

INNOVATIONS

Content available on Google Scholar

Home Page: www.journal-innovations.com

Assessment of Students' Reading Comprehension Status: The Instance of Grade Eight Students at Mangudo Primary School

Yonas Yohannes Koyra

Ammanuel Berhanu Jarssa

Lecturers in Bule Hora University,

Department of English Language and Literature

Bule Hora, Ethiopia

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess students' reading comprehension status in Mangudo primary school with a reference to grade eight which has 211 students within five sections. It particularly treats students' reading comprehension skills initiatives and practices for checking their reading comprehension status. It has employed a survey descriptive research design with 70 simple random sampled students. The result revealed that there is remarkable and solid progress after the intervention of consecutive reading strategies-based instructions. Almost all of the students have improved their reading comprehension skills status through reading comprehension strategies that help them to tackle the problem like lack of basic and inadequate knowledge of English which results in serious errors in reading comprehension. Some of them achieved complete realization of reading comprehension while the majority remain non-basic and not many errors.

Keywords: 1 Comprehension status 2 reading comprehension 3 reading strategies

Introduction

1. Background

Reading skills, is one of the language macro-skills, it is the ability to acquire information from optical and orthographic texts, encompasses reading micro-skills required for skillful reading such as discriminating main ideas, understanding sequence, noticing specific details, making inferences, making comparisons and making predictions (Jack and Richard, 2002a). As reading is looking up a written text for understanding its contents and messages, it is an effort of effective readers to identify information implied in symbols, pictures, graphs, letters, words, phrases, clauses, and sentences by perceiving with eyes over the surface of pages. It has, also, been defined as perceiving a written text to understand its contents silently and saying a written text out loud or through oral reading (Jack and Richard, 2002b). These authors further asserted that reading comprehension is the identification of the intended meaning of written communication. They added that theories of comprehension emphasize an active process drawing both the information contained in the existing message and background knowledge. Thus, they started reading comprehension as a result of observing the written message into the readers' minds.

Reading comprehension requires using different reading strategies; such strategies are specific procedures of attempting to gain adequate information from a text. Wallace (1992) said since we read for different purposes, we have to tackle different texts in different ways. This implies different reading strategies are used for different reading purposes, and they enhance comprehension of a reading text. Hence, if students use a single method for different texts, they may fail to understand well so that it is wasting of time. Instead, reading strategies or different techniques of accessing meanings from a text, which are employed fixable and selectively in the course of reading should be used. Such strategies, for instance, are skimming to keep main ideas in mind, scanning for specific items, numbers, or dates in the text, guessing unknown words from context, and stopping and re-reading when students do not understand the text (Jack and Richard, 2002c). Reading comprehension strategies are the sequences of procedures readers are encouraged to use to help understand texts as Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review technique (Jack and Richard, 2002d). These reading comprehension strategies are often included in three reading activity stages: **pre-reading** consisting of previewing, setting purposes for reading, etc; **while reading** consists of monitoring comprehension, adjusting purposes, using specific strategies like guessing, skimming, scanning, etc; and **post-reading** consisting summarizing, evaluating text, etc.

Students who took reading achievement tests for checking their reading comprehension skills have been allowed to demonstrate their ability to read textbooks, learned articles, and other sources of information relevant to academic education. They are expected to

show that they can use one or more of the following reading skills which were proposed by Alderson et al., (1995). Such reading skills are as specific reading strategies as (a) skimming, (b) scanning, (c) getting the gist, (d) distinguishing the main ideas from supporting detail, (e) distinguishing fact from opinion, (f) distinguishing statement from example, (g) deducing implicit ideas and information, (h) deducing the use of unfamiliar words from context, (i) understanding relations within the sentence, (j) understanding relations across sentences and paragraphs, and (k) understanding the communicative function of sentences and paragraphs.

Bussmann (1996) described reading as analytic-synthetic process in which series of written signs are converted through interpretation into information. Pirozzolo and Wittrock (1981) asserted reading as a sensual reconstruction of a complex neurophysiological process in which the optic-perceptive and articulatory components function more or less simultaneously with the perception of lexical meanings and the recognition of syntactic structures. Garner and Bochna (2004) showed beginner readers are capable to transfer information through activities they are exposed to with the repeated presentation, explanation, teacher modeling, and questioning of strategies. Williams et al., (2004) found text structure, content familiarity, and reading comprehension ability affect students' performance. Local researchers Abdu (1993) and Getachew (1996b) suggested students needed to have appropriate texts and tasks to use varieties of reading strategies that help them to perform well in reading. Hence, reading comprehension skills is a process of interpretation of signs or letters into words and sentences to give information to persons; it is the process of regaining and understanding stored ideas, which are the presentations of symbols to be examined by sight or touch.

As Alonso (2011), the English language as a second or foreign language has been given due attention in education for its crucial role in development of science, business, and industry. Furthermore, educational innovations in English as a foreign language have received considerable attention around the world (Alptekin 2002). In Ethiopia, English has been given due consideration with expansion of modern education. Learning English is seen as opportunity to develop language competence for secondary education, secure a job, introduce modernity, and creates the prospect for future success. Ethiopian Education and Training Policy [ETP] let English be taught as subject beginning from grade one, and to be the medium of instruction for secondary and higher education (ETP, 1994). It is obvious that the English language encompassed listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, and they have been permitted to be taught. In Ethiopia, grade eight is the transitional level from primary to secondary school, and students have been required to master English language skills so as they could be promoted to the complete medium of English instruction which begins in grade nine. Ethiopian Ministry of Education [MoE] (2016) covertly states grade nine as the level of transition from mother tongue to English medium of instruction. Getachew (1996a) confirmed reading as the most important of the other three

skills basically because students' academic success or failure depends to a large degree on their ability to read and comprehend the textbooks and notes they receive in different subjects where all study materials have been written in English. Therefore, students are needed to be engaged in reading comprehension activities in school course works, areas outside the school, and their leisure times.

2. Statement of the Problem

Many people read different reading materials for several purposes. Variations in reading purposes determine reading strategies the readers use and access reading comprehension (Atkins et al., 1996). However, failure in using suitable reading strategies fails of comprehending information. Having this limitation as the rationale of this study, furthermore, the corresponding author of this article is one of the former English Language Teachers at Mangudo Primary School has observed grade eight students' reading comprehension problem that they lack effective reading comprehension skills during their reading lessons. They seem that they do not know how to guess, skim or scan existing information from the given texts. The students read a letter for letter or word for word instead of reading phrases or clauses, or sentences by a single glance. This implies that the students have a lack of reading in units which results in problems in reading comprehension skills. Then they do not comprehend the intended message of the text. Therefore, the authors raised the question of how to improve the existing problem of students' reading comprehension through implementing different reading strategies and activities considering their academic level.

3. The Objective of the Study

This study aimed to improve students' reading comprehension status of grade eight students at Mangudo Primary School by introducing students' reading comprehension strategies for their prolonging readings sessions.

4. Significances of the Study

It is helpful for the participant students of this study to become effective readers to comprehend any given passages or text of learning. It may direct English language teachers on how they could help their students during reading comprehension lessons with reading comprehension activities. The findings of the study may add value for further studies as background literature of reading skill in general and/or reading comprehension strategies in particular.

5. Delimitation of the Study

The study is delimited to grade eight students since it is the terminal point of mother tongue instructional medium and primary education. After completing grade eight, students are promoted to grade nine where English becomes an instruction medium in the Ethiopian education system. In terms of content, it focuses on grade eight students' reading

comprehension status because reading is the central and necessary skill of learning than other language skills, and it plays a great role in all subject matters.

Research Design And Methods

1. Research Design

The quasi-experimental design has opted for this study. It employs quantitative research method.

2. Population

The participants of this study were Mangudo Primary School grade eight students enrolled in 2019/2020. Their total number is two hundred eleven within five sections.

3. Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The process of sampling was done based on (Kothari, 2004) which encourages using 33% of the total population. It happened by randomly picking up students' names from a small box to fulfill the expected number that is 14 students per section and became 70 sample students from the total of 211 in five sections.

4. Data Collection Tools

Reading achievement tests were used to collect information for the study. The tests were used to describe students' reading comprehension status.

4.1. Test

It contains five consecutive tests arranged as one pretest and four posttests. They have been administered in make-up classes with sample students. In between pre-and every posttest, there was reading strategies-based instruction. The contents of reading texts were adapted from different magazines and books written with easy vocabulary. The marking scheme of the tests followed the holistic scale of UCLES (1987) International Examinations in English as a Foreign Language as shown in Table 1.

5. Methods of Data Analysis

6.

The data collected through test results were quantified by numbers and percentages. The process of analysis was conducted immediately after tabulating the results of the tests, and adequate interpretations were narrated alongside each item in the analysis. Finally, the conclusion was drawn on the independent page.

7. Ethical Considerations

The authors would like to address ethical issues of privacy and secrecy and are pleased to keep the originality of the study throughout the whole process. The researchers guaranteed the participants who responded to reading achievement tests not to expose their name, identity, and other issues either in printed or electronic materials. The participants received a verbal description of the purpose of the study, and all participants' responses were kept confidential.

Findings

Students' test results: there are five consecutive reading achievement tests were administered to selected students – one pretest and four successive posttests. All of them are tabulated and changed into a percent (quantitative) and interpreted in narration (qualitative). This helps the authors to analyze or count how many students were placed below or above the pass, which is considered as the average level of reading comprehension status.

Table 2 shows that all excellent, very good, and good statuses are at 0%. In the next status 22(31.43%) students achieved 8 – 11 marks, which placed them under 'pass' category; whereas, 23 (32.86%) of them scored 5 – 7 marks and placed under 'weak category'. The remaining 25 (35.71%) students obtained 0 – 4 marks, which classifies them on 'very poor' status. The cumulative rank of students below the 'pass' category is felt on 'weak' and 'very poor' categories which collectively account 48 (68.57%) students. It alone accounts more than two third (2/3) the students and indicates the failure of majority.

Table 3, posttest one, one can easily understand 13 (18.57%) students achieved 12 – 15 marks, which make them be in the 'good' category; whereas, 25 (35.71%) of them scored 8 – 11 marks, which are 'pass' results; 10 (14.29%) students obtained 5-7 marks, which fall on 'weak' status, and remain 22 (31.43%) obtained 0-4 marks, which categorizes them under very poor statuses.

In pretest no student was registered on the columns of good, very good, and excellent; but in post-test one 13(18.57%) students were registered in the column of good category. It shows slight progress on the result of students' reading comprehension skill test from 0% to 18.57%, however, very good and excellent categories still kept on 0%. In other ways, the pass, weak, and very poor status have shown changes by 2.85%, 17.14%, 4.28% respectively when comparing to the percentage of pretest in table two. The percent change shown in the pass and weak, the percent increase may be interpreted in the same way while the percent change is shown in very poor status, the decrease of percent may be interpreted differently, however, in both cases, there is positive reading comprehension status implication. The very poor status decreased by 3(4.28%) which means it fed

3(4.28%) to either of its above categories or statuses. In the same angle 13(18.57%) students shifted to the good category from either of the status below it. This indicates that there is a slight change in students' reading comprehension status when comparing pretest and posttest one. That may be the result of implementing reading strategies.

In the pretest, fail status that blows pass mark (weak and very poor) account 48(68.57%) or more than two-thirds (2/3) of the students who have Basic English language problem (inadequate knowledge in grammar and vocabulary which causes serious errors) become 32(45.71%) or less than half (1/2) of the total students. This decrement has a possibly positive implication that 16(22.86%) students moved either one or both to the pass and the good status. In solid statement 13(18.57%) students have improved their reading status to a good category which was 0% I pretest.

Table 4 recognizes 4 (5.71%) students achieved 16 – 17 marks, which make them fall on 'very good' status; whereas, the other 23 (32.86%) students obtained 12 – 15 marks, which are 'good' results and 31 (44.29%) students scored 8 – 11 marks, which fall them on 'pass' category; 12 (17.14%) students scored 5 – 7 marks, which fall them on 'weak' status, and the very poor category became 0%. However, the students result shows progress from test to test, the highest status –excellent remained unoccupied.

The very poor category held 25(35.71) students that were the majority in a pretest, and 22(31.43) in posttest one. This made it to take the first and the second rank on Table 1 and Table 2 or pretest and posttest one respectively. But it became 0% in posttest two (Table 3) and took the last rank of the statuses. It decreased by the difference of 25(35.43%) students between pretest and posttest two while the difference between posttest one and posttest two is 22(31.43%) students. It implies that students improved their reading comprehension status. Therefore, the students under the failed status (weak and very poor) shown moderate progress and shifted to either of the above statuses.

In posttest one, the weak category held 10(14.29%) while the very poor category held 22(31.43%) students. They both together held 32(45.71%) in posttest one. In posttest two the weak category holds 12(17.14%) while the very poor category becomes 0%. They both together hold 12(17.14%). The weak category alone might have held 32(45.71%) if the very poor category students shifted only to it, and neither of the students progressed from it during posttest two. But it holds only 12(17.14%). When we compare the reading comprehension status of weak category students in posttest one 10(14.29%) and the posttest two 12(17.14%), it seems showing increasing by 2(2.86%). But the fact the number of students decreased by 20(28.57%) in case that it could hold 32(45.71%) since the very poor category became 0%. Therefore, the difference of cumulative of progressed students between posttest one and posttest two of the failed status (weak and the very poor category) is 20(28.57%), which was 32(45.71%) in pretest and posttest one. In posttest two, the failed status that below the pass accounts 12(17.14%) or 1/5 of the total

students which were 32(45.71%) in posttest one was decreased by 20(28.57%). This decreasing frequency has two positive implications. The first one is 20(28.57%) of students shifted to pass and/or the above categories by improving their reading comprehension skill status through the implementation of reading comprehension strategies when comparing posttest one and posttest two. In the other case, the progress from pretest to posttest one increased by 16(22.86%) became 20(28.57%) in posttest two by showing a 4(5.71%) difference in increment.

The pass category held the least 22(31.43%) in the pretest. But the majority both in posttest one and posttest two that became 25(35.71%) and 31(44.29%) registered respectively. The difference in the three tests is 3(4.29%) between pretest and posttest one, 6(8.57%) between posttest one and posttest two, 9(12.86%) between pretest and posttest two. This shows that there are improvements and progress in students' reading comprehension when the researchers implement different reading strategies. The students' basic problems and serious errors are being solved from test to test.

The good status which was with 0% in pretest and 13(18.57%) in posttest one becomes 23(32.86%) in posttest two. When weighing against the three tests, it brings noteworthy changes. The frequency and percentage differences in pretest and posttest one is 13(18.57%), pretest and posttest two is 23(32.86%), and posttest one and posttest two 10(14.29). These significant differences show the tangible improvement and progress of the students' reading comprehension skill status through the implementation of reading comprehension strategies.

In the pretest all the students 70(100%) below the good status when it was 0%. In posttest one, it increased by 13(18.57%), and in posttest two 23(32.86%). Totally, in both tests, it shows 36(51.43%) that more than half (1/2) of the whole participants of the test. It might have a possibility to be 40(57.14%) but 4(5.71%) fortunately shifted to the very good status which is above the good one. However, the standards below the good status decreased by 40(57.14%) when comparing pretest and posttest two, and the remained amount is 30(42.86). The difference of progressed students in posttest one 13(18.57%) and posttest two 23(32.86%) is 10(14.29%). This points out that in posttest two there is 36(51.43%) progress between pretest and posttest two, and 10(14.29) progress between posttest one and posttest two.

The very good status was 0% in pretest and posttest one. But on post-test two the registering of 4(5.71%) students shows the improvement progress of students reading comprehension skill. The difference among the three tests is 4(5.71%) that as presented in posttest two (Table 4).

Table 5 indicates, 2(2.86%) students achieved 18-20, 13 (18.57%) students achieved 16 – 17 marks, which make them fall on 'very good' status; whereas, the other 31(44.29%) of

them obtained 12 – 15 marks, which are 'good' results, 21(30%) score 8-11 marks which places them underpass column and 3(4.29%) score 5-7 marks which categorizes them under weak status, and the very poor status became 0%.

The very poor category held 25(35.71%) in pretest becomes 0% in posttest two and posttest three. This indicates the students under very poor status eradicated from it and shifted to the above status.

The weak category held 23(32.86%) in pretest 12(17.14%) in posttest two And 3(4.29%) in posttest three. The difference between pretest 23(32.86%) and posttest three 3(4.29%) is 20(28.57%); the difference of [posttest two 12(17.14%) and posttest three 3(4.29%) is 9(12.86%). The implication is 20(28.57%) students' reading comprehension status progressed when comparing pretest and posttest three meanwhile 9(12.86%) solid progress is shown in posttest three comparing to posttest two. In general, there is apparent reading comprehension skill status improvement from test to test.

The pass status was 31(44.29%) in posttest two becomes 21(30%) in posttest three which decreased by 10(14.29%). The decrement has positive implications that mean 10(14.29%) of students shifted to either of the status above the pass category. It might have a possibility to be 40(57.14%) if 9(12.86%) weak category students who improved their reading comprehension skill status in posttest three shifted only to it, either of its posttest two 31(44.29%) students improve their reading comprehension skill status. But the difference from the expected one 40(57.14%) and posttest three 21(30%) is 19(27.14%) the actual difference between posttest two 31(44.29%) and posttest three 21(30%) is 10(14.29%). The sum of the two differences is 41.43%. The average is 20.71%. Therefore, in posttest three, students in the pass status, show 20.71% on average and 14.29% solid progress. This improvement of reading comprehension skill status is the result of reading comprehension intervention before posttest three.

The good status was 23(32.86%) in posttest two becomes 31(44.29%) in post-test three which shows 8(11.43%) progress from post-test two to posttest three. The total population below the good status in posttest two was 43(61.43%) becomes 24(34.29%). Thus, the difference is 19(27.14%) means 19 (27.14%) students upgraded their reading skill status. Therefore, it might have the possibility to be 42(60%) if 19(27.14%) of students below good status in posttest two upgraded only to it, and neither of the examinees on it of posttest two improves their reading comprehension skill. But now it has only 31(44.29%). The difference between the expected amount of 42(60%) and the actual rescored 31(44.29%) is 11(15.71%). The actual difference between posttest two 23(32.86%) and posttest three 31(44.29%) is 8(11.43%) which shows increasing. On average it has shown 13.37% improvement and there is 11.43% solid progress in students' reading comprehension status.

The very good status was 4(5.71%) in posttest two becomes 13(18.57%) progress with a difference of 9(12.86%) from posttest two to posttest three the total examinee below it in posttest two was 66(94.29%) decreased and becomes 55(78.57%) with the difference of 11(15.71%) from posttest two to posttest three. This decreasing by itself shows progress in each status from test to test. In general, it might have the possibility to be 15(21.43%) students if students below its standards progressed and recorded only on it, and neither the 4(5.71%) students on it of posttest two shown improvement in their reading comprehension status. As possible to see from posttest three (Table 4) the excellent status has 2(2.86%) students and this is why the very good status has 13(18.57%) students. The difference shown between posttest two 4(5.71%) and posttest three 13(18.57%) is 9(12.86%). Therefore, students at a very good status have shown solid 9(12.86%) progress in their reading comprehension status from posttest two to posttest three because of the intervention reading comprehension strategies in different tests.

There was no student (0%) in excellent status pretest to posttest two. But now in posttest three 2(2.86%) students have shown their excellent performance. That witnesses the students reading comprehension status progress from time to time through intervention of reading comprehension strategies.

Table 6, states 5(7.14%) students who achieved 18 – 20 marks, which fall them on 'excellent' status. The other 20(28.57%) students scored 16 – 17 marks, which group them into the 'very good' category; whereas, 36(51.43%) students scored 12 – 15 marks, which let them into 'good' status, and the other 7(10%) students achieved 8 – 11 marks that group them into 'pass' status, 2(2.86%) of them scored 5 – 7 marks that categorize them into 'weak' status, and finally the very poor category remains 0%.

Posttest four (Table 6) is the last test which helps to provide the total progress of students reading comprehension skill status improvement. Students classified under the very poor category were already eradicated in posttest three and still, it remained 0% in posttest four.

The weak category which was 23(32.86%) in pretest at last in posttest four remains with insignificant 2(2.86%) of students in. 21(30%) of students improved their reading comprehension status posttest one to posttest four through interventions of reading comprehension strategies and shifted to either of the categories above the weak status. When comparing posttest three 3(4.29%) and posttest four 2(2.86%), the progress difference is 1(1.43%). However, the change is the least; still, there is an improvement in students' reading comprehension skill status.

The pass category (maybe called the benched status) was 22(31.43%) in pretest becomes 7(11.43%) in posttest four. In pretest 70(100%) students were in pass status and the statuses under it, which means the statuses above the pass category, were 0%. But in

posttest four, the pass category and the status below it become 9(12.86%) and the statuses above the pass category become 61(87.14%) and shown this much solid progress. Specifically, when comparing posttest three 21(30%) with posttest four 7(11.43%) the difference is 14(20%) and it is the progress which is recorded in posttest four and implies the improvement from test to test.

The good status was 0% in pretest becomes 36(51.43%) which holds more than half (1/2) of the total participants of the test. It has shown 51.43% progress in students' reading comprehension status. When comparing it with posttest three 31(44.29%), the difference is 5(7.14%). It might have the possibility to be 46(65.71%) because 15(21.43%) progressed to it from the categories below it. So, the expected difference is 10(14.29%), but the solid difference is 5(7.14%). In case of this or that there is progress on students' reading comprehension skill status from test to test because of implementation of reading comprehension strategies. In general, up to posttest four, the good status has shown progress from 0% to 51.43%.

The very good category was 0% in pretest becomes 20(28.57%) in posttest four with tangible progress. In comparing posttest three, 13(18.57) with posttest four 20(28.57%) the difference increased by 7(11.43%). It could be 23(32.86%), but 3(4.29%) students transferred to the excellent status which is the topmost category of the students' reading comprehension status. Therefore, it shows 7(11.43%) progress.

The excellent status category was in 0% from pretest up to posttest two or in three consecutive tests. Then it becomes 2(2.86%) in posttest three and 6(8.57%) in posttest four with a difference of 4(5.71%) when comparing the last two tests. In posttest four indicated solid progress in all status; specifically, 6(8.57%) of students have shown excellent performance in reading comprehension skill. After teaching sessions during post-test one up to four, the vacant positions above the average level occupied with up-scoring students consecutively. This consistent achievement was the result of the interventions of reading strategies into the study sessions of target students.

To summarize the discussion part, students have shown the remarkable and solid difference from test to test beginning from posttest one to posttest four. The excellent, very good, and good statuses category were 0% in the pre-test, but they become 5(7.14%), 20(28.57%), and 36(51.43%) respectively in the final posttest. Totally 61(87.14%) students have shown solid and great improvement in their reading comprehension skill status in the posttest four, (Table 6). The pass, weak, and very poor categories included 70(100%) of students in the pre-test, but in posttest four they become 7(11.43%), 2(2.86%), and 0% respectively. Totally 9(12.86%) remain there. Particularly, 2(2.86%) students have not improved their reading comprehension to the pass category or the status above it. Thus, this indicates that there are high, middle, and low achiever students. Therefore, the two students may be from the low achiever students.

Conclusion

Thus, from the pretest result of students, it can be concluded as some students felt on 'pass' and more students below the 'pass' mark category as 'weak' and 'very poor' categories respectively. Both categories are placed below the average status (pass) of students, and the statuses above the average remain vacant. So, this pretest result implies students have Basic English language problems that could be inadequate knowledge in both grammar and vocabulary which resulted in serious errors in students reading comprehension skills.

The data shown on posttest one indicates that there is a little change in students' reading progress immediately after the pretest. The results might be considered satisfactory; it reveals that there are slight improvements in posttest one in comparison to pretest. The improvement may be the result of the implementation of a reading comprehension strategy.

According to a result of posttest two, one can conclude that there is moderate progress in posttest two. The majority of students place above the average status. Therefore, it indicates students under the very poor category who have Basic English Language problems have completely improved their reading comprehension status. Students under the weak category are inadequate in vocabulary and grammar also shown good progress. Some students particularly under the pass category are still having some serious errors that those who are at above pass status improved; however, they are with not many and non-basic errors.

The remarkable progress has been shown particularly on posttest three that the majority 46(65.71%) of students are placed above the pass status. It means 65.71% of the students improved reading comprehension status by improving their vocabulary and grammar inadequacy, and some serious errors. But still, most of them, except 2(2.86) under the excellent category, have not many and non-basic errors. The pass status by itself remains with 21(30.00%) students which held the fewer students compared to the total students. It is natural to have the low-level achiever students in education and that is why the weak category held 3(4.29%) of students who are still inadequate to show progress on their reading comprehension skills status.

In posttest four, 6(8.57%) of students have shown the excellent performance of natural English with minimal errors and complete realization of the reading comprehension skills while 55(78.57%) of students have shown better performance with the accurate realization of reading comprehension skills with not many and non-basic errors. However, 7(10.00%) of students have performed awkward and non-communicating treatment of reading comprehension skills with some serious errors whereas 2(2.86%) of students are still failed to reach the expected standard of reading comprehension skills. This difference is natural in education as we are individually different. There is a difference among

students' achievements that is high, middle, and low; it is why 9(12.86%) of the students are failed to improve their reading comprehension skills through the implementation of reading comprehension strategies.

In general, more importantly, to improve the students' reading comprehension skills status, the intervention of teaching reading skills with strategic activities is more emphasized.

References

1. *Abdu, M. (1993). The Reading Interests of High School Students (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.*
2. *Alderson, J. C., Clapham, C. and Wall, D. (1995). Language Test Construction and Evaluation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*
3. *Alonso, D. J. (2011). English as a Second Language. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.*
4. *Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards Intercultural Communicative Competence in EL T. ELT Journal 56/1, 57-69.*
5. *Atkins, J., Hailom, B. and Nuru, M. (1996). Skills Development Methodology (Part 2). Addis Ababa: Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Addis Ababa University.*
6. *Bussmann, H. (1996). Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. London: Routledge.*
7. *ETP.(1994). Ethiopian Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Press.*
8. *Garner, J. and Bochna, C. (2004). Transfer of a Listening Comprehension Strategy to Independent Reading in First-grade Students. Early Childhood Education Journal, 32 (2), 69-74. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ732268). Retrieved on October 18, 2020, from ERIC Database.*
9. *Getachew, A. (1996a). The Teaching of Reading in Government High Schools in Addis Ababa: a Descriptive Study (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.*

10. Getachew, A. (1996b). *The Teaching of Reading in Government High Schools in Addis Ababa: a Descriptive Study (Unpublished MA Thesis)*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
11. Hailom, B. (1994). *Teaching English by Integrating the Macro-skills. A Paper Presented at the ELT Conference, Organized by the United States Information Service and the Ministry of Education*.
12. Heugh, K., Benson, C., BerhanuBogale and MekonnenAlemu.(2007). *Final Report Study on Medium of Instruction in Primary Schools in Ethiopia, Commissioned by the Ministry of Education*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
13. Jack, C. R., and Richard, S. (2002a). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
14. Jack, C. R., and Richard, S. (2002b). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
15. Jack, C. R., and Richard, S. (2002c). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
16. Jack, C. R., and Richard, S. (2002d). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
17. Jack, C. R., and Richard, S. (2002e). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
18. Jack, C. R., and Richard, S. (2002f). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
19. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques (2nd Rev. Ed.)*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
20. MoE.(2016). *Concept Note for Technical Assistance to Study the Status of Transition from Mother Tongue to English Medium of Instruction in Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: Mother Tongue and English Language Education Development Directorate, Ministry of Education.
21. Nuttall, C. (1982). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Heinemann Publishers.
22. Pirozzolo, F.J. and Wittrock, M.C. (eds.) (1981). *Neuropsychological and Cognitive Processes in Reading*. London.

23. Williams, J., Hall, K. and Lauer, K. (2004). *Teaching Expository Text Structure to Young at-risk Learners: Building the Basics of Comprehension Instruction. Exceptionality, 12 (3), 129 -144.*(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ682909). Retrieved on October 18, 2020, from ERIC Database.

Tables

Table 1. The marking scheme of the test followed the holistic scale of UCLES (1987)

Range	Status	Error
18-20	Excellent	Natural English with minimal errors and complete realization of the task set.
16-17	Very Good	More than a collection of simple sentences, with good vocabulary and structures; some non-basic errors.
12-15	Good	Simple but accurate realization of the task set with sufficient naturalness of English and not many errors.
8-11	Pass	Reasonably correct but awkward and non-communicating or fair and natural treatment of the subject, with some serious errors
5-7	Weak	Original vocabulary and grammar both inadequate to the subject.
0-4	Very Poor	Incoherent. Errors show a lack of basic knowledge of English

Table 2. Pretest result

Range	Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
18-20	Excellent	0	0
16-17	Very Good	0	0
12-15	Good	0	0
8-11	Pass	22	31.43
5-7	Weak	23	32.86
0-4	Very Poor	25	35.71
Total		70	100

Table 3. Posttest one result

Range	Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
18-20	Excellent	0	0
16-17	Very Good	0	0
12-15	Good	13	18.57
8-11	Pass	25	35.71
5-7	Weak	10	14.29
0-4	Very Poor	22	31.43
Total		70	100

Table 4. Posttest two result discussion

Range	Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
18-20	Excellent	0	0
16-17	Very Good	4	5.71
12-15	Good	23	32.86
8-11	Pass	31	44.29
5-7	Weak	12	17.14
0-4	Very Poor	0	0
Total		70	100

Table 5. Posttest threeresult

Range	Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
18-20	Excellent	2	2.86
16-17	Very Good	13	18.57
12-15	Good	31	44.29
8-11	Pass	21	30.00
5-7	Weak	3	4.29
0-4	Very Poor	0	0
Total		70	100

Table 6. Posttest fourresult

Range	Status	Frequency	Percent (%)
18-20	Excellent	6	8.57
16-17	Very Good	21	30.00
12-15	Good	34	48.57
8-11	Pass	7	10
5-7	Weak	2	2.86
0-4	Very Poor	0	0
Total		70	100