts unless they stayed silent for at least five minutes. The possible data loss resulting from these silent periods was counteracted by asking retrospective questions about these silent periods at the end of the think-aloud procedure. Nevertheless, the possible effects of the method itself on the task solving processes of the participants cannot be completely excluded.

Thirdly, another limitation of the present study is related to assessing the language proficiency levels of the participants, the placement test used at the beginning of the first data collection phase did not have all the components of a regular language proficiency test, but it had to be used because of feasibility reasons: administering a full language proficiency test could not be fitted into the time frame of the academic skills course, and the placement

test used was the only such instrument available for the researcher with all its components at the time of the data collection. Furthermore, carrying out a second assessment of the participants' language proficiency levels towards the end of the semester may have also been informative, but at the time of the data collection no second placement test or language proficiency test was available for the researcher, and it is not very likely that during the approximately 10-week long period between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> data collection phases the proficiency of the participants underwent significant changes.

In addition, another possible limitation connected to the data collection is that the data was collected only on two occasions. This design had to be chosen for feasibility reasons because data collection with the think-aloud method is time consuming and more than two data collection sessions would have required the sacrifice of too much free time on the part of the participants. Nevertheless, investigating the reading comprehension processes of the same population by collecting data at more data collection points (e.g., at the end of each week of the semester), and possibly for a longer period of time (e.g., over the course of an academic year) would produce more insightful results.

Furthermore, the subjective nature of the data analysis carried out with the method of propositional analysis also has to be considered. It has to be acknowledged that propositional analysis involves several decisions and interpretations depending on the subjective judgement of the researcher. These possible negative influences were attempted to be counteracted by the triangulation of the researcher: a co-coder was asked to analyse 50% of both the first and the second phase data in addition to the researcher herself, and the propositionalised source texts and guided summaries were also sent to the supervisor of this dissertation for expert feedback.

Finally, the present dissertation study focussed on a small sample, and its results could be the basis for some future research projects conducted on larger sample sizes. For

instance, investigating the initial reading strategy use of university students at the beginning of their studies could provide generalizable results regarding the quality and quantity of reading strategy instruction students might receive during their high school studies. In addition, large scale studies could also provide generalizable results related to the effect of language proficiency on the ability to extract task-relevant information from a source text, and it could shed light on patterns which did not emerge in the case of a small scale sample.

## References

- Ackerman, R., & Goldsmith, M. (2011). Metacognitive regulation of text learning: On screen versus on paper. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 17(1), 18–32.
- Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Alderson, J. C. (2000) *Assessing reading*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Alderson, J. C., & Urquhart, A. H. (1985). The effect of students' academic discipline on their performance on ESP reading tests. *Language Testing*, 2, 192–204.
- Alexander, P., & Jetton, T. L. (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental perspective. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson & R. Barr (Eds), *Handbook of reading research, Vol. III* (pp. 285–310). New York, NY: Longman.
- Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 460–472.
- Anderson, R. C. (1977). The notion of schemata and the educational enterprise: General discussion of the conference. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Barnett, M. (1988). Teaching through context: How real and perceived strategy use affect L2 comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(2), 150–162.
- Baron, N. S. (2017). Reading in a digital age. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 99(2), 15–20.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Bernhardt, E. (1991). *Reading development in a second language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bovair, S., & Kieras, D. (1985). A guide to propositional analysis for research on technical prose. In B. K. Britton & J. B. Black (Eds.), *Understanding expository text* (pp. 315–364). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bowles, M. (2010). *The think-aloud controversy in second language research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Cambourne, B. (1979). How important is theory to the reading teacher? *Australian Journal of Reading*, 2, 78–90.
- Carrel, P. L., & Wise, T. E. (1998). The relationship between prior knowledge and topic interest in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 285–309.
- Carrell, P. L., Pharis, B., & Liberto, J. (1989) Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 647–78.
- Carver, R. (1990). *Reading rate: A review of research and theory*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Carver, R. (1992). Reading rate: Theory, research, and practical implications. *Journal of Reading*, 36, 84–95.
- Carver, R. (2000). *The causes of high and low reading achievement*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Casanave, C. D. (1988). Comprehension monitoring in ESL reading. A neglected essential. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 283–302.
- Clarke, M. A. (1979). Reading in Spanish and English: Evidence from Adult ESL Students. *Language Learning*, 29, 121–150.

- Clarke, M. A. (1988). The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading: Or when language competence interferes with reading performance. In P. L. Carrel, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 114–124). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Coady, J. (1979). A psycholinguistic model of the ESL reader. In R. Mackay, B. Barkman, & R. R. Jordan (Eds.), *Reading in a second language*, (pp. 5–12). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Connor, U., Nagelhout, E., & Rozycki, W. V. (Eds.). (2008). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 402–423.
- Cook, V. (2009). Developing links between second language acquisition and foreign language teaching. In K. Knapp, B. Seidlhofer, & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning* (pp. 139–61). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, A. (2005). Vocabulary growth through independent reading and reading aloud to children. In E. Hiebert & M. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary* (pp. 45–68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Duff, P. A., & Anderson, T. (2015). Case study research. In J. D. Brown & C. Coombe (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Language Research* (pp. 112–118). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dyson, M.C., & Haselgrove, M. (2000). The effects of reading speed and reading patterns on the understanding of text read from screen. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 23(2), 210–223.
- Ellis, N. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 305–352.
- Fairbanks, C., Cooper, J., Masterson, L., & Webb, S. (2009). Culturally relevant pedagogy and reading comprehension. In S. Israel & G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 587–606). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Felvi (2019). Elmúlt évek statisztikái [Past year statistics]. Retrieved October 13, 2019, from [https://www.felvi.hu/felveteli/ponthatarok\\_statisztikak/elmult\\_evek/!ElmultEvek/index.php/elmult\\_evek\\_statisztikai/korosztalyok](https://www.felvi.hu/felveteli/ponthatarok_statisztikak/elmult_evek/!ElmultEvek/index.php/elmult_evek_statisztikai/korosztalyok)
- Fender, M. (2001). A review of L1 and L2/ESL word integration skills and the nature of L2/ESL word integration development involved in lower-level text processing. *Language Learning*, 51, 319–396.
- Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: Its structure and use* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Thompson & Heinle.
- Flavell, J. H. (1971). First discussant's comments: What is memory development the development of? *Human Development*, 14, 272–278.
- Floyd, P., & Carrell, P. (1987). Effects on ESL reading and teaching cultural content schemata. *Language Learning*, 37, 89–108.

- Gardner, D. (2004). Vocabulary input through extensive reading: A comparison of words found in children's narratives and expository reading material. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 1–37.
- Gernsbacher, M. A. (1997). Two decades of structure building. *Discourse Processes*, 25, 265–304.
- Goldman, S., Varma, S., & Coté, N. (1996). Extending capacity-constrained construction integration: Toward “smarter” and flexible models of text construction. In B. Britton & A. Graesser (Eds.), *Models of understanding text* (pp. 73–113). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of Reading Specialist*, 6, 126–135.
- Goodman, K. (1988). The reading process. In P. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 11–21). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gough, P. B. (1972). One second of reading. In J. F. Kavanagh & I. G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by ear and by eye*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Grabe, W. (2000). Reading research and its implications for reading assessment. In A. Kunnan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation in language assessment* (pp. 226–262). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2013). *Teaching and researching reading* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Gray, W. S. (1960). The major aspects of reading. In H. Robinson (ed.), *Sequential development of reading abilities* (pp. 8–24). Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.



- Guthrie, J., & Taboada, A. (2004). Fostering the cognitive strategies of reading comprehension. In J. Guthrie, A., Wigfield, & K. Perencevich (Eds.), *Motivating reading comprehension: concept-oriented reading instruction* (pp. 87–112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hampton, J. (1997). Psychological representation of concepts. In M. Conway (Ed.), *Cognitive models of memory* (pp. 81–110). Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Han, F. (2012). *Transfer or threshold: The relationship between L1 and FL comprehension monitoring*. Paper presented at the Joint Australian Association for Research in Education and Asia-Pacific Educational Research Association Conference. Retrieved January 02, 2017 from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544524>
- Hanley, J. R., Tzeng, O., & Huang, H. S. (1999). Learning to read Chinese. In M. Harris & G. Hatano (Eds.), *Learning to read and write: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 173–195). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoover W., & Tunmer W. E. (1993). The components of reading. In G. B. Thompson, W. E. Tunmer & T. Nicholson (Eds.), *Reading acquisition processes* (pp. 1–19). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching second language reading*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- IELTS (n.d.). Test Format. Retrieved September 16, 2019, from <https://www.ielts.org/about-thetest/test-format>
- IELTS Mentor (2017a). IELTS Academic reading sample 98 – Helium’s future up in the air. Retrieved May 02, 2017, from <https://www.ielts-mentor.com/reading-sample/academic-reading/767-ielts-academic-reading-sample-98-helium-s-future-up-in-the-air>

- IELTS Mentor (2017b). IELTS Academic reading sample 99 – Investigating children’s language. Retrieved June 13, 2017, from <https://www.ielts-mentor.com/reading-sample/academic-reading/768-ielts-academic-reading-sample-99-investigating-children-s-language>
- IELTS Mentor (2017c). IELTS Academic reading sample 131 – Votes for women. Retrieved June 13, 2017, from <https://www.ielts-mentor.com/reading-sample/academic-reading/801-ielts-academic-reading-sample-131-votes-for-women>
- Jimenez, R. T., Garcia, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1996). The reading strategies of bilingual Latina/o students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(1), 90–112.
- Johns, A. M. (1988). Reading for summarizing: An approach to text orientation and processing. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 4, 79–90.
- Johnson, P. (1981). Effects on reading comprehension of language complexity and cultural background of a text. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 169–181.
- Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (1781). *Critique of pure reason*. London, UK: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Kaplan, R. B. (2005). Contrastive rhetoric. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 375–391). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kaufman, G., & Flanagan, M. (2016). *High-low split: Divergent cognitive construal levels triggered by digital and nondigital platforms*. Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. New York, NY: ACM, pp. 2773–2777.
- Kern, R. (1994). The role of mental translation in L2 reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 441–461.

- Khalifa, H., & Weir, C. J. (2009). *Examining reading: Research and practice in assessing second language reading*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. *Psychological Review*, 95, 163–182.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A framework for cognition*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85, 363–394.
- Kintsch, W., & Yarbrough, J. C. (1982). Role of rhetorical structure in text comprehension. *Educational Psychology*, 74(6), 363–394.
- Kintsch, W., Patel, V., & Ericksson, K. A. (1999). The role of long-term working memory in text comprehension. *Psychologia*, 42, 186–198.
- Koda, K. (2007). Reading and language learning: Crosslinguistic constraints on second language reading development. *Language Learning Supplement*, 57, 1–44.
- Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Koda, K. (2008). Impacts of prior literacy experience on second language learning to read. In K. Koda & A. Zehler (Eds.), *Learning to read across languages* (pp. 68–96). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kolers, P. A. (1968). Bilingualism and information processing. *Scientific American*, 218(3), 78–89.
- Kubanyiova, M. (2015). Ethics in research. In J. D. Brown & C. Coombe (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to language research* (pp. 176–182). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 694–716.
- Linderholm, T., & van den Broek, P. (2002). The effects of reading purpose and working memory capacity on the processing of expository text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 778–784.
- Logan, G. (1997). Automaticity and reading: Perspectives from the instance theory of automatization. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 13, 123–146.
- Logan, G. (2002). An instance theory of attention and memory. *Psychological Review*, 109, 376–400.
- Lorch, J., Lorch, E., & Kluzewitz, M. (1993). College students' conditional knowledge about reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 239–252.
- Lundberg, I. (1999). Learning to read in Scandinavia. In M. Harris & G. Hatano (Eds.), *Learning to read and write: A cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 157–72). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Macaro, E., & Erler, L. (2008). Raising the achievement of young-beginner readers of French through strategy instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 90–119.
- Matthews, M. (1990). Skill taxonomies and problems for the testing of reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 7(1), 511–517.
- Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (2002). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophical and practical guide*. London, UK: Routledge.
- McKeown, M. G., & Beck, I. L. (2004). Transforming knowledge into professional development resources: Six teachers implement a model of teaching for understanding text. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104, 391–408.

- McNamara, D., & Kintsch, W. (1996). Learning from texts: Effects of prior knowledge and text coherence. *Discourse Processes*, 22, 247–288.
- Medin, D., & Ross, B. (1989). The specific character of abstract thought: Categorization, problem-solving, and introduction. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of human intelligence*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Meyer, B. J. F., & Poon, L. W. (2001). Effects of structure strategy training and signaling on recall of texts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 141–159.
- Morris, R. (2006). Lexical processing and sentence context effects. In M. Traxler & M. A. Gernsbacher (Eds.), *Handbook of Psycholinguistics* (pp. 377–401). Burlington, MA: Academic Press.
- Nassaji, H. (2002). Schema theory and knowledge-based processes in second language reading comprehension: A need for alternative perspectives. *Language Learning*, 52, 439–482.
- Nicholson, T. (1993). The case against context. In G. B. Thompson, W. E. Tunmer, & T. Nicholson (Eds.), *Reading acquisition processes* (pp. 91–104). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Nist, S. L., & Mealey, D. L. (1991). Teacher-directed comprehension strategies. In R. Flippo, & D. Caverly (Eds.), *Teaching reading and study strategies at the college level* (pp.42–85). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Nuttall, C. (1982). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. London, UK: Heinemann Educational Books.
- OECD (2015). PISA 2015 key findings for Hungary. Retrieved June 18, 2019, from <https://www.oecd.org/hungary/pisa-2015-hungary.htm>

- Ogbu, J. U., & Simmons, H. D. (1998) Voluntary and involuntary minorities: A cultural-ecological theory of school performance with some implications for education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 29, 155–88.
- Oktatási Hivatal [Educational Authority]. (2017). *Magyar nyelv és irodalom* [Hungarian language and literature]. Retrieved January 02, 2017 from [https://www.oktatas.hu/pub\\_bin/dload/kozoktatas/erettsegi/vizsgakovetelmenyek2017/magyar\\_nyelv\\_es\\_irodalom\\_vk\\_2017.pdf](https://www.oktatas.hu/pub_bin/dload/kozoktatas/erettsegi/vizsgakovetelmenyek2017/magyar_nyelv_es_irodalom_vk_2017.pdf)
- Olshavasky, J. E. (1977). Reading as problem solving: An investigation of strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 4, 654–674.
- Olson, C. B. (2003). *The reading/writing connection: Strategies for teaching and learning in the secondary classroom*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Olson, C. B., & Land, R. (2007). A cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for English language learners in secondary school. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 41(3), 269–303.
- Ozgungor, S., & Guthrie, J. T. (2004). Interactions among elaborative interrogation, knowledge, and interest in the process of constructing knowledge from text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 437–43.
- Paivio, A. (2007). *Mind and its evolution: A dual coding theoretical approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 609–640). New York, NY: Longman.
- Pearson PTE (n.d.). Test Format. Retrieved September 21, 2019, from <https://pearsonpte.com/the-test/format/>

- Perfetti, C. (1986). Cognitive and linguistic components of reading ability. In B. Foorman & A. Siegel (Eds.), *Acquisition of reading skills: Cultural constraints and cognitive universals* (pp. 11–40). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Perfetti, C. (1994). Psycholinguistic and reading ability. In M. A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), *Handbook of psycholinguistics* (pp. 849–894). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Perfetti, C. (1999) Comprehending written language: A blueprint for the reader. In C. Brown & P. Hagoort (Eds.), *Neurocognition of language* (pp. 167–208). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Perfetti, C., & Britt, M. (1995). Where do propositions come from? In C. Weaver, S. Mannes & C. Fletcher (Eds.), *Discourse comprehension: Essays in honour of Walter Kintsch* (pp. 11–34). Hillsdale, NJ: L Erlbaum.
- Perfetti, C., & Hart, L. (2001). The lexical basis of comprehension skill. In D. Gorfien (Ed.), *On the consequences of meaning selection* (pp. 67–86). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Perfetti, C., Marron, M., & Foltz, P. (1996). Sources of comprehension failure: Theoretical perspectives and case studies. In C. Cornoldi & J. Oakhill (Eds.), *Reading comprehension difficulties* (pp. 137–165). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Perfetti, Ch. A., Goldman, S. R. & Hogaboam, T. W. (1979). Reading skill and the identification of words in discourse context. *Memory and Cognition* 7, 273–282.
- Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language Testing*, 20, 26–56.
- Pichette, F., Segalowitz, N., & Connors, K. (2003). Impact of maintaining L1 reading skills on L2 reading skill development in adults: Evidence from speakers of Serbo-Croatian learning French. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 391–403.

- Pressley, M. (2002). Comprehension strategy instruction: A turn-of-the-century status report. In C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 11–27). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M. (2006). *Reading instruction that works* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M., Gaskins, I. W., Solic, K. & Collins, S. (2006). A portrait of Benchmark School: How a school produces high achievement in students who previously failed. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 282–306.
- Pritchard, R. (1990). The effects of cultural schemata on reading processing strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25, 273–295.
- RAND Reading Study Group (2002). *Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Rapp, D., van den Broek, P., McMaster, K., Kendeou, P., & Espin, C. (2007). Higher-order comprehension processes in struggling readers: A perspective for research and intervention. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 11, 289–312.
- Rayner, K., & Pollatsek, A. (1989). *The psychology of reading*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rayner, K., Juhász, B., & Pollatsek, A. (2005). Eye movements during reading. In M. Snowling & C. Hulme (Eds.), *The science of reading* (pp. 79–97). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Readability Formulas (n.d.). Readability Guidelines to Calculate Readability Scores. Retrieved May 02, 2017, from <http://www.readabilityformulas.com/articles/readability-guidelines-to-calculate-readability-scores.php>
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to discourse studies*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.



- Rose, M. S. (2001). In defence of summarization. *College of The Bahamas Research Journal, 10*, 29–34.
- Rosenshine, B., Meister, C., & Chapman, S. (1996). Teaching students to generate questions: A review of the intervention studies. *Review of Educational Research, 66*, 181–221.
- Rowe, M., Ozuru, Y., & McNamara, D. S. (2006). An analysis of a standardized reading ability test: What do questions actually measure? In S. A. Barab, K. E. Hay, & D. T. Hickey (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh international conference of the learning sciences* (pp. 627–633). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1977). Understanding and summarizing brief stories. In D. LaBerge, & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *Basic processes in reading: Perception and comprehension* (pp. 265–303). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro et al. (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 33–59). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Samuels, S. J., & Flor, R. (1997). The importance of automaticity for developing expertise in reading. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 13*, 107–122.
- Sanford, A. J., & Garrod, S. C. (1981). *Understanding written language: Comprehension Beyond the sentence*. New York, NY: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Schugar, J. T., Schugar, H., & Penny, C. (2011). A Nook or a book? Comparing college students' reading comprehension levels, critical reading, and study skills. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning, 7*(2), 174–192.
- Smith, F. (1971). *Understanding reading*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Smith, F. (1973). *Psycholinguistics and reading*. Boston, MA: Thomson Learning.

- Stanovich, K. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16, 32–71.
- Stanovich, K. (2000). *Progress in understanding reading: Scientific foundations and new frontiers*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Stanovich, K. E., Cunningham, A. E., & Feeman, D. J. (1984). Intelligence, cognitive skills, and early reading progress. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19(3), 278–303.
- Steffenson, M., Joagh-Dev, C., & Anderson, R. C. (1979). A cross-cultural perspective on reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 15, 10–29.
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1997). *The fourth turning: An American prophecy*. New York, NY: Broadway Books.
- Styles, E. (2006). *The psychology of attention* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Szűcs, Á. (2017). The metacognitive reading strategy awareness of first-year EFL BA students: A mixed-methods study. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy*, 11, 60–79. Retrieved January 11, 2019 from <http://langped.elte.hu/WoPaLParticles/W11Szucs.pdf>
- Szűcs, Á., & Kövér, Á. (2016). Reading skills involved in guided summary writing: A case study. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy*, 10, 65–72. Retrieved December 20, 2017 from <http://langped.elte.hu/WoPaLParticles/W10SzucsKover.pdf>
- Taboada, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (2006). Contributions of student questioning and prior knowledge to construction of knowledge from reading information text. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38, 1–35.
- Tang, G. (1992). The effect of graphic representation of knowledge structures on ESL reading comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 177–195.
- Tankó, Gy. (2014). *Professional writing: The academic context*. Budapest, HU: Eötvös University Press.

- Tankó, Gy. (2017). *Academic skills test: Guided summary rating pack*. Internal document, ELTE, Budapest.
- Tankó, Gy. (2019). *Paraphrasing, summarising and synthesising skills for academic writers: Theory and practice* (2nd rev. ed.). Budapest, HU: Eötvös University Press.
- TOEFL iBT (n.d.). TOEFL iBT Test Content. Retrieved September 21, 2019, from <https://www.ets.org/toefl/ibt/about/content/>
- Trabasso, T. and Bouchard, E. (2002) Teaching readers how to comprehend texts strategically. In C. C. Block and M. Pressley (eds), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 176–200). New York: Guilford Press.
- Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Vacca, R. (2002). Making a difference in adolescents' school lives: Visible and invisible aspects of content area reading. In A. Farstrup, & S. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 184–204). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. New Jersey, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Vellutino, E. R. (2003). Individual differences as sources of variability in reading comprehension in elementary school children. In A. P Sweet, & C. E. Snow (Eds.), *Re-thinking reading comprehension* (pp.51–81). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Weir, C. J. (1993). *Understanding and developing language tests*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Prentice Hall International Ltd.

- Weir, C. J., & Khalifa, H. (2008). A cognitive processing approach towards defining reading comprehension. *Research Notes*, 31, 2–10.
- Widdowson, H. (1983). *Learning purpose and language use*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Woloshyn, V., Pressley, M., & Schneider, W. (1992). Elaborative interrogation and prior knowledge effects of learning of facts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 115–124.
- Yamashita, J. (2002). Mutual compensation between L1 reading ability and L2 language proficiency in L2 reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 25, 81–95.
- Yuill, N., & Oakhill, J. (1991). *Children's problems in text comprehension*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

## Appendices

### Appendix A – Consent form in Hungarian and in English

#### BELEEGYZŐ NYILATKOZAT EÖTVÖS LORÁND TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM, BUDAPEST

**Tanulmány címe:** Angol nyelvű tudományos szövegek olvasása: Esettanulmány az első éves anglisztika BA szakos hallgatók olvasási folyamatairól

**Kutató neve:** Szűcs Ágota

**Program neve:** Nyelvpedagógia Doktori Program

#### Bevezetés

- A jelen kutatásban a doktori disszertációhoz gyűjtök adatokat.
- Azért kaptál felkérést a jelen kutatásban való részvételre, mert regisztráltál a BBN-ANG11-104/? Tudományos Íráskészség 1 kurzusra.
- Kérlek olvasd el ezt a beleegyző nyilatkozatot és tedd fel a felmerülő kérdéseidet mielőtt a kutatásban való részvételbe beleegyeznél.

#### A kutatás célja

- A kutatás célja, az első éves anglisztika BA szakos hallgatók olvasási folyamatainak feltérképezése.
- A jelen kutatás keretein belül gyűjtött adatok a kutató doktori disszertációs tanulmányának alapjául szolgálnak majd, és a továbbiakban részét képezhetik egyéb, a kutató által publikált vagy előadott tudományos munkáknak.

#### Az adatfelvétel folyamata

- Amennyiben a résztvevő beleegyezik a kutatásban való részvételbe, egy irányított tömörítési feladatot kell megoldania, melynek során a feladatmegoldás közben meg kell próbálnia minden felmerülő gondolatát magyarul vagy angolul verbalizálni. Ez videófelvétel formájában rögzítésre kerül, és a feladatmegoldást követően egyes részeit visszanézve további beszélgetés alapjául szolgálnak. Az interjú előreláthatóan két órát vesz igénybe, és a félév során két adatgyűjtési alkalom várható.

#### A kutatásban való részvétellel járó kockázatok

- A kutatásban való részvétel nem jár semmilyen kockázattal.

#### A kutatásban való részvétel előnyei

- Azok a diákok, akik részt vesznek a kutatásban, kiegészítő gyakorlási lehetőséget kapnak a félév végén írandó Tudományos Íráskészség zárthelyi dolgozatra. Ezen felül további segítséget és visszajelzést kapnak a feladatmegoldási folyamataikkal és stratégiáikkal kapcsolatban, ami nagyban hozzájárulhat a tudományos olvasási- és íráskészségeik fejlesztéséhez.

## Az adatok kezelése

- A kutatásban való részvétel anonim és önkéntes módon történik. A teljes anonimitás biztosításának érdekében, az adatok elemzése és publikálása során a résztvevők álneveket kapnak. Az adatok bármilyen formájú publikálása esetén a résztvevőkkel kapcsolatban semmilyen olyan személyes adat nem kerül publikálásra, amely személyazonosságukat felismerhetővé tehetné.
- A kutatással kapcsolatos minden dokumentum, a jelen beleegyező nyilatkozatot is beleértve, szigorúan titkos. A kutatással kapcsolatos minden fizikai dokumentum egy lezárt szekrényben kerül tárolásra, az elektronikus fájlok biztonságáról pedig titkosított és jelszóval védett mappák gondoskodnak. A kutatón kívül más sem a fizikai, sem az elektronikus dokumentumokhoz nem fog hozzáféréssel rendelkezni. Öt évvel a doktori cím megszerzése után, a kutatáshoz kapcsolódó minden adat és dokumentum megsemmisítésre kerül.

## Részvételtől való visszalépés

- A résztvevőnek jogában áll a kutatásban való részvételtől bármikor elállni. Az adatgyűjtési folyamat bármely pontján a résztvevőnek jogában áll bármelyik kérdés megválaszolását megtagadni vagy akár a teljes részvételtől visszalépni. Ezen döntése semmilyen formában nem befolyásolja a kutatóval vagy az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetemmel való viszonyát és semmilyen következménnyel nem jár.

## Információkérési lehetőségek

- A résztvevőnek a kutatás során bármikor jogában áll kérdéseket feltenni és azokra választ kapni. Az adatfelvételt követően felmerülő kérdéseket a kutatónak, **Szűcs Ágotának** az **agota\_szucs@hotmail.co.uk** e-mail címen lehet jelezni.

## Beleegyezés

- A résztvevő alábbi aláírásával kijelenti, hogy a tanulmányban önkéntes részvételt vállal. Továbbá aláírásával tanúsítja, hogy a jelen dokumentumban foglaltakat elolvasta, megértette és elfogadja. A résztvevő az aláírt és dátummal ellátott dokumentumból egy darab másolatot kap.

A résztvevő neve (NYOMTATOTT BETŰVEL): \_\_\_\_\_

A résztvevő aláírása: \_\_\_\_\_ Dátum: \_\_\_\_\_

A kutató aláírása: \_\_\_\_\_ Dátum: \_\_\_\_\_

**Consent form in English**  
**CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY**  
**EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY**

**Title of the Study (working title):**            **Reading English for Academic Purposes: A case study on the reading processes of first-year EFL learner BA students**

**Researcher:**                                **Szűcs Ágota**

**Programme:**                                **PhD Programme in Language Pedagogy**

**Introduction**

- You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted for my PhD dissertation.
- You were selected as a possible participant because you registered for the BBN-ANG11-104/? Academic Skills 1 course.
- I ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to participate in the study.

**Purpose of Study**

- The purpose of the study is to gather insight about the reading processes of first-year English major BA students.
- Ultimately, the data obtained from this research project will be published as part of my PhD dissertation, and later it might also be published or presented as part of an academic article.

**Description of the Study Procedures**

- If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to solve a guided summary writing task while verbalizing all your emerging thoughts either in English or in Hungarian. This will be video recorded, and at the end of the task we will further discuss certain parts of the interview. The whole procedure is estimated to take approximately two hours.

**Risks of Being in this Study**

- Participating in the study has no risks.

**Benefits of Being in the Study**

- The students who participate in this study get an opportunity for extra practice for their end of the term Academic Skills Test. Furthermore, they can get a deeper insight into their own task solving processes and further input in reading for academic purposes and guided summary writing.

**Confidentiality**

- This study is anonymous. To maintain the anonymity, when the data from this study is published in any format, the names of the participants will be changed. I will not include any information in any report I may publish that would make it possible to identify any of the participants.
- The records of this study will be kept strictly confidential. Research records will be kept in a locked file, and all electronic information will be coded and secured using a password protected file. Nobody besides me will have access to the collected data. Five years after obtaining my doctorate, the audio and video records will be permanently deleted.

**Right to Refuse or Withdraw**

- The decision to participate in this study is entirely up to you. You may refuse to take part in the study *at any time* without affecting your relationship with the researcher of this study or Eötvös

Loránd University. Your decision will not result in any loss or benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely from the interview at any point during the process.

**Right to Ask Questions**

- You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by me before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact me, **Ágota Szűcs** at **agota\_szucs@hotmail.co.uk**.

**Consent**

- Your signature below indicates that you have decided to volunteer as a research participant for this study, and that you have read and understood the information provided above. You will be given a signed and dated copy of this form to keep, along with any other printed materials deemed necessary by the researcher of this study.

**Participant's Name (with CAPITAL LETTERS):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Participant's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Researcher's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_



## **Appendix B – Think-aloud demonstration tasks**

### **First phase demonstration task:**

*Read the following task and solve it while verbalising every single thought emerging in your mind.*

You have two water jugs. One jug can hold 5 litres and the other 3 litres. The jugs have no marks and one cannot see how much water they contain. They can be filled from a water tap and emptied in a sink. One can also pour water from one jug in another.

Please note the contents of the water jug on a sheet of paper. Please make two columns, one for each jug. Initially, both jugs are empty, so we have 0 - 0. Your task is to make 4 litres of water.

### **Second phase demonstration task:**

*Read the following text and answer the question while verbalising every single thought emerging in your mind.*

**Text:** Also outside you'll see one of the White House's latest projects: the First Lady's garden. Here Mrs Obama is growing vegetables so that her family - but also guests - get fresh vegetables. Mrs. Obama hopes the garden will be a learning experience where visitors to the White House can see how fresh food can be part of a healthy diet.

**Question:** What does Mrs. Obama hope will be a learning experience?

## Appendix C – Think-aloud practice tasks

### First phase practice tasks:

*Create a meaningful, grammatically correct English sentence from the words below. Please, use all the words, and while solving the task, verbalize every single thought that emerges in your mind. You can verbalize your thoughts both in English and Hungarian. Please use the language you are thinking in.*

**Words:** was Because he so was hard often to find Stuart around the house small

**Solution:** Because he was so small, Stuart was often hard to find around the house.

**Words:** bundle doorstep that same immediately truly Jane Ricky flowers her on her of When just loved realized she that and she him found the loves a

**Solution:** When Jane found a bundle of flowers on her doorstep, she immediately realized that Rick truly loves her, and that she loved him just the same.

### Second phase practice tasks:

*Create a meaningful, grammatically correct English sentence from the words below. Please, use all the words, and while solving the task, verbalize every single thought that emerges in your mind. You can verbalize your thoughts both in English and Hungarian. Please use the language you are thinking in.*

**Words:** storm streets after the the the on lay trees hit town broken

**Solution:** After the storm hit the town, trees lay broken on the streets.

**Words:** the he his his but only mean worse attitude man situation lonely because was was made

**Solution:** The man was mean because he was lonely, but his attitude only made his situation worse.

## Appendix D – The data collection tasks

### TASK A

**Read the passage below and write a paragraph of 130 words (+/-10%) in which you summarise in your own words as far as possible *the difficulties of collecting data from children*, which are discussed in the reading passage below.**

#### **Investigating Children's Language**

For over 200 years, there has been an interest in the way children learn to speak and understand their first language. Scholars carried out several small-scale studies, especially towards the end of the 19th century, using data they recorded in parental diaries. However, detailed, systematic investigation did not begin until the middle decades of the 20th century when the tape recorder came into routine use. This made it possible to keep a permanent record of samples of child speech so that analysts could listen repeatedly to obscure extracts, and thus produce a detailed and accurate description. Since then, the subject has attracted enormous multi-disciplinary interest, notably from linguists and psychologists, who have used a variety of observational and experimental techniques to study the process of language acquisition in depth.

Central to the success of this rapidly emerging field lies the ability of researchers to devise satisfactory methods for eliciting linguistic data from children. The problems that have to be faced are quite different from those encountered when working with adults. Many of the linguist's routine techniques of enquiry cannot be used with children. It is not possible to carry out certain kinds of experiments, because aspects of children's cognitive development – such as their ability to pay attention or to remember instructions – may not be sufficiently advanced. Nor is it easy to get children to make systematic judgments about language, a task that is virtually impossible below the age of three. And anyone who has tried to obtain even the most basic kind of data – a tape recording of a representative sample of a child's speech – knows how frustrating this can be. Some children, it seems, are innately programmed to switch off as soon as they notice a tape recorder being switched on.

There is no single way of studying children's language. Linguistics and psychology have each brought their own approach to the subject, and many variations have been introduced to cope with the variety of activities in which children engage, and the great age range that they present. Two main research paradigms are found.

One of these is known as 'naturalistic sampling'. A sample of a child's spontaneous use of language is recorded in familiar and comfortable surroundings. One of the best places to make the recording is in the child's own home, but it is not always easy to maintain good acoustic quality, and the presence of the researcher or the recording equipment can be a distraction (especially if the proceedings are being filmed). Alternatively, the recording can be made in a research centre, where the child is allowed to play freely with toys while talking to parents or other children, and the observers and their equipment are unobtrusive.

A good quality, representative, naturalistic sample is generally considered an ideal datum for child language study. However, the method has several limitations. These samples are informative about speech production, but they give little guidance about children's comprehension of what they hear around them. Moreover, samples cannot contain everything, and they can easily miss some important features of a child's linguistic ability.

They may also not provide enough instances of a developing feature to enable the analyst to make a decision about the way the child is learning. For such reasons, the description of samples of child speech has to be supplemented by other methods.

The other main approach is through experimentation, and the methods of experimental psychology have been widely applied to child language research. The investigator formulates a specific hypothesis about children's ability to use or understand an aspect of language and devises a relevant task for a group of subjects to undertake. A statistical analysis is made of the subjects' behaviour, and the results provide evidence that supports or falsifies the original hypothesis.

Using this approach, as well as other methods of controlled observation, researchers have come up with many detailed findings about the production and comprehension of groups of children. However, it is not easy to generalise the findings of these studies. What may obtain in a carefully controlled setting may not apply in the rush of daily interaction. Experimental research is, therefore, a slow, painstaking business; it may take years before researchers are convinced that all variables have been considered and a finding is genuine (Based on IELTS Mentor, 2017b).

## TASK B

**Read the passage below and write a paragraph of 130 words (+/-10%) in which you summarise in your own words as far as possible *the ways in which the suffragettes managed to promote their movement*, which are discussed in the reading passage below.**

### **Votes for Women**

Formed in 1903 by the political campaigner Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters Christabel and Sylvia, the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) began an educated campaign to put women's suffrage on the political agenda. New Zealand, Australia and parts of the United States had already enfranchised women, and growing numbers of their British counterparts wanted the same opportunity.

With their slogan 'Deeds not words', and the introduction of the colour scheme, the WSPU soon brought the movement the cohesion and focus it had previously lacked. Membership grew rapidly as women deserted the many other, less directed, groups and joined it. By 1906 the WSPU headquarters, called the Women's Press Shop, had been established in Charing Cross Road. In spite of limited communications (no radio or television, and minimal use of the telephone) the message had spread around the country, with members and branch officers stretching to as far away as Scotland.

The newspapers produced by the WSPU, first *Votes for Women* and later *The Suffragette*, played a vital role in this communication. Both were sold throughout the country and proved an invaluable way of informing members of meetings, marches, fund-raising events and the latest news and views on the movement.

Equally importantly for a rising political group, the newspaper returned a profit. This was partly because advertising space was bought in the paper by large department stores such as Selfridges, and jewellers such as Mappin & Webb. These two, together with other like-minded commercial enterprises sympathetic to the cause, had quickly identified a direct way to reach a huge market of women, many with money to spend.

The creation of the colour scheme provided another money-making opportunity which the WSPU was quick to exploit. The group began to sell playing cards, board games, Christmas and greeting cards, and countless other goods, all in the purple, white and green colours. In 1906 such merchandising of a corporate identity was a new marketing concept.

But the paper and merchandising activities alone did not provide sufficient funds for the WSPU to meet organisational costs, so numerous other fund-raising activities combined to fill the coffers of the 'war chest'. The most notable of these was the Woman's Exhibition, which took place in 1909 in a Knightsbridge ice-skating rink, and in 10 days raised the equivalent of £250,000 today.

Nowadays, the Museum of London's has a large, visual exhibition of the suffragette movement, with a huge number of items on show. Against a quiet background hum of street sounds, copies of *The Suffragette*, campaign banners and photographs are all on display, together with one of Mrs Pankhurst's shoes and a number of purple, white and green trinkets.

Photographs depict vivid scenes of a suffragette's life: WSPU members on a self-proclaimed 'monster' march, wearing their official uniforms of a white frock decorated with purple, white and green accessories; women selling *The Suffragette* at street corners, or chalking up pavements with details of a forthcoming meeting.

Windows display postcards and greeting cards designed by women artists for the movement, and the quality of the artwork indicates the wealth of resources the WSPU could call on from its talented members.

Visitors can watch a short film made up of old newsreels and cinema material which clearly reveals the political mood of the day towards the suffragettes. The programme begins with a short film devised by the 'antis' - those opposed to women having the vote - depicting a suffragette as a fierce harridan bullying her poor, abused husband. Original newsreel footage shows the suffragette Emily Wilding Davison throwing herself under King George V's horse at a famous race.

Although the exhibition officially charts the years 1906 to 1914, graphic display boards outlining the bills of enfranchisement of 1918 and 1928, which gave the adult female populace of Britain the vote, show what was achieved. It demonstrates how advanced the suffragettes were in their thinking, in the marketing of their campaign, and in their work as shrewd and skilful image-builders. It also conveys a sense of the energy and ability the suffragettes brought to their fight for freedom and equality. And it illustrates the intelligence employed by women who were at that time deemed by several politicians to have 'brains too small to know how to vote' (Based on IELTS Mentor, 2017c).

## Appendix E – Propositional Analysis of the Text of Task A and Task B

Table 45

*The Propositional Analysis of the ‘Investigating Children’s Language’ Text*

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S1	For over 200 years, there has been an interest in the way children learn to speak and understand their first language.	P1 (INTEREST-IN \$ WAY) P2 (MOD WAY P4) P3 (MOD WAY P5) P4 (LEARN CHILDREN SPEAK) P5 (UNDERSTAND CHILDREN LANGUAGE) P6 (MOD LANGUAGE FIRST) P7 (POSSESS CHILDREN P6) P8 (DURATION-OF P1 OVER-200-YEAR)
S2	Scholars carried out several small-scale studies, especially towards the end of the 19th century, using data they recorded in parental diaries.	P1 (CARRY-OUT SCHOLAR STUDY) P2 (MOD STUDY SMALL-SCALE) P3 (NUMBER-OF P2 SEVERAL) P4 (TIME P1 TOWARDS-THE-END-OF-THE-19TH-CENTURY) P5 (MOD P1 P6) P6 (USE SCHOLAR DATA) P7 (REF DATA P8) P8 (RECORDED-IN SCHOLAR DATA DIARY) P9 (MOD DIARY PARENTAL)
S3	However, detailed, systematic investigation did not begin until the middle decades of the 20th century when the tape recorder came into routine use.	P1 (HOWEVER S2 S3) P2 (BEGIN \$ INVESTIGATION) P3 (MOD INVESTIGATION DETAILED) P4 (MOD INVESTIGATION SYSTEMATIC) P5 (NEGATE P2) P6 (UNTIL P5 P7) P7 (TIME P2 MIDDLE-DECADES) P8 (POSSESS 20TH-CENTURY MIDDLE-DECADES) P9 (REF P7 P10) P10 (COME-INTO TAPE-RECORDER USE) P11 (MOD USE ROUTINE)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S4	This made it possible to keep a permanent record of samples of child speech so that analysts could listen repeatedly to obscure extracts and thus produce a detailed and accurate description.	P1 (MAKE-POSSIBLE-TO S3P10 P2) P2 (KEEP \$ RECORD) P3 (MOD RECORD PERMANENT) P4 (POSSESS SAMPLE RECORD) P5 (POSSESS SPEECH SAMPLE) P6 (MOD SPEECH CHILD) P6 (SO-THAT P1 P7) P7 (LISTEN-TO ANALYST EXTRACTS) P8 (MOD LISTEN REPEATED) P9 (MOD EXTRACT OBSCURE) P10 (THUS P7 P11) P11 (PRODUCE ANALYST DESCRIPTION) P12 (MOD DESCRIPTION DETAILED) P13 (MOD DESCRIPTION ACCURATE)
S5	Since then, the subject has attracted enormous multi-disciplinary interest, notably from linguists and psychologists, who have used a variety of observational and experimental techniques to study the process of language acquisition in depth.	P1 (SINCE S3P10 P2) P2 (ATTRACT SUBJECT INTEREST) P3 (MOD INTEREST MULTI-DISCIPLINARY) P4 (DEGREE-OF INTEREST ENORMOUS) P5 (POSSESS LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST INTEREST) P6 (MOD P5 ESPECIAL) P7 (USE LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST TECHNIQUE) P8 (MOD TECHNIQUE OBSERVATIONAL) P9 (MOD TECHNIQUE EXPERIMENTAL) P10 (NUMBER-OF TECHNIQUE VARIETY-OF) P11 (IN-ORDER-TO P7 P12) P12 (STUDY LINGUIST/PSYCHOLOGIST PROCESS) P13 (TYPE-OF PROCESS LANGUAGE-ACQUISITION) P14 (MOD P13 IN-DEPTH)



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S6	Central to the success of this rapidly emerging field lies the ability of researchers to devise satisfactory methods for eliciting linguistic data from children.	P1 (ABLE-TO RESEARCHER P2) P2 (DEVISE RESEARCHER METHOD) P3 (FOR METHOD P4) P4 (ELICIT METHOD DATA) P5 (MOD METHOD SATISFACTORY) P6 (MOD DATA LINGUISTIC) P7 (FROM P4 CHILDREN) P8 (NECESSARY-FOR P1 SUCCESS) P9 (POSSESS FIELD SUCCESS) P10 (MOD FIELD EMERGING) P11 (DEGREE-OF EMERGING RAPID)
S7	The problems that have to be faced are quite different from those encountered when working with adults.	P1 (DIFFERENT-FROM PROBLEM1 PROBLEM2) P2 (MOD PROBLEM1 P3) P3 (MUST \$ P4) P4 (FACE \$ PROBLEM1) P5 (DEGREE-OF DIFFERENT-FROM QUITE) P6 (ENCOUNTER PROBLEM2 P7) P7 (WHEN P8) P8 (WORK-WITH \$ ADULT)
S8	Many of the linguist's routine techniques of enquiry cannot be used with children.	P1 (ABLE-TO P2) P2 (USE \$ TECHNIQUE) P3 (NEGATE P1) P4 (MOD TECHNIQUE ENQUIRY) P5 (MOD P4 ROUTINE) P6 (POSSESS LINGUIST P5) P7 (NUMBER-OF P6 MANY) P8 (WITH P1 CHILDREN)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S9	It is not possible to carry out certain kinds of experiments, because aspects of children's cognitive development – such as their ability to pay attention or to remember instructions – may not be sufficiently advanced.	P1 (MOD P3 POSSIBLE) P2 (NEGATE P1) P3 (CARRY-OUT \$ EXPERIMENT) P4 (MOD EXPERIMENT CERTAIN-KIND) P5 (BECAUSE P1 P12) P6 (MOD DEVELOPMENT ADVANCED) P7 (AMOUNT-OF P6 SUFFICIENT) P8 (MOD DEVELOPMENT COGNITIVE) P9 (POSSESS CHILDREN P8) P10 (DEGREE-OF P9 ASPECT) P11 (MOD P7 POSSIBLE) P12 (NEGATE P11) P13 (EXAMPLE-OF P10 P14) P14 (OR P15 P16) P15 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN PAY-ATTENTION) P16 (ABLE-TO CHILDREN P17) P17 (REMEMBER CHILDREN INSTRUCTION)
S10	Nor is it easy to get children to make systematic judgments about language, a task that is virtually impossible below the age of three	P1 (MOD P2 EASY) P2 (GET-TO-MAKE CHILDREN JUDGMENT) P3 (NEGATE P1) P4 (MOD JUDGMENT SYSTEMATIC) P5 (ABOUT JUDGMENT LANGUAGE) P6 (REF P2 P7) P7 (MOD TASK IMPOSSIBLE) P8 (TIME P7 BELOW-THE-AGE) P9 (NUMBER-OF AGE THREE)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S11	And anyone who has tried to obtain even the most basic kind of data – a tape recording of a representative sample of a child’s speech – knows how frustrating this can be.	P1 (KNOW P2 P13) P2 (TRY ANYONE P3) P3 (OBTAIN ANYONE DATA) P4 (MOD DATA BASIC) P5 (MOD BASIC MOST) P6 (EVEN P5) P7 (REF P5 P8) P8 (POSSESS SAMPLE RECORDING) P9 (MOD RECORDING TAPE) P10 (MOD SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVE) P11 (POSSESS SPEECH P10) P12 (POSSESS CHILD SPEECH) P13 (MOD P3 FRUSTRATING) P14 (MOD P13 POSSIBLE)
S12	Some children, it seems, are innately programmed to switch off as soon as they notice a tape recorder being switched on.	P1 (SEEM P2) P2 (ROGRAMME-TO CHILDREN P5) P3 (NUMBER-OF CHILDREN SOME) P4 (MOD PROGRAMME INNATELY) P5 (SWITCH-OFF CHILDREN) P6 (AS-SOON-AS P5 P7) P7 (NOTICE CHILDREN P8) P8 (SWITCH-ON \$ TAPE-RECORDER)
S13	There is no single way of studying children’s language.	P1 (EXIST WAY) P2 (NEGATE P1) P3 (MOD WAY SINGLE) P4 (POSSESS P5 WAY) P5 (STUDY \$ LANGUAGE) P6 (POSSESS CHILDREN LANGUAGE)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S14	Linguistics and psychology have each brought their own approach to the subject, and many variations have been introduced to cope with the variety of activities in which children engage, and the great age range that they present.	P1 (BRING LINGUISTICS/PSYCHOLOGY APPROACH) P2 (POSSESS LINGUISTICS/PSYCHOLOGY APPROACH) P3 (TO APPROACH SUBJECT) P4 (INTRODUCE \$ VARIATION) P5 (NUMBER-OF VARIATION MANY) P6 (IN-ORDER-TO P4 P7) P7 (COPE-WITH \$ ACTIVITIES) P8 (AMOUNT-OF ACTIVITY VARIETY) P9 (ENGAGE-IN CHILDREN ACTIVITY) P10 (PRESENT ACTIVITY AGE-RANGE) P11 (MOD AGE-RANGE GREAT)
S15	Two main research paradigms are found.	P1 (FIND \$ RESEARCH-PARADIGM) P2 (MOD RESEARCH-PARADIGM MAIN) P3 (NUMBER-OF P2 TWO)
S16	S16 One of these is known as 'naturalistic sampling'.	P1 (REF RESEARCH-PARADIGM NAUTALISTIC-SAMPLING)
S17	A sample of a child's spontaneous use of language is recorded in familiar and comfortable surroundings.	P1 (RECORD \$ LANUAGE-USE-SAMPLE) P2 (MOD LANGUAGE-USE-SAMPLE SPONTANEOUS) P3 (POSSESS CHILD P2) P4 (IN P1 SURROUNDING) P5 (MOD SURROUNDING FAMILIAR) P6 (MOD SURROUNDING COMFORTABLE)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S18	One of the best places to make the recording is in the child's own home, but it is not always easy to maintain good acoustic quality, and the presence of the researcher or the recording equipment can be a distraction (especially if the proceedings are being filmed).	P1 (ISA PLACE2 PLACE1) P2 (MOD PLACE2 BEST) P3 (NUMBER-OF PLACE2 ONE) P4 (IN-ORDER-TO P2 P5) P5 (MAKE \$ RECORDING) P6 (REF P2 HOME) P7 (POSSESS CHILD HOME) P8 (BUT P6 P9) P9 (NEGATE P10) P10 (MOD P12 EASY) P11 (TIME P10 ALWAYS) P12 (MAINTAIN \$ QUALITY) P13 (MOD QUALITY ACOUSTIC) P14 (MOD P13 GOOD) P15 (ISA RESEARCHER/RECORDING-EQUIPMENT DISTRACTION) P16 (MOD P15 POSSIBLE) P17 (IF P15 P18) P18 (FILM \$ PROCEEDING) P19 (MOD P18 ESPECIAL)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S19	Alternatively, the recording can be made in a research centre, where the child is allowed to play freely with toys while talking to parents or other children, and the observers and their equipment are unobtrusive.	P1 (MAKE \$ RECORDING) P2 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE) P3 (IN P1 RESEARCH-CENTRE) P4 (WHERE P3 P5) P5 (ALLOWED-TO CHILD1 P6) P6 (PLAY CHILD) P7 (MOD PLAY FREE) P8 (WITH P6 TOY) P9 (WHILE P8 P10) P10 (TALK-TO CHILD1 PARENT/CHILD2) P11 (MOD CHILD OTHER) P12 (MOD OBSERVER/EQUIPMENT UNOBTRUSIVE) P13 (POSSESS OBSERVER EQUIPMENT)
S20	A good quality, representative, naturalistic sample is generally considered an ideal datum for child language study.	P1 (ISA SAMPLE DATUM) P2 (MOD SAMPLE NATURALISTIC) P3 (MOD SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVE) P4 (MOD SAMPLE QUALITY) P5 (MOD QUALITY GOOD) P6 (MOD P1 GENERAL) P7 (MOD DATUM IDEAL) P8 (FOR P1 STUDY) P9 (MOD STUDY LANGUAGE) P10 (MOD LANGUAGE CHILD)
S21	However, the method has several limitations.	P1 (HOWEVER S20P1 P2) P2 (POSSESS METHOD LIMITATION) P3 (NUMBER-OF LIMITATION SEVERAL)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S22	These samples are informative about speech production, but they give little guidance about children's comprehension of what they hear around them.	P1 (MOD SAMPLE INFORMATIVE) P2 (ABOUT P1 SPEECH-PRODUCTION) P3 (BUT P1 P4) P4 (GIVE SAMPLE GUIDANCE) P5 (AMOUNT-OF GUIDANCE LITTLE) P6 (ABOUT P4 COMPREHENSION) P7 (POSSESS CHILDREN COMPREHENSION) P8 (OF P7 P9) P9 (HEAR CHILDREN) P10 (AROUND P9 CHILDREN)
S23	Moreover, samples cannot contain everything, and they can easily miss some important features of a child's linguistic ability.	P1 (ABLE-TO SAMPLE P2) P2 (CONTAIN SAMPLE EVERYTHING) P3 (NEGATE P1) P4 (ABLE-TO SAMPLE P5) P5 (MISS SAMPLE FEATURE) P6 (MOD MISS EASY) P7 (MOD FEATURE IMPORTANT) P8 (NUMBER-OF P7 SOME) P9 (POSSESS ABILITY FEATURE) P10 (MOD ABILITY LINGUISTIC) P11 (POSSESS CHILD P10)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S24	They may also not provide enough instances of a developing feature to enable the analyst to make a decision about the way the child is learning.	P1 (PROVIDE SAMPLE INSTANCE) P2 (MOD P1 POSSIBLE) P3 (NEGATE P2) P4 (AMOUNT-OF INSTANCE ENOUGH) P5 (POSSESS FEATURE INSTANCE) P6 (MOD FEATURE DEVELOPING) P7 (IN-ORDER-TO P3 P8) P8 (ENABLE-TO SAMPLE P9) P9 (MAKE ANALYST DECISION) P10 (ABOUT P9 WAY) P11 (MOD WAY P12) P12 (LEARN CHILD \$)
S25	For such reasons, the description of samples of child speech has to be supplemented by other methods.	P1 (BECAUSE-OF S24P7 P2) P2 (MUST \$ P3) P3 (SUPPLEMENT \$ CHILD-SPEECH-SAMPLE-DESCRIPTION) P4 (BY P3 METHOD) P5 (MOD METHOD OTHER)
S26	The other main approach is through experimentation, and the methods of experimental psychology have been widely applied to child language research.	P1 (REF APPROACH EXPERIMENTATION) P2 (MOD APPROACH MAIN) P3 (MOD P2 OTHER) P4 (APPLY \$ METHOD) P5 (POSSESS PSYCHOLOGY METHOD) P6 (MOD PSYCHOLOGY EXPERIMENTAL) P7 (MOD APPLY WIDE) P8 (TO P4 RESEARCH) P9 (MOD RESEARCH LANGUAGE) P10 (MOD LANGUAGE CHILD)



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S27	The investigator formulates a specific hypothesis about children's ability to use or understand an aspect of language and devises a relevant task for a group of subjects to undertake.	P1 (FORMULATE INVESTIGATOR HYPOTHESIS) P2 (MOD HYPOTHESIS SPECIFIC) P3 (ABOUT P1 P4) P4 (ABLE-TO CHILD P5) P5 (USE/UNDERSTAND CHILD ASPECT) P6 (POSSESS LANGUAGE APECT) P7 (DEVISE INVESTIGATOR TASK) P8 (MOD TASK RELEVANT) P9 (FOR P7 GROUP) P10 (POSSESS SUBJECT GROUP) P11 (IN-ORDER-TO P9 UNDERTAKE)
S28	A statistical analysis is made of the subjects' behaviour, and the results provide evidence that supports or falsifies the original hypothesis.	P1 (MAKE \$ ANALYSIS) P2 (MOD ANALYSIS STATISTICAL) P3 (OF P1 BEHAVIOUR) P4 (POSSESS SUBJECT BEHAVIOUR) P5 (PROVIDE RESULT EVIDENCE) P6 (MOD EVIDENCE P7) P7 (SUPPORT/FALSIFY EVIDENCE HYPOTHESIS) P8 (MOD HYPOTHESIS ORIGINAL)
S29	Using this approach, as well as other methods of controlled observation, researchers have come up with many detailed findings about the production and comprehension of groups of children	P1 (USE \$ STATISTICAL-ANALYSIS/METHOD) P2 (MOD METHOD OTHER) P3 (REF METHOD CONTROLLED-OBSERVATION) P4 (CAUSE P1 P5) P5 (COME-UP-WITH RESEARCHER FINDING) P6 (MOD FINDING DETAILED) P7 (AMOUNT-OF P6 MANY) P8 (ABOUT FINDING PRODUCTION/COMPREHENSION) P9 (POSSESS GROUP PRODUCTION/COMPREHENSION) P10 (POSSESS CHILDREN GROUP)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S30	However, it is not easy to generalise the findings of these studies.	P1 (HOWEVER S29P5 P2) P2 (MOD P3 EASY) P3 (GENERALISE \$ FINDING) P4 (NEGATE P1) P5 (POSSESS STUDY FINDING)
S31	What may obtain in a carefully controlled setting may not apply in the rush of daily interaction.	P1 (MOD P2 POSSIBLE) P2 (APPLY-IN FINDING CONTROLLED-SETTING) P3 (MOD CONTROL CAREFUL) P4 (BUT P1 P8) P5 (MOD P6 POSSIBLE) P6 (APPLY-IN FINDING DAILY-INTERACTION) P7 (MOD DAILY-INTERACTION RAPID) P8 (NEGATE P5)
S32	Experimental research is, therefore, a slow, painstaking business.	P1 (THEREFORE S31P4 P2) P2 (REF RESEARCH BUSINESS) P3 (MOD RESEARCH EXPERIMENT) P4 (MOD BUSINESS SLOW) P5 (MOD BUSINESS PAINSTAKING)
S33	It may take years before researchers are convinced that all variables have been considered and a finding is genuine.	P1 (BECOME-CONVINCED-ABOUT RESEARCHER P2/P4) P2 (CONSIDER \$ VARIABLE) P3 (NUMBER-OF VARIABLE ALL) P4 (MOD FINDING GENUINE) P5 (TAKE P1 YEAR) P6 (NUMBER-OF YEAR SEVERAL) P7 (MOD P5 POSSIBLE)

Table 46

## The Propositional Analysis of the 'Votes for Women' Text

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S1	Formed in 1903 by the political campaigner Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters Christabel and Sylvia, the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) began an educated campaign to put women's suffrage on the political agenda.	P1 (FORM CAMPAIGNER UNION)
		P2 (MOD CAMPAIGNER POLITICAL)
		P3 (LABEL P2 MRS-EMMELINE-PANKHURST)
		P4 (LABEL UNION WOMEN'S-SOCIAL-AND-POLITICAL-UNION/WSPU)
		P5 (TIME P1 1903)
		P6 (FORM DAUGHTER1 UNION)
		P7 (LABEL DAUGHTER1 CHRISTABEL)
		P8 (POSSESS MRS-EMMELINE-PANKHURST DAUGHTER1)
		P9 (TIME P6 1903)
		P10 (LABEL UNION WOMEN'S-SOCIAL-AND-POLITICAL-UNION)
		P11 (FORM DAUGHTER2 UNION)
		P12 (LABEL DAUGHTER2 SYLVIA)
		P13 (LABEL UNION WOMEN'S-SOCIAL-AND-POLITICAL-UNION)
		P14 (POSSESS MRS-EMMELINE-PANKHURST DAUGHTER2)
		P15 (TIME P11 1903)
		P16 (BEGIN UNION CAMPAIGN)
		P17 (LABEL UNION WOMEN'S-SOCIAL-AND-POLITICAL-UNION)
		P18 (MOD CAMPAIGN EDUCATED)
		P19 (IN-ORDER-TO P16 P20)
		P20 (PUT CAMPAIGN SUFFRAGE)
		P21 (POSSESS WOMAN SUFFRAGE)
		P22 (ON P20 AGENDA)
		P23 (MOD AGENDA POLITICAL)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S2	New Zealand, Australia and parts of the United States had already enfranchised women, and growing numbers of their British counterparts wanted the same opportunity.	P1 (ENFRANCHISE NEW-ZELAND/AUSTRALIA/UNITED-STATES WOMEN) P2 (AMOUNT-OF UNITED-STATES PARTS) P3 (MOD ENFRANCHISE ALREADY) P4 (WANT COUNTERPART OPPORTUNITY) P5 (MOD COUNTERPART BRITISH) P6 (POSSESS COUNTERPART NUMBER) P7 (MOD NUMBER GROWING) P8 (MOD OPPORTUNITY SAME)
S3	With their slogan 'Deeds not words', and the introduction of the colour scheme, the WSPU soon brought the movement the cohesion and focus it had previously lacked.	P1 (BRING WSPU COHESION/FOCUS) P2 (TIME BRING SOON) P3 (MOD COHESION/FOCUS P4) P4 (LACK MOVEMENT COHESION/FOCUS) P5 (TIME P4 PREVIOUSLY) P6 (TO P1 MOVEMENT) P7 (WITH P1 SLOGAN/INTRODUCTION) P8 (LABEL SLOGAN DEEDS-NO-WORDS) P9 (POSSESS WSPU SLOGAN) P10 (POSSESS COLOUR-SCHEME INTRODUCTION)
S4	Membership grew rapidly as women deserted the many other, less directed, groups and joined it.	P1 (GROW MEMBERSHIP) P2 (MOD GROW RAPID) P3 (BECAUSE P1 P4) P4 (DESERT WOMAN GROUP) P5 (MOD GOUNP DIRECTED) P6 (DEGREE-OF DIRECTED LESS) P7 (MOD GROUP OTHER) P8 (AMOUNT-OF P7 MANY) P9 (BECAUSE P1 P10) P10 (JOIN WOMAN WSPU)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S5	By 1906 the WSPU headquarters, called the Women's Press Shop, had been established in Charing Cross Road.	P1 (ESTABLISH \$ HEADQUARTER) P2 (POSSESS WSPU HEADQUARTER) P3 (LABEL P2 WOMEN'S-PRESS-SHOP) P4 (TIME P1 BY-1906) P5 (IN P1 ROAD) P6 (LABEL ROAD CHARING-CROSS-ROAD)
S6	In spite of limited communications (no radio or television, and minimal use of the telephone) the message had spread around the country, with members and branch officers stretching to as far away as Scotland.	P1 (IN-SPITE-OF P10 COMMUNICATION) P2 (DEGREE-OF COMMUNICATION LIMITED) P3 (EXAMPLE-OF P2 RADIO) P4 (NEGATE RADIO) P5 (EXAMPLE-OF P2 TEVEVISION) P6 (NEGATE TELEVISION) P7 (EXAMPLE-OF P2 USE) P8 (DEGREE-OF USE MINIMAL) P9 (POSSESS TELEPHONE USE) P10 (SPREAD MEMBER/BRANCH OFFICER MESSAGE) P11 (AROUND P10 COUNTRY) P12 (BECAUSE P11 P13) P13 (STRETCH-TO MEMBER/BRANCH OFFICER SCOTLAND) P14 (MOD P13 AS-FAR-AS)
S7	The newspapers produced by the WSPU, first Votes for Women and later The Suffragette, played a vital role in this communication.	P1 (PLAY NEWSPAPER ROLE) P2 (MOD ROLE VITAL) P3 (IN P1 COMMUNICATION) P4 (PRODUCE WSPU NEWSPAPER) P5 (LABEL NEWSPAPER VOTES-FOR-WOMEN) P6 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S8	Both were sold throughout the country and proved an invaluable way of informing members of meetings, marches, fund-raising events and the latest news and views on the movement	P1 (SELL \$ NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2) P2 (LABEL NEWSPAPER1 VOTES-FOR-WOMEN) P3 (LABEL NEWSPAPER2 THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P4 (THROUGHOUT P1 COUNTRY) P5 (PROVIDE NEWSPAPER1/NEWSPAPER2 WAY) P6 (MOD WAY INVALUABLE) P7 (OF WAY P8) P8 (INFORM \$ MEMBER) P9 (ABOUT INFORM MEETING/MARCH/FUND-RAISING-EVENT/NEWS/VIEWS) P10 (MOD NEWS/VIEWS LATEST) P11 (ON VIEW MOVEMENT)
S9	Equally importantly for a rising political group, the newspaper returned a profit.	P1 (RETURN NEWSPAPER PROFIT) P2 (MOD P1 IMPORTANT) P3 (FOR P2 GROUP) P4 (MOD GROUP POLITICAL) P5 (MOD P4 RISING) P6 (AS-IMPORTANT-AS P1 S8P5)
S10	This was partly because advertising space was bought in the paper by large department stores such as Selfridges, and jewellers such as Mappin & Webb.	P1 (BECAUSE S9P1 P2) P2 (BUY STORE ADVERTISING-SPACE) P3 (MOD STORE DEPARTMENT) P4 (MOD P3 LARGE) P5 (IN P2 PAPER) P6 (EXAMPLE-OF STORE P7) P7 (LABEL STORE SELFRIDGES) P8 (EXAMPLE-OF JEWELLER P9) P9 (LABEL JEWELLER MAPPIN-AND-WEBB)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S11	These two, together with other like-minded commercial enterprises sympathetic to the cause, had quickly identified a direct way to reach a huge market of women, many with money to spend.	P1 (IDENTIFY DEPARTMENT-STORE1/DEPARTMENT-STORE2/ENTERPRISE WAY) P2 (LABEL DEPARTMENT-STORE1 SELFRIDGES) P3 (LABEL DEPARTMENT-STORE2 MAPPIN-AND-WEBB) P4 (MOD ENTERPRISE COMMERCIAL) P5 (MOD P4 LIKE-MINDED) P6 (MOD P5 OTHER) P7 (MOD P6 SYMPATHETIC-TO-CAUSE) P8 (MOD IDENTIFY QUICK) P9 (MOD WAY DIRECT) P10 (TO WAY P11) P11 (REACH WAY MARKET) P12 (MOD MARKET HUGE) P13 (COMPOSED-OF MARKET WOMAN) P14 (POSSESS WOMAN MONEY) P15 (NUMBER-OF P14 MANY) P16 (TO MONEY SPEND)
S12	The creation of the colour scheme provided another money-making opportunity which the WSPU was quick to exploit.	P1 (PROVIDE CREATION OPPORTUNITY) P2 (POSSESS COLOUR-SCHEME CREATION) P3 (MOD OPPORTUNITY MONEY-MAKING) P4 (MOD P3 ANOTHER) P5 (EXPLOIT WSPU OPPORTUNITY) P6 (MOD EXPLOIT QUICK)
S13	The group began to sell playing cards, board games, Christmas and greeting cards, and countless other goods, all in the purple, white and green colours.	P1 (BEGIN GROUP P2) P2 (SELL GROUP PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS) P3 (MOD GOODS OTHER) P4 (NUMBER-OF P3 COUNTLESS) P5 (MOD PLAYING-CARD/BOARD-GAME/CHRISTMAS-CARD/GREETING-CARD/GOODS PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S14	In 1906 such merchandising of a corporate identity was a new marketing concept.	P1 (ISA P2 CONCEPT) P2 (MENCHANDISE CORPORATE-IDENTITY) P3 (MOD CONCEPT MARKETING) P4 (MOD P3 NEW) P5 (TIME P1 1906)
S15	But the paper and merchandising activities alone did not provide sufficient funds for the WSPU to meet organisational costs, so numerous other fund-raising activities combined to fill the coffers of the 'war chest'.	P1 (PROVIDE PAPER/MERCHANDISING-ACTIVITY FUND) P2 (AMOUNT-OF FUND SUFFICIENT) P3 (NEGATE P2) P4 (FOR P3 WSPU) P5 (TO P4 P6) P6 (MEET WSPU COSTS) P7 (MOD COSTS ORGANISATIONAL) P8 (SO P3 P9) P9 (COBINE \$ FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY) P10 (MOD FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY OTHER) P11 (NUMBER-OF P10 NUMEROUS) P12 (IN-ORDER-TO P9 P13) P13 (FILL FUND-RAISING-ACTIVITY COFFER) P14 (POSSESS WAR-CHEST COFFER)
S16	The most notable of these was the Woman's Exhibition, which took place in 1909 in a Knightsbridge ice-skating rink, and in 10 days raised the equivalent of £250,000 today.	P1 (MOD FUNDRAISING-ACTIVITY NOTABLE) P2 (MOD NOTABLE MOST) P3 (REF P1 EXHIBITION) P4 (LABEL EXHIBITION WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION) P5 (TAKE-PLACE WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION) P6 (TIME WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION 1909) P7 (IN P5 ICE-SKATING-RINK) P8 (IN P5/ICE-SKATING-RINK KNIGHTSBRIDGE) P9 (RAISE WOMAN'S-EXHIBITION MONEY) P10 (AMOUNT-OF MONEY EQUIVALENT-OF-£250,000) P11(TIME P10 TODAY)



Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S17	Nowadays, the Museum of London has a large, visual exhibition of the suffragette movement, with a huge number of items on show.	P1 (POSSESS MUSEUM EXHIBITION) P2 (TIME P1 NOWADAYS) P3 (LABEL MUSEUM MUSEUM-OF-LONDON) P4 (MOD EXHIBITION LARGE) P5 (MOD EXHIBITION VISUAL) P6 (MOD EXHIBITION SUFFRAGETTE-MOVEMENT) P7 (WITH EXHIBITION ITEM) P8 (RATE-OF ITEM NUMBER) P9 (AMOUNT-OF NUMBER HUGE) P10 (ON ITEM SHOW)
S18	Against a quiet background hum of street sounds, copies of The Suffragette, campaign banners and photographs are all on display, together with one of Mrs Pankhurst's shoes and a number of purple, white and green trinkets.	P1 (DISPLAY \$ COPY/BANNER/PHOTOGRAPH/SHOE/TRINKET) P2 (AGAINST P1 STREET-SOUND) P3 (MOD STREET-SOUND BACKGROUND-HUM) P4 (MOD BACKGROUND-HUM QUIET) P5 (MOD COPY THE-SUFFRAGETTE) P6 (MOD BANNER CAMPAIGN) P7 (POSSESS MRS-PANKHURST SHOE) P8 (NUMBER-OF SHOE ONE) P9 (MOD TRINKET PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S19	<p>Photographs depict vivid scenes of a suffragette's life: WSPU members on a self-proclaimed 'monster' march, wearing their official uniforms of a white frock decorated with purple, white and green accessories; women selling The Suffragette at street corners, or chalking up pavements with details of a forthcoming meeting.</p>	<p>P1 (DEPICT PHOTOGRAPH SCENE)  P2 (MOD SECENE VIVID)  P3 (ABOUT SCENE LIFE)  P4 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE LIFE)  P5 (EXAMPLE-OF P1 P6)  P6 (WEAR MEMBER UNIFORM)  P7 (MOD MEMBER WSPU)  P8 (ON P6 MARCH)  P9 (MOD MARCH MONSTER)  P10 (MOD P9 SELF-PROCLAIMED)  P11 (MOD UNIFORM OFFICIAL)  P12 (POSSESS WSPU P11)  P13 (IS UNIFORM FROCK)  P14 (MOD FROCK WHITE/DECORATED)  P15 (WITH DECORATED ACCESSORY)  P16 (MOD ACCESSORY PURPLE/WHITE/GREEN)  P17 (EXAMPLE-OF P1 P18)  P18 (SELL WOMAN NEWSPAPER)  P19 (LABEL NEWSPAPER THE-SUFFRAGETTE)  P20 (ON P18 STREET-CORNER)  P21 (EXAMPLE-OF P1 P22)  P22 (CHALK-UP WOMAN PAVEMENT)  P23 (WITH P22 DETAILS)  P24 (POSSESS MEETING DETAIL)  P25 (MOD MEETING FORTHCOMING)</p>

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S20	Windows display postcards and greeting cards designed by women artists for the movement, and the quality of the artwork indicates the wealth of resources the WSPU could call on from its talented members.	P1 (DISPLAY WINDOW POSTCARD/GREETING-CARD) P2 (DESIGN ARTIST POSTCARD/GREETING-CARD) P3 (MOD ARTIST WOMAN) P4 (FOR P2 MOVEMENT) P5 (INDICATE QUALITY WEALTH) P6 (POSSESS ARTWORK QUALITY) P7 (POSSESS RESOURCE WEALTH) P8 (MOD RESOURCE P9) P9 (ABLE-TO WSPU P10) P10 (CALL-ON WSPU RESOURCE) P11 (FROM P11 MEMBER) P12 (MOD MEMBER TALLENTED) P13 (POSSESS WSPU P12)
S21	Visitors can watch a short film made up of old newsreels and cinema material which clearly reveals the political mood of the day towards the suffragettes.	P1 (ABLE-TO VISITOR P2) P2 (WATCH VISITOR FILM) P3 (MOD FILM SHORT) P4 (MOD P3 P5) P5 (MAKE-UP-OF FILM NEWSREEL/CINEMA-MATERIAL) P6 (MOD NEWSREEL/CINEMA-MATERIAL OLD) P7 (REVEAL FILM MOOD) P8 (MOD REVEAL CLEAR) P9 (MOD MOOD POLITICAL) P10 (POSSESS DAY P9) P11 (TOWARDS P9 SUFFRAGETTE)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S22	The programme begins with a short film devised by the 'antis' - those opposed to women having the vote - depicting a suffragette as a fierce harridan bullying her poor, abused husband.	P1 (BEGIN PROGRAMME) P2 (WITH P1 FILM) P3 (MOD FILM SHORT) P4 (MOD P3 P5) P5 (DEVISE ANTI FILM) P6 (REF ANTI P7) P7 (OPPOSE-TO ANTI P8) P8 (POSSESS WOMAN VOTE) P9 (DEPICT FILM SUFFRAGETTE) P10 (MOD SUFFRAGETTE FIERCE-HARRIDAN) P11 (BULLY SUFFRAGETTE HUSBAND) P12 (MOD HUSBAND POOR) P13 (MOD HUSBAND ABUSED) P14 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE HUSBAND)
S23	Original newsreel footage shows the suffragette Emily Wilding Davison throwing herself under King George V's horse at a famous race.	P1 (SHOW FOOTAGE P10) P2 (MOD FOOTAGE NEWSREEL) P3 (MOD P2 ORIGINAL) P4 (THROW SUFFRAGETTE SUFFRAGETTE) P5 (LABEL SUFFRAGETTE EMILY-WILDING-DAVISON) P7 (UNDER P4 HORSE) P8 (POSSESS KING HORSE) P9 (LABEL KING KING-GEORGE-V) P10 (AT P7 RACE) P11 (MOD RACE FAMOUS)

Sentence number	Text	Propositional analysis
S24	Although the exhibition officially charts the years 1906 to 1914, graphic display boards outlining the bills of enfranchisement of 1918 and 1928, which gave the adult female populace of Britain the vote, show what was achieved.	P1 (ALTHOUGH P2 P4) P2 (CHART EXHIBITION PERIOD) P2 (MOD CHART OFFICIAL) P3 (DURATION-OF PERIOD 1906-TO-1914) P4 (SHOW GRAPHIC-DISPLAY-BOARD ACHIEVEMENT) P5 (POSSESS WSPU ACHIEVEMENT) P6 (OUTLINE GRAPHIC-DISPLAY-BOARD BILL-OF-ENFRANCHISEMENT) P7 (TIME BILL-OF-ENFRANCHISEMENT 1918/1928) P8 (GIVE BILL-OF-ENFRANCHISEMENT VOTE) P9 (TO VOTE FEMALE-POPULACE) P10 (MOD FEMALE-POPULANCE ADULT) P11 (POSSESS BRITAIN FEMALE-POPULACE)
S25	It demonstrates how advanced the suffragettes were in their thinking, in the marketing of their campaign, and in their work as shrewd and skilful image-builders.	P1 (DEMONSTRATE EXHIBITION P2) P2 (MOD THINKING/MARKETING/WORK ADVANCED) P3 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE THINKING) P4 (POSSESS CAMPAIGN MARKETING) P5 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE WORK) P6 (REF WORK IMAGE-BUILDER) P7 (MOD IMAGE-BUILDER SHREWD/SKILFUL)
S26	It also conveys a sense of the energy and ability the suffragettes brought to their fight for freedom and equality.	P1 (CONVEY EXHIBITION SENSE) P2 (OF SENSE ENERGY/ABILITY) P3 (MOD ENERGY/ABILITY P4) P4 (BRING SUFFRAGETTE ENERGY/ABILITY) P5 (TO P4 FIGHT) P6 (POSSESS SUFFRAGETTE FIGHT) P7 (FOR FIGHT FREEDOM/EQUALITY)
S27	And it illustrates the intelligence employed by women who were at that time deemed by several politicians to have “brains too small to know how to vote.”	P1 ILLUSTRATE EXHIBITION P2 P2 EMPLOY WOMEN INTELLIGENCE P3 DEEM POLITICIAN P7 P4 NUMBER-OF POLITICIAN SEVERAL P5 TIME P3 AT-THE-TIME P6 POSSESS WOMEN INTELLIGENCE-TO-VOTE P7 NEGATE P6

## **Appendix F –The semi-structured interview schedules**

### **First phase interview schedule:**

1. Hány éves vagy?
2. Mióta tanulsz angolul?
3. Milyen formában tanultál angolul ebben az időszakban?
4. Tanultál-e valaha olvasási stratégiákról, vagy arról, hogy hogyan dolgozz fel egy szöveget egy szövegértési feladat során?
5. Mi alapján alakítottad ki azt a módszert, amivel feldolgozol egy szöveget?
6. Kellette-e valaha az imént megoldott olvasási feladathoz hasonlót megoldanod?
7. Tanultál-e valaha tömörítésről?
8. Kellett-e valaha tömörítési feladatokat megoldanod (szóban vagy írásban)?
9. Van esetleg bármi egyéb olyan az említett témákkal kapcsolatban amit fontosnak találsz de még nem beszéltünk róla?

### **English translation:**

1. How old are you?
2. How long have you been learning English?
3. How have you been learning English during this period?
4. Have you ever received any instruction/training about reading strategies or how to process a text in reading comprehension task?
5. How did you develop your current text processing methods?
6. Have you ever encountered any tasks which were similar to the one you have just completed?
7. Have you ever received any instruction/training about summarisation?
8. Have you ever had to do any summarisation tasks (oral or written)?
9. Is there anything else you find important in connection with the topics we discussed that we have not talked about yet?

### **Second phase interview schedule:**

1. A feladatmegoldással kapcsolatban csináltál bármit másképp mint a félév elején? Amennyiben igen, akkor mit?
2. Változott-e bármiben az ahogyan egy szöveget feldolgozol a félév elejéhez képest? Amennyiben igen, akkor miben?
3. Volt szó olvasási stratégiákról vagy tömörítésről bármelyik másik egyetemi órán? Amennyiben igen, akkor melyiken?
4. Van esetleg bármi egyéb olyan az említett témákkal kapcsolatban amit fontosnak találsz de még nem beszéltünk róla?

### **English translation:**

1. What do you think you did differently when executing the tasks compared to the beginning of the semester?
2. Have you noticed any differences in your text processing methods compared to the beginning of the semester? If yes, what?
3. Have you received any instruction/training related to reading strategies or summarisation skills in any other university classes? If yes, which course was it?
4. Is there anything else you find important in connection with the topics we discussed that we have not talked about yet?

