Research Paper   Open Access

The Comparative Study on the Reading performance on Linear and Non – Linear Text of Grade 11 Students of President Ramon Magsaysay State University, IBA Main Campus A.Y. 2018 – 2019

Echaure, Pauline Fortin
President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Philippines

 ABSTRACT : This study aimed to compare the reading performance on linear and non – linear texts of 140 Grade 11 students of President Ramon Magsaysay State University during S.Y. 2018-2019. The study was limited to the reading comprehension and analysis of ideas of students in reading and interpreting texts. The reading texts of the respondents prepared by the researcher were used in this study and the analysis of the outputs was used in the data gathering needed in this research work. The work text was evaluated by ten English Teachers, as the teacher-respondents. The study revealed that the levels of reading performance of students before the intervention were rated as "did not meet expectation" in linear text and "fairly satisfactory" in non – linear text. The researcher developed a work text in the form of Non-Linear and Linear texts where teacher-respondents assessed it as "very valid" and "very usable" with the help of different indicators. The level of reading of students in linear and non – linear text assessments after the intervention were both rated as "outstanding". There is a significant difference on the level of reading performance of linear text readers and non - linear text readers between the pre-test and post-test assessments. Based on the summary of the investigations conducted and the conclusions arrived at, the researcher offered the following recommendations; the use of Work text which provides more illustrations, graphic organizers, diagrams, and drawings is strongly encouraged for better academic achievement and reading performance of students; the development of work text for Non-Linear reading should be properly and carefully planned and the aesthetic principles are considered for the appreciation of the readers; an in-service training especially for English teachers for capability building across all courses in the development of work text is strongly recommended; and finally, a parallel or similar study with in-depth and wider scope so as to validate the findings obtained in the study should be conducted.

KEYWORDS: *linear texts, non – linear texts, reading comprehension*

I.   INTRODUCTION

Reading is the complex cognitive process of decoding symbols to derive meaning. It is difficult to imagine a world without books and other kinds of reading material. If it not had been for Johann Gutenberg's invention of the movable letters for printing, students would not be able to enjoy such a wide array of reading materials today. It has been said that reading is exercise for the mind, this is because reading provides more input and stimulates the mind. Reading also improves a person's command of a language.

Hence, this research would concentrate on an investigation of the effects of the text selection on students' reading performance when reading linear and non - linear texts particularly in English as a Second Language (ESL) context. This area is chosen to be explored as it is hoped that the results found may be helpful for future researchers and academicians who are teaching Second Language Learners. In addition, research in this area is important in discovering the effective mode to ensure teaching and learning reading takes place effectively.

It is realized that reading habits tend to decline gradually and this has negative implications for youngsters and learners from different school levels. Lack of interest in reading, poor reading habits and negative attitudes towards reading, the success and failure of reading performance are affected by text selection. Hence, styles of teaching reading need to be modified to ensure effectiveness. Learners tend to frown upon reading; presumably their teachers' teaching strategy do not change the traditional type of reading activities or texts. Therefore, learners are equipped with the same boring techniques or presented with the same monotonous style of reading of reading passage and activities extracted from text books that are normally done in Philippine classroom

settings. This only implies that reading texts may play an important role in influencing students' reading performance.

This study aimed to compare the effects of linear and non – linear texts on the reading performance of Grade 11 students of President Ramon Magsaysay State University.

Specifically, it targeted to answer the following questions:
1. What is the level of reading performance of students before the intervention of:
    a. Linear text; and
    b. Non – Linear text?
2. What possible Instructional Material can be devised to improve the reading performance of students?
3. How is the Instructional Material evaluated by the teachers in terms of:
    a. usability; and,
    b. validity?
4. What is the level of reading performance of students after the intervention of:
    a. Linear text; and
    b. Non – Linear text?
5. Is there a significant difference on the reading performance of students in linear and non – linear texts before and after the intervention?

II. FIGURES AND TABLES

1. Level of Reading Performance on Linear and Non-Linear Texts in the Pre-Test Assessment (before the intervention)

Table 1 shows the Level of Reading Performance on Linear and Non – Linear Text readers in the Pre-test assessment before the intervention.

Table 1
Level of Reading Performance on Linear and Non - Linear
Texts in the Pre – Test Assessment

PRE-TEST	LINEAR				NON- LINEAR		
Grading Scale	Qualitative Interpretation	Raw Score	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Raw Score	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Below 75	Did not Meet Expectation	0 - 24	95	67.90	0-24	42	30.00
75 - 79	Fairly Satisfactory	25 - 29	44	31.40	25 - 29	57	40.70
80 – 84	Satisfactory	30 - 34	1	0.70	30 - 34	40	28.60
85 - 89	Very Satisfactory	35 - 39	0	0.00	35 - 39	1	0.70
90 – 100	Outstanding	40 - 50	0	0.00	40 - 50	0	0.00
	Total		140	100		140	100.00
	Mean	22.61			26.50		
	Interpretation	Did not Meet Expectation			Fairly Satisfactory		

In the pre-test for linear text, out of one hundred forty (140) respondents, ninety five (95) got below 75 transmuted grade with an equivalent percentage of 67.9 which means the initial grades of the respondents based on their scores in the pre- assessment given were ranging from 0 – 24 which means student did not meet expectation. Forty – four (44) students got 25 – 29 raw scores which was interpreted as "fairly satisfactory" and has a grading scale of 75 – 79, and 1 student got 30 – 34 scores in the given assessment which was interpreted as "satisfactory" with a grading scale ranging from 80 – 84. The computed overall weighted mean of the performance of students in pre – test in linear text was 22.61 with qualitative interpretation of "Did not meet expectation".

In the pre-test for non – linear text, out of one hundred forty (140) students, 42 (or 30%) got scores ranging from 0 – 24 which was below 75 transmuted grade, interpreted as "did not meet expectation". Fifty seven (57) students (or 40.70%) got 75 – 79 grading scale, interpreted as "fairly satisfactory", with raw score

ranging from 25 – 29. Forty (40) (or 28.6%) of students got 80 – 84 transmuted grade, interpreted as "satisfactory" with scores ranging from 30 – 34 and 1 (or 0.70%) got a score ranging from 35 - 39corresponding to the scale of 85 – 89 interpreted as "very satisfactory". The computed overall weighted mean of the performance of students in pre – test in non - linear text was 26.50 with qualitative interpretation of "fairly satisfactory".

Assessment on the Effectiveness of Work Text for Non-Linear and Linear Text Reading.
Validity

Table 2 shows the assessment on the effectiveness of the work text for non-linear and linear reading text as to Validity.

Table 2 : Assessment on the Effectiveness of the Work text for Non-Linear and Linear Text Reading as to Validity

N=10

	Validity	WM	QI	Rank
1	The instructions are easy to understand and straightforward	4	Very Valid	2
2	The task encourages learners to apply classroom learning to the real – world.	3.5	Very Valid	5
3	Subject matter is clearly stated.	4	Very Valid	2
4	The task enhances students' critical thinking	3.8	Very Valid	4
5	Wordings are clear to read and understand.	4	Very Valid	2
	Overall weighted Mean	3.86	Very Valid	

The teacher-respondents assessed the work text instructional material "very valid". The three indicators namely: 1.) the instructions are easy to understand and straightforward, 2.) the subject matter is clearly stated and, 3.) the wordings are clear to read and understand had computed weighted mean of 4.00 which ranked 2nd. The second indicator, the tasks encouraged learners to apply classroom learning to the real world, has weighted mean of 3.5 which ranked 5th. The computed overall weighted mean on the responses towards validity of the work text was 3.86 with qualitative interpretation of "very valid".

Usability

Table 3 shows the assessment on the effectiveness of the work text for non-linear and linear text reading as to Usability.

Table 3 : Assessment on the Effectiveness of the Work text for Non-Linear And Linear Text Reading as to Usability

N=10

	Usability	Weighted Mean	Qualitative Interpretation	Rank
1	The goals of the task are obvious to: (a) Teachers (b) Students	4	Very Useful	2
2	The tasks are appropriate to the learners' communicative needs.	4	Very Useful	2
3	The task reflects a real – world pedagogic rationale.	3.8	Very Useful	5
4	The tasks are easy to check.	4	Very Useful	2
5	The task is likely to be interesting and motivating to the students.	3.9	Very Useful	4
	Overall weighted Mean	3.94	Very Useful	

The teacher-respondents assessed the work text as "very useful". The three indicators, namely: 1.) the goals of the tasks are obvious between teachers and students, 2.) the tasks are appropriate to the learners' communicative needs, and 4.) the tasks are easy to check, gathered a computed weighted mean of 4.00 which ranked 2nd while least on the third indicator, tasks reflect a real-world pedagogic rationale, with mean of 3.80

which was ranked as 5th. The computed overall weighted mean on the responses towards usability of the work text was 3.94 with qualitative interpretation of "very useful".

Level of Reading Performance on Linear and Non - Linear Texts in the Post-Test Assessment (after the intervention)

Table 4 shows the Level of Reading Performance on Linear and Non-Linear Text readers in the Post-Test Assessment.

Table 4 : Level of Reading Performance of Linear and Non-Linear
Text Readers in the Post – Test Assessment

POST-TEST			LINEAR			NON- LINEAR	
Grading Scale	Qualitative Interpretation	Raw Score	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Raw Score	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Below 75	Did not Meet Expectation	0 - 24	0	0.00	0-24	0	0.00
75 - 79	Fairly Satisfactory	25 - 29	0	0.00	25 - 29	0	0.00
80 – 84	Satisfactory	30 - 34	0	0.00	30 - 34	0	0.00
85 - 89	Very Satisfactory	35 - 39	4	2.90	35 - 39	0	0.00
90 – 100	Outstanding	40 - 50	136	97.10	40 - 50	140	100.00
	Total		140	100.00		140	100.00
	Mean		44.45			47.76	
	Interpretation		Outstanding			Outstanding	

In the post-test for linear text, out of one hundred forty (140) students, 136 (or 97.1%) of the students obtained raw scores ranging from 40 – 50, equivalent to thetransmuted grading scale of 90 – 100 interpreted as "outstanding". Four (4) (or 2.9%) had raw scores ranging from 35 – 39 with transmuted grading scale of 85 – 89, interpreted as "very satisfactory". The computed overall weighted mean for post-test assessment in linear text was 44.45 which has a qualitative interpretation of "outstanding".

In the post-test for non - linear text, one hundred forty (140) respondents (or 100%) got 90 – 100 transmuted grading scale based on their scores ranging from 40 – 50, interpreted as "outstanding". The computed overall weighted mean for post - test assessment in non-linear text was 47.76 which has a qualitative interpretation of "outstanding".

Test of Difference in Reading Performance Between Pre-test and Post-Test Assessments
5.1 Linear Text Reading

Table 5 shows the t-test to determine difference on the results of pre-test and post-test assessments in linear text reading.
Taylor (2011), on the other hand, showed that
digital and printed text were equally effective for students' learning outcomes, arguing that the complexity of the material, interaction with the different formats, and extended memory retention did not make a difference on reading comprehension scores.

Table 5: t-test to determine difference on the results of pre-test and post-test assessments in linear text reading

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test linear	22.6143	140	3.71771	.31420
	Post – test linear	44.4500	140	2.33314	.19719

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pre – test linear	-21.84	4.25214	0.35937	-22.54626	-21.1252	-60.8	139	0
	post-test linear								

There is a significant difference on the performance of the students in the pre-test and post-test assessments in linear text reading manifested on the computed Significant or P-value of 0.000 which is lower than(<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance. Therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected.
Taylor (2011), on the other hand, showed that
digital and printed text were equally effective for students' learning outcomes, arguing that the complexity of the material, interaction with the different formats, and extended memory retention did not make a difference on reading comprehension scores.
retention did not make a difference on reading comprehension scores.

Non - Linear Text Reading
Table 6 shows the t-test to determine difference on the results of pre-test and post –test assessments in non - linear text reading.

Table 6 :t-test to determine difference on the results of pre-test and post – test assessments in non - linear text reading

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	pre-test nonlinear	26.5000	140	4.77629	.40367
	post – test nonlinear	47.7571	140	1.59978	.13521

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
pre-test nonlinear post – test nonlinear	-21.25714	5.23460	.44240	-22.13185	-20.38243	-48.049	139	.000

There is significant difference on the performance of the students in the pre-test and post-test assessment using the non - linear text manifested on the computed Significant or P-value of 0.000 which is lower than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the summary of findings, the researcher concluded that: the level of reading performance before the intervention in linear texts was interpreted as did not meet expectation and fairly satisfactory in the non – linear texts; the researcher developed a work text in the form of Non-Linear and Linear texts; the work text in reading linear and non – linear text was assessed very valid and very usable by the teacher – respondents; the level of reading performance on linear and non – linear texts in the post-test assessment after the intervention were both rated as "outstanding., and; there is significant difference on the level performance of linear text readers and Non - Linear text readers between the pre-test and post-test assessments.

REFERENCES

[1]. Abraham &Mcdonald (2011). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research . https://instr.iastate.libguides.com/c.php?g=49332&p=318076

[2]. Ain Nadzimah, A. & Chan, S. H. (2006). Shaping reading tasks for the MUET: Developing the craft. http://www.melta.org.my/ET/2006/2006_7.pdf. (accessed 12/2/2010).

[3]. Albesher, Khaled Besher (2012) Developing the Reading Skills of ESL Students Through Collaborative Learning Strategy

[4]. Amadieu, F., Tricot, A., &Mariné, C. (2010). Interaction between prior knowledge and concept-map structure on hypertext comprehension, coherence of reading orders and disorientation. Interacting with Computers, 22(2), 88-97. doi:10.1016/j.intcom.2009.07.001

[5]. Blaire, Sheena H. "Techniques for Effective Writing". Research Information. New York, Volume 45, 2001

[6]. Boechler, P. M. (2001). How spatial is hyperspace?Interacting with hypertextdocuments: cognitive processes and concepts. Cyber Psychology& Behavior, 4,23e46.

[7]. Bransford, J., & Johnson, M. K. (2015) Contextual prerequisites for understanding: Some investigations of comprehension and recall. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11*, 717-726.

[8]. Brusilovsky, P. (2003) Adaptive navigation support in educational hypermedia: The role of student knowledge level and the case for meta-adaptation. British Journal of Educational Technology, 34 (4), 487-497

[9]. Çakmak, E. &Altun, A. (2008). İlköğretimöğrencilerininhipermetinselokumasüreçlerininincelenmesi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim FakültesiDergisi, 34, 63-74

[10]. Charney, D. (1987). Comprehending non-linear text: The role of discourse cues and reading strategies. In J. Smith & F. Halasz (Eds.) Hypertext 87 Proceedings (pp.109-120). New York: Association for Computing Machinery

[11]. Coiro, J. (2011). Predicting Reading comprehension on the internet: Contributions ofoffline Reading skills, online Reading skills, and prior knowledge. Journal ofLiteracy Research: A Publication of the Literacy Research Association, 43(4)

[12]. Coiro, J., Castek, J., &Guzniczak, E. (2011). Uncovering online reading comprehension processes: two adolescents reading independently and collaboratively onthe Internet. Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association, 60, 354e369.

[13]. Coiro, J., &Dobler, E. (2007). Exploring the online reading comprehension strategiesused by sixth-grade skilled readers to search for and locate information on the Internet.

[14]. Corpuz, Brenda B. and Paz I. Lucido(2008). Educational Technology 1. Qezon City, Metro Manila: Lorimar Publishing, Inc.

[15]. Davis, D. S., &Neitzel, C. (2012). Collaborative sense-making in print anddigitaltextenvironments. Reading and Writing, 25(4), 831e856. http://doi.org/10.1007/

[16]. Denton, C. A., Wolters, C. A., (2015). Adolescent's use of reading comprehension strategies: Differences related to reading pro-ficiency, grade level, and gender. Learning and Individual Differences, 37, 81-95. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2014.11.016

[17]. Denton, C. A., Barth, A. E., Fletcher, J. M., Wexler, J., Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Romain, M., & Francis, D. J. (2011). The relations among oral and silent reading and comprehension in middle school: Implications for identification and instruction of students with reading difficulties. Scientific Studies of Reading, 15(2), 109-135

[18]. Francisco, Apolo S. et. al, Effective Study and Thinking Skills (A Textbook in Communication Arts I). TCS Publishing House, 2010.

[19]. Goldman, S. R., & Murray, J. D. (1992). Knowledge of connectors and as cohesion devices in text: A comparative study of native-english and english-as-a-second-language speakers. Journal of Educational Psychology, (84), 504-519

[20]. Goldman, S. R., & Murray, J. D. (1992). Knowledge of connectors and as cohesion devices in text: A comparative study of native-english and english-as-a-second-language speakers. Journal of Educational Psychology, (84), 504-519

[21]. Goldman, S. R., & Murray, J. D. (1992). Knowledge of connectors and as cohesion devices in text: A comparative study of native-english and english-as-a-second-language speakers. Journal of Educational Psychology, (84), 504-519.

[22]. Gourgey, A. F. (1998). Metacognition in basic skills instruction. Instructional Scien

[23]. Fukuyama, Y. (2006). Effects of Contextual Visuals as Advance Organizers on 2L Reading Comprehension.

[24]. Goldman, S. R. (2012)Knowledge of connectors and as cohesion devices in text. A comparative study of native english and english as second language speakers. Journal Educational Psychology

[25]. Goodman K. 1988. The reading process. In Carrell, Devine, and Eskey 1988,11 – 21

[26]. Güneş, F. (2009). Ekranokumadaverimlilik. KalkınmadaAnahtarVerimlilikGazetesi, Milli ProdüktiviteMerkeziAylıkYayınOrganı. 248, 26-28 Ford, N. & Chen, S.

[27]. Guthrie, L.F. & Wang H.S. (2004). Ethnographic Approaches to Reading Research in P.D. Pearson (Ed.) Handbook of Reading Research. New York: Longman.

[28]. Hibbing, A. N., Rankin – Erickson, J. L. (2003). A picture is worth a thousand words; Using visual images to improve comprehension for middle school struggling readers, the reading teacher, 56(8), 758.

[29]. Hutchinson, T., and A. Waters. *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987.

[30]. Kieras, D. E. (2010) The role of major referents and sentence topic in the construction of passage macrostructure. *Discourse Processes, 4*, 1-15

[31]. Kintsch, W. (1998) Comprehension: A Paradigm for Cognition. Cambridge University Press.

[32]. Ladia, Agnes P., et. al. (2007) Study and Thinking Skills towards English Proficiency. Malabon, City

[33]. Lawless, K. A., & Schrader, P. G. (2008). Where do we go now? Understandingresearch on navigation in complex digital environments. In D. J. Leu, & J. Coiro(Eds.), Handbook of new literacies (pp. 267e296). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erl-

[34]. Levy, S. (2007, November 26). The future of reading. Newsweek. Retrieved January 18, 2009, from www.newsweek.com/id/70983/output/print

[35]. Linguagem and Ensino, Reading Theories and Implications for the processing of Linear Texts and Hypertext, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2004

[36]. Lorch, R. F., & Chen, A. H. (1986). Effects of number signals on reading and recall. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*, 263-279.

[37]. Mateos, M., Villalon, R., de Dios, M.J. and Martin, E. (2007) Reading and writing tasks on different university degree courses: what do the students say they do? Studies in Higher Education, 32.4, 489-510

[38]. Mayer, R. E. (2005). Multimedia learning: Are we asking the right questions? Educational Psychologist, 32, 1-19

[39]. McAdams, M., & Berger, S. (2001). Hypertexts. Journal of Electronic Publishing, 6(3).

[40]. Mikulecky, Beatrice S. 2008. Teaching Reading in a Second Language. Pearson Education, Inc.

[41]. M. F. Patel, English Language Teaching (Jaipur: Sunrise Publisher, 2010, p. 113

[42]. Naumann, J. (2010, May). Predicting comprehension of electronic Reading tasks: theimpact of computer skills and Reading literacy. In Paper presented at the annualconference of the american educational research association (AERA) (Denver, CO).

[43]. Naumann, J., Richter, T., Christmann, U., &Groeben, N. (2008). Working memorycapacity and reading skill moderate the effectiveness of strategy training inlearning from hypertext. Learning and Individual Differences, 18(2), 197e213

[44]. PanayiotaKendeou, Krista R. Muis and Sandra Fulton. (2011). Reader and text factors in reading comprehension processes. Journal of Research in Reading, 34. 4, 365–383

[45]. Perfetti, C. A., & Roth, S. (1981). Some of the interactive processes in reading and their role in reading skill. In A. Lesgold& C. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[46]. Rahman. (2010). The Effects of Linear and Non-linear Text on Students' Performance in Reading.Malaysia.http://www.fp.utm.my/epusatsumber/pdffail/ptkghdfwp2/p_2010_10230_f700624c3 b8546e7ac912f98d8d91957.pdf. (accessed 2/4/2016)

[47]. Rouet, J.-F. (2006). The skills of document use: From text comprehension to web-basedlearning. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[48]. Rouet, J.-F., & Britt, M. A. (2011). Relevance processes in multiple documentcomprehension. In M. T. McCrudden, J. Magliano, & G. Schraw (Eds.), Textrelevance and learning from text (pp. 19e52). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing

[49]. Rovet, J. – F (2006). The skills of document use: from text comprehension to web – based learning.

[50]. Rovet, J – F & Britt, M. A. (2011). Relevance Processes in Multiple Document Comprehension. Text Relevance and Learning from Text

[51]. Salmeron, L., Canas, J. J., Kintsch, W., & Fajardo, I. (2005). Reading strategies andhypertext comprehension. Discourse Processes, 40(3), 171e19l.http://doi.org/10.1207/s15326950dp4003_1.

[52]. Salmerón, L., & García, V. (2011). Reading skills and children's navigation strategies in hypertext. Computers in Human Behavior, 27(3), 1143–1151. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.12.008

[53]. Samuels, S.J., & Farstrup, A.E. (2011).What research has to say about reading instruction (4th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association

[54]. Sharifah Amani Binti Syed Abdul Rahman. (2010). The Effects of Linear and Non-linear Text on Students' Performance in Reading. ME Thesis,UniversitiTeknologi Malaysia.http://www.fp.utm.my/epusatsumber/pdffail/ptkghdfwp2/p_2010_10230_f700624c3b8546e7 ac912f98d8d91957.pdf. (accessed 2/4/2016)

[55]. Smith, F. 1994. Understanding Reading 5ᵗʰ ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

[56]. Taylor, A. K. (2011). Students learn equally well from digital as from paperbound texts. Teaching of Psychology,

[57]. 38(4), 278-281. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0098628311421330

[58]. Taylor, A. K. (2011). Students learn equally well from digital as from paperbound texts. Teaching of Psychology, 38(4), 278-281. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0098628311421330

[59]. Taylor, A. K. (2011). Students learn equally well from digital as from paperbound texts. Teaching of Psychology38(4),278-281. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0098628311421330

[60]. The Philippine Star (2010) http://theconversation.com/why-students-need-more-math-talk-104034

[61]. Walsh, M. (2010). Multimodal literacy: what does it mean for classroom practice? Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 33(3), 211-239.

[62]. Wang, J. H., & Guthrie, J. T. (2004). Modeling the Effects of Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, Amount of Reading and Past Reading Achievement on Text Comprehension between U.S. and Chinese Students. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*

[63]. Wyse, D. (2006). The good writing guide for education students. London: Sage   Publishing.

[64]. Villamin, Arceli M., et. al. (2000) Interpreting Graphics, Developmental Reading I