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ABSTRACT

This study has recently been conducted to find out the effect of extensive exposure to reading materials and of moderate amount of exposure supported by explicit instruction on enhancing discourse signaling awareness. Data analyzed quantitatively came from test scores of 36 high school students at elementary level in İstanbul, Turkey, divided into two groups who were treated through a certain type of learning/teaching method over a two-week period. Unlike the first group who were instructed to read 28 reading passages with six target conjunctions embedded in them (and, or, but, so, because, although) the second one was provided 14 reading passages, and a handout with exercises on the target conjunctions, supported with explanations on the handout. It was found that those who were exposed to extensive amount of reading statistically performed better in the final test. Those who were exposed to moderate amount of reading input plus instruction performed better, as well, albeit not statistically. However, performances between the groups in the final test did not differ significantly. Further, to earn a qualitative dimension to the study, participant evaluation reports were collected, coded, and analyzed. Sentences in reports beginning with “I realized …, I understood …” or “I have noticed that …” can be an evidence that they may go on doing reading activities in a more conscious manner. Pedagogical implications in a nutshell suggest that reading comprehension can be achieved through reading itself. Still teachers can find individualized ways for their students to read in their L2. Suggestions for future research are also included.

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

For quite a long time language skills have been tried to be taught separately, that is in a disconnected manner. As well, despite efforts and several years of formal education, many people still suffer from incompetence and lack of performance in teaching and learning language skills. One of the most probable reasons for this unfortunate situation is stated by Gass and Selinker (2008) who posit that “one cannot hope to appreciate the complexity of the learning situation by studying one limited part of it” (p. 110). While “no curriculum can practice all skills on a consistent basis” (Grabe, 2009, p. 350), much emphasis can be devoted to teaching fundamental aspects of skills in general and reading skills in particular.

By the same token, reading and listening have been labelled as receptive in many studies, which is why as the word receptive implies reading has been thought as an inactive process. In other words, reading skills have been mainly thought to occur in a vacuum not on an ongoing process. However, in recent decades, studies have shown that reading is itself productive as it requires that many cognitive, physical, and sociocultural mechanisms co-work simultaneously and in harmony for a higher level of comprehension (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Grabe, 2009).

Justification and Significance

As opposed to reading which is not valued as much as it deserves, grammar or vocabulary instruction is highly appreciated in this study’s location of inquiry. It is without doubt that the latter is crucial for not only using a language accurately but also appropriately, but uprooting linguistic items from their surrounding context may not produce expected results in language learning. This study, therefore, focused on reading extensively while dealing with the important role of specific elements of cohesion in a discourse, that is, conjunctions.

This study was conducted in a setting where reading in both L1 and L2 is neglected considerably. Apart from direct impact on participants by means of the materials used, the research study also contributed indirectly to motivation of the participants by making them engaged in reading itself. To add to the point, the setting of the study was an environment where there are strong biases towards learning English and where reading in L1 is already a luxury for its users, though there might be exceptions. More importantly,
in the education system of the context of this study, students’ attitudes towards courses are mostly exam-driven. As a result, this research may be seen as important in that it was conducted among students lacking a good background and motivation for language education. The contribution of this study may be that it can offer insight to EFL teachers or researchers who would like to instill higher reading skills in learners with relatively low abilities and low motivation.

Research Design
The study was conducted within a mixed-design approach to see whether interpretations of the data analyzed quantitatively overlap with those of the data analyzed qualitatively.

Research Questions (RQs) and Hypotheses
This recent study has been done to find the answers to the following questions.

RQ1: Is varied exposure to reading input, extensive and moderate supported by instruction, conducive to enhancing discourse signaling awareness?
Hypothesis: $H_1$. Both exposure levels, extensive and moderate, are conducive to enhancing discourse signaling awareness.

RQ2: Which of the learning/teaching methods (extensive exposure to reading input or moderate amount of exposure supported by instruction) is more effective in enhancing discourse signaling awareness?
Hypothesis: $H_2$. There is no difference between the two types learning/teaching methods in terms of their effect on enhancing discourse signaling awareness.

While one group that is instructed is normally expected to perform better in the comprehension test, the other group will have already done a larger amount of reading. Therefore, I do expect enhancement in either group’s test achievement but I have doubt as to whether one will outperform the other remarkably.

RQ3: What are the thought patterns of EFL learners about extensive reading alone and reading supported with instruction/guidance?
Hypothesis: I expect there is variation in how EFL learners see extensive reading alone and reading with instruction due mainly to individual differences such as language background or reading habits both in L1 and L2.

LITERATURE REVIEW
The Role of Extensive Exposure to Input or Extensive Reading in an EFL Context
It goes without saying that reading is one of the most essential features of language learning process, if not the backbone. And reading extensively can be deemed as the output of this fact. These implications finally make it a necessity for language learners to be exposed to different genres of reading input. Echoing Nation and Newton (2009), “in order to meet the full range of language features, learners need to be exposed to a range of discourse types” (p. 16). And while dealing with various types of texts learners develop and use strategies that can help them negotiate meaning. Even the use of strategies unsuccessfully may earn them a positive quality, an ability “to activate a much more conscious problem-solving mode of attention” (Grabe, 2009, p. 229).

Skills mentioned above require awareness to be developed and this can be realized through extensive reading. For example, a recent meta-analysis (Nakanishi, 2015) showed that “extensive reading improves students’ reading proficiency”. Likewise, a study by Liu and Todd (2016) put forward that even without instruction, participants had “significant gains” (p. 71) in reading comprehension.

The Role of Explicit Instruction in an EFL Context
The binary dimension of language processing, implicit learning and explicit instruction are highly emphasized in many studies including this one. As a matter of fact these two modes of language learning/teaching are not mutually exclusive, that is the use of one mode in an educational setting does not mean that the other is useless. This case is stated in an informative way by Grabe (2009):

A pure reading skills approach, typically a skills practice textbook without extended reading material, does not generate coherent conceptual learning that would engage students, build intrinsic motivation or flow experiences, encourage mastery with more challenging academic tasks and projects, or provide a sense of learner autonomy through student choices. Conversely, a simple extensive-reading program does not allow for the instructional guidance and support with a range of academic skills that are crucial for more advanced reading comprehension.” (p. 338)

Learners especially those with lower abilities, therefore, can increase their chance of learning English if they are provided with tasks or materials appropriate for both types of instruction, explicit or implicit. However, as Schmidt (1994) claims “consciousness of input at the level of noticing is a necessary condition for L2 development.” This is why “direct instruction, conscious raising, and a focus on form are valuable to the extent that they help learners facilitate understanding” (Schmidt, 1995, p. 4). As a result, extensive reading and explicit instruction should not be presented on a continuum in teaching milieus.

While treating learners with multiple language tools, the question of what to teach also comes to mind. The reason is that even though needs are individual, learning environments are mostly for collective experiences. If there is also a time limitation for any reason, then instructors can perform more strategically and teach more selectively. My point is that they can teach most frequently used vocabulary, recurring patterns in texts, or elements that signal discourse. This need of EFL learners is clearly expressed by Nation (p. 4) who argues that “the amount of attention given to an item should be roughly proportional to the chances of it being met again” (p. 4).

All in all when extensive reading or implicit learning and explicit instruction or intentional learning are considered
together, some earlier studies demonstrate that “the advantage of intentional learning through explicit has been clear” (Laufer, 2003; Lin & Hirsh, 2012, as cited in Pellicer-Sánchez, 2016, p. 98).

Text/Discourse
Grabe and Kaplan (1996) second that “a text is a structural equivalent of language in real use which conveys meaning in all four senses of Hymes’s communicative competence (whether a text is: possible, feasible, appropriate, and performed)” (p. 40). This implies what a text is not: a group of words that “does not form a unified whole” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 2). Though there is not a sharp distinction between a text and discourse, some scholars (Brown & Yule, 1983; Martínez-Flor, A., & Usó-Juan, E. 2006) use text and discourse with a difference in meaning and mostly using the latter for spoken utterances. However in this study no such difference is preferred in interpreting the findings.

Cohesion
In Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) terms, cohesion is the “relations within the text that define it as a text” (p.4). Although they claim that conceptually cohesion is “semantic” (p. 4), they indicate that “all grammatical units – sentences, clauses, groups, words – are internally cohesive simply because they are structured” (p. 7). Therefore, I believed the coalescence of form and meaning in designing the study was important.

Discourse Signaling and Conjunctions
Conjunctions in most materials are given under the title of grammar or form-focused sections of ELT materials. On the one hand, they can be regarded as independent units but in essence they are “explicit linkages from one text to the text and they signal to students that instructional activities are coherently linked” (Grabe, 2009, p. 345). This might be the reason why learners do not always benefit from the strict categorization of linguistic units and thus disregarding relations among them. As a result, in this study extensive reading and teaching of conjunctions whether explicitly or implicitly are merged.

As cited in Grabe and Kaplan (1996, p. 47), Biber has found that “text genres may be identified by the co-occurrence patterns of groups or surface linguistic features”. Conjunctions, being one of those linguistic features, can have a priority for those particularly with “poor language behaviors” (Clarke, 1980, p. 120).

To add, conjunctions are “grammatical contributions to textuality” (McCarthy, 1991, p. 46). Nunan (1999) supports McCarthy by stating that “if learners are not taught grammar in context, that is, from a functional perspective, it will be difficult for them to see how and why alternative forms exist to express different communicative meanings” (p. 110). Therefore, extensive reading of texts with different genres could help learners understand the role of conjunctions in text structure and their restructuring the text.

Although Halliday and Hasan (1976) contend that “there is no single, uniquely correct inventory of the types of conjunctive relation” (p. 238), they make a categorization: “additive” (e.g. and, or), “adversative” (e.g. but, although), “causal” (e.g. so, because), and “temporal” (e.g. then). Six conjunctions in all categories except for the fourth one, temporal conjunctions, were used as target words in the testing instrument in the study. Thus, it was aimed that discourse competence could be gained by participants by means of the use of different conjunctions each addressing a different aspect of textual structures.

METHODS
Participants and Setting
Participants (N=36), both males (n=19) and females (n=17), were 12th grade students at a public high school in Istanbul, Turkey. English is their L2 with Turkish being their L1. They were selected through cluster sampling using a convenience procedure.

As determined by Quick Placement Test (QPT), 2001, the participants were either at breakthrough or elementary level. The test was administered just before the study began so that it was understood that initial levels of the students are the same or similar in terms of language proficiency. The rationale for using QPT is that “it has been validated in many countries and it can be used for learners of all levels and ages” (Geranpayeh, 2003, pp. 1-2).

Participants’ previous language experience was mostly confined to grammar instruction or memorizing vocabulary lists given to them particularly before the formal examinations.

Instrumentation
Instruments of this study and how they were formed are explained below.

Reading passages with target conjunctions embedded in them
The number of the reading passages given to group 1 and 2 was 28 and 14 respectively. They were at elementary or low intermediate levels. For group 1, the length of the reading texts differed from 111 to 392 words with a mean of 231. On the other hand, for group 2, the length of the passages varied from 111 to 335 words with a mean of 214.

“Expository and narrative texts impose different types of demands on readers” (Grabe, 2009, p. 11). Therefore, for the sake of multiplicity of the input, all the passages were either expository (e.g. Distance Learning) or narrative (e.g. The Storm). Some of them were loaded with cultural aspects of L1 so that participants could benefit from the familiarity of the topic (e.g. Nasreddin and the Ferry Man). Furthermore, some of them contained pictures relevant with the topic. The rationale for using pictures was to increase motivation for reading as participants mostly did not have a habit of reading in their L2 on a regular basis.

All texts incorporated target conjunctions (N=6). They were and, or, but, so, because, although. A multiplicity of the
conjunction types was provided so that a wider perspective for discourse awareness could be gained by the participants. All the input was provided online and several confirmation checks as to whether any technical or procedural problems occurred were done. See Appendix 1 for a sample of reading passages.

**Instruction**

The second group in the study was treated with half of the reading passages (n=14) given to the first group (n=28) and with a handout based solely on the target conjunctions. The researcher being the English teacher of the participants also guided them through explanations on conjunctions in class hours over a two-week period. See Appendix 2 for a section in the handout.

**A diagnostic cloze test**

As an assessment tool, cloze test was used in the sense that it is one of the “selective tasks that have a combination of form-focused and meaning-focused objectives, but with more emphasis on meaning” (Brown, 2004, p. 201). The text of the cloze test was selected in accordance with the proficiency level of the participants and from an online data source of a renowned publishing company, British Council-Oxford University Press. However, it was adapted by inserting some of the target conjunctions in it. As the text was legally downloadable, no special permission was requested from the publishing company.

While developing the cloze test, “a rational deletion procedure” (Brown, 2004, p. 202) was used. Eight blanks were formed to be filled in the test, each corresponding to one of the target conjunctions (two of them were repeated). The test was used both as pre- and post-test. It was observed in both groups that most of the students did not realize both tests were the same. See Appendix 3 for the sample diagnostic cloze test (pre-and post-test).

**Self-evaluation reports**

This study was actually designed quantitatively however in order to make more meaning out of the figures obtained through statistical analyses, a qualitative perspective was added. To this end, participants were asked to write about their thoughts and feelings about the overall study. One of the major aim was to see the gap, if any, between what was initially intended to achieve through this study and how they perceived it. As well, the extent of the usefulness of the learning/teaching methods could be better understood so that the scope of pedagogical implications could be extended.

**Data Collection and Procedures**

Participants were given detailed information about the study and pre-test was implemented before they were exposed to reading input. On the same day, they were provided the materials online and were recommended to read the texts on a daily basis and work upon them. Such strategies as reading, re-reading, finding the clues, focusing on the unknown vocabulary, or using a dictionary were told so that their grasp of the meaning of the text and awareness of discourse signals could be achieved well.

This procedure was the same for both groups. Nevertheless, the second group was guided through a handout (self-study) and instruction (provided by the instructor in class hours over two weeks) all related to discourse signals, conjunctions in particular.

Throughout the two-week intervention participants were contacted online (via emailing or a social media application) or face-to-face in order that continuity as regards reading texts was provided. The rationale can be explained by Schmidt, 1995:

Not all learning is deliberate or intentional (for example, it is clearly possible to learn vocabulary through extensive reading, without a clear intention to learn new words) but all learning does require attention (if readers do not pay attention to new words when they encounter them they will not learn them. (p. 1)

Thus, in order for the participants not to lose their attention regarding reading, they were examined closely and several student-teacher conferences were made.

On the final day, they were required to take the post-test. After evaluations of the study through self-reports were collected, the study was completed.

Data collected were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

**Data Analysis**

For research questions 1 and 2, inferential analyses were run as well as descriptive analysis through SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). However, as the sample size was limited to 36 and it did not show normal distribution, non-parametric tests were used. For this aim, Wilcoxon and Mann Whitney U tests were conducted. The data collected were in compatible with the assumptions of these statistical tests.

For research question 3, a qualitative analysis was done though coding, theming and interpreting upon them in the light of relevant literature and recent research findings.

Details are given in the fourth section that follows.

**ANALYSES AND RESULTS**

**Descriptive Statistics (for Research Questions 1 and 2)**

Descriptive statistics of all participants are shown in Table 1 below.

Figures below show that all participants regardless of group categorization benefitted from the study, though not remarkably.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of either group. The last column “gain” gives the mean and standard deviation of the difference or the residue between the pretest and posttest results.

Figures in Table 2 reveal that in both groups participants increased their performance after the intervention of extensive reading. However, it can also be seen that the gain of the first group is more than that of the second group.

**Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test (for Research Question 1)**

According to Kolmogorov-Smirnov (k-s) test analysis, p value was significant (p=0.001<0.05) which means that the sample was not normally distributed. Therefore, non-parametric tests were used to analyze the data. First of all, in order to find the increase, if there is any, between the pre- and post-test results within the groups, equivalence of (parametric) paired t-test, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test was conducted.

Table 3 below shows Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test result for group 1.

**Table 3. Wilcoxon signed ranks test for group 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 2 - Test 1</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.213*</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05

The analysis revealed that the difference between the beginning and the final performance of the participants in the test was statistically significant (p=0.027<0.05).

Table 4 below shows Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test result for group 2.

**Table 4. Wilcoxon signed ranks test for group 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 2 - Test 1</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-1.386*</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.05

As is seen above, the difference between pre-test and post-test performance within group 2 is not statistically significant (p=0.166>0.05).

**Mann Whitney U Test (for Research Question 2)**

As the sample was not normally distributed thus not meeting the assumptions of parametric tests, equivalence of independent t-test, Mann Whitney U Test, was run. The aim was to see if there was any statistically significant difference in the increase in test results between the two groups.

**Table 5 below shows the results.**

**Table 5. Groups-test scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17,36</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>20.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<0.05

Calculations suggest that there were no significant differences between the groups in terms of their performance in the pre-test (U=141.5, p=0.498) and post-test (U=155, p=0.820).

**Coding of Written Self-Reports and Codebook (for Research Question 3)**

In order to integrate the participants in the study thus to increase their engagement, they were asked to evaluate the study, their gains, or any criticisms regarding the study and comment retrospectively. They wrote their thoughts and feelings on a paper after being asked about their thoughts on the study. There was no time limit for their self-evaluation and reports were collected for later analysis (N=27). Participants were told to write in either their L1, Turkish, or L2, English. The rationale was that they might have felt discouraged if they had been forced to write in English. As their English proficiency level is not very high, there was a possibility that they wouldn’t express their thoughts and feelings the way they wished. While coding, their sentences in self-reports were translated by the researcher.

Data elicited from the written self-reports of the participants were coded. The reason was to “search for patterns in data and for ideas that help explain why those patterns are there in the first place” (Bernard, 2011, as cited in Saldaña, 2013, p. 9). Consequently, a codebook was created, which is “a set of codes, definitions, and examples used as a guide to help analyze interview data” (DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall, & Mc. Culloch, 2011, p. 138). Descriptive coding was used while forming the codebook (Saldaña, 2013, pp. 87-91). See Appendix 4 for the codebook based on self-reports.

**Theming**

What came next after coding the data obtained from self-reports was to “detect patterns” (Saldaña, 2013, p. 4) so that most commonly emerging themes could be found out. (See Appendix 4) The themes follow.
• **Theme 1: Contribution of reading to other skills and field**

Participants not only expanded their vocabulary knowledge through extensive reading they also reported improving other skills such as pronunciation, vocabulary, or grammar.

• **Theme 2: Increased Awareness and Strategy Use**

Obviously, participants increased their awareness through involvement in the research study towards text and sentence construction by applying certain cognitive and metacognitive strategies, one of them being monitoring their progress in reading.

• **Theme 3: Self-determination to Promote Language Experience**

Participants told that they started reading for pleasure for the first time and showed a determination to compose a language learning plan for now and future.

**DISCUSSIONS**

In the light of the results explained above, it can be said that all analyses led us to the usefulness of extensive reading or being exposed to a remarkable amount of reading through reading (Nation and Newton, 2009, Nakanishi, 2015). The effect of the amount of reading that was used as a variable in the study may change from one type of teaching and learning method to another. Yet, the study yielded positive results as to the impact of reading on learning discourse signaling devices, which in turn could increase reading comprehension. This may be described as a continuous cycle. The objective that reading should enhance awareness seems to have been realized by means of the use of both “local and global strategies” that are essential for “active comprehension” (Grabe, 2009, p. 229). To take a case in point, an example can be given from a participant’s self-evaluation report:

“...There were passages that I didn’t understand so I wrote the unknown words on a paper, I carefully examined the structures. And I reread them carefully by taking these into account.” N.G.

Of note is that activities contained in the study seem to have triggered the need in learners to use several strategies to cope with the difficulties stemming from having lower proficiency level. The frequent use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies hints that participants “learnt awareness of their comprehension processing and used strategies that supported comprehension” (Grabe, 2009, p. 223).

Another participant concisely expressed the way she/he used her/his reading strategies while and after reading:

“When I read the passages, I recalled the class content. I understood which tense was used in which passage. I particularly noted down the conjunctions.” E.B.

The examples above may be an evidence for reading being a process of “hypothesis testing” (Smith, 1971, as cited in Hirvela, 2004, p. 52). In other words “while reading recursively – that is, moving forward and backward through the text – readers reject earlier hypothesis and create new ones” (Hirvela, 2004, p. 52).

While reconstructing the reading passages, it was more than normal for some of the participants to favor one form of learning/teaching. An evidence comes from one participant in the second group:

“I looked at the transitions between the sentences but with the handout I got better in understanding them.” E.S.

However, all the students who reflected upon their experiences in self-reports indicated that they improved and they monitored their progress from the beginning to the end. An example follows:

“Before the study, I wasn’t able to understand sentences but now at least I can understand some words. I can learn even if a little.” A.S.

In summary, at the core of this study were signals that can promote discourse awareness which includes “a set of skills and processes that incorporate several reading strategies” (Grabe, 2009, p. 196). It was revealed that both extensive reading through self-study and reading with explicit instruction were conducive to enhancing discourse signals.

Above all, the biggest outcome of this study may be that majority of the participants seem to have changed their attitudes towards language learning from negative to positive. Quotations below suggest this transformation:

“The initial negative bias towards English has disappeared slowly. I observe that my reading comprehension skills has improved.” I.T.

“My vocabulary level and my curiosity regarding English has increased. I want to read a book in the semester holiday.” Y.T.

**CONCLUSIONS**

**Restatement of the Problem**

In the setting where this study has been conducted, one of the major problems with learning English comes from the transfer of L1 reading habits but in the negative direction. More specifically, there is a tendency not to do reading in general or reading for pleasure in particular. An evidence may come from the initial reactions of the participants to how the study would take place. When the first group realized that they were not required to do any specific exercises or answer any questions related to the texts, they were surprised. Reading for the sake of reading comprehension is not something that they do in their L1 very frequently, as stated by them in the conversations between them and the researcher, me, before and after the study. I do not have such a strong evidence to generalize this situation to the parent population. Yet, via close examination and observation of Turkish adult EFL learners for quite a long time, nearly 20 years, I have come to realize that EFL learners should start from scratch and read both in L1 and L2 and not for class-bound purposes but pleasure.

This study therefore had two major aims, worded in three research questions. The first was to look for a statistically supported evidence for the effect of reading extensively without instruction or moderately with instruction. The second aim was to strengthen the breadth of the study through depth. This was possible with the actual reports of the participants on every phase of the study, their experiences throughout, and their plans for future.
Research Questions

RQ1 Is varied exposure to reading input, extensive and moderate supported by instruction, conducive to enhancing discourse signaling awareness?
It was found that both types of learning and teaching methods enhanced participants’ awareness of discourse signals. However, the increase in the first group unlike the one in the second group was statistically confirmed by a statistical analysis. Thus, learners who were engaged in extensive reading but without any explicit guidance seem to have performed better than those who read less but instructed through an extra material and teacher guidance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for group 1 but it was not rejected for group 2.

RQ2 Which of the learning/teaching methods (extensive exposure to reading input or moderate amount of exposure supported by instruction) is more effective in enhancing discourse signaling awareness?
While the two types of learning/teaching methods adopted in this study seem to have been benefitted by the learners, neither one seems to have been more significant than the other in statistical terms. In other words, both groups increased their awareness of discourse signals but not at a remarkable level. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

RQ3 What are the thought patterns of EFL learners about extensive reading alone and reading supported with instruction/guidance?
Most participants did not favor one type of reading over another. Yet they clearly stated that the study on reading contributed to not only to reading per se but to other language skills as well. After they completed the study, they seem to have been very determined to take action to improve their reading and vocabulary skills. Additionally, learners’ use of sentences that begin with “I realized that …, I understood that … or I have noticed that …” can be an evidence that they may go on doing reading activities in a more conscious manner.

Implications and Applications

This study showed that even among learners with low proficiency and high level of negative bias towards reading in L2, reading can be promoted. This implies that reading comprehension can be achieved through reading itself. This necessitates multiplicity of resources adapted and adopted for multiplicity of contexts. The participants though lacking language experience at a high level told that they enjoyed being exposed to much input though they did not understand them totally. In relation to these findings and observations, it can be said that teachers can find individualized ways for their students to read in their L2. This idea is in line with Clarke (1980) who wrote that “perhaps there are not ‘good readers’ or ‘bad readers’ but merely ‘good’ and ‘poor’ reading behaviors” (p. 120). In other words, results of Clarke’s study imply that in essence there is no absolutism when it comes to classifying readers. Instead, there are study patterns that haven’t been individualized yet.

The test used as initial and final test in the study can be used in teaching environments where instructors have similar aims such as teaching the function of conjunctions in understanding larger texts. By the same token, such tests can also be designed by teachers for diagnostic purposes who think that assessment, teaching and learning are closely related. Such efforts may require more time and energy but as language teachers, our job “involves encouraging and scaffolding learning which extends beyond the bounds of the physical classroom” (McDonough, Shaw, & Masuhara, 2013, p. 101) (emphasize added). In a similar vein, the reading teacher, in particular, should “assume the role of a guide, a model, or stimulator rather than the provider of the correct answers to comprehension questions” (Salataçı & Akyel, 2002, p. 10).

Limitations and Delimitations

To begin with, sample size of the study was limited to 36 and participants were not selected randomly, which is why results cannot be generalized to the population. To put it another way, the sample may not be representative of the parent population, 12th grade high school students. Moreover, the length of the manipulation of the variables was not long despite a fact that learning is a never ending process.

Another limitation is the lack of a delayed test which rejections the possibility of understanding whether the increase in participants’ awareness was a long-term or not.

Suggestions for Future Research

A collection of words or sentences can be a text or a discourse when they are backed by contextualization. This requires different lengths at different proficiency levels and different topics. Therefore, not only pedagogically useful reading passages, but also different rhetorical types should be worked upon in future studies.

In a similar vein, researchers in future can collect data from multiple sources. A learner who can find the correct answer in a multiple choice format may not be that successful when he or she is required to produce a text using those words. This brings to my mind the seemingly dichotomous paradigms in language education, receptive and productive. A study merging differing perspectives of language learning, therefore, could have more to say to those involved in EFL learning and teaching.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1. A sample of the reading passages used in the study with discourse signals embedded

TEXT 1- Sugeng Loses his Home

Indonesia is a beautiful country. It has many islands. It is a hot country. Most people live on the island of Java. Java is a rich island. But too many people live there and life is not easy. His name was Sugeng. `Sugeng’ means ‘happy’ or ‘safe’, but Sugeng’s life was not always happy or safe. There were many people in Sugeng’s family. He had five brothers and four sisters. But one of his sisters died when she was only two months old. One of his brothers died when he fell from a tree. Sugeng’s family lived near a mountain. This was a dangerous place because sometimes fire and rocks came down from the mountain. But the land was good and there was a lot of water. Sugeng was happy on the farm. He had, a lot of work to do, but he liked his work. Because he was small and strong he climbed coconut trees to get the coconuts. He took the cows to the river to wash them. Sugeng liked the river very much. He rode on the back of one of his cows and swam in the river with them.

(Retrieved from http://aj3000.com/wp/free-graded-readers/fire-on-the-mountain-chapter-1/)

Appendix 2. A section of exercises in the handout used to instruct Group 2

Rewrite as one sentence using the conjunction given.
1. I don’t eat cheese. I don’t eat butter. (or)
2. I like him. He’s annoying. (but)
3. We’re having salad for lunch. We’re not very hungry. (so)

Appendix 3. The diagnostic cloze test (pre- and post-test)

Name-surname:

CLOZE TEST

Fill in the blanks with the right conjunction.
Last spring my best friend Isabelle (1) I booked a holiday in Venice. We rented a small apartment for a week with a fantastic view of the canals. At the last moment another friend, Linda, asked if she could come too. We felt sorry for her (2) she had problems with her boyfriend, so we said yes. Venice was magical and the weather was perfect (3) the holiday was a disaster for one simple reason: Linda was so mean! She has a good job (4) she’s not poor, (5) she just didn’t want to pay for anything. When we went sightseeing she didn’t want to go to any museums (6) galleries that cost money. (7) she wanted to go on a gondola herself she complained that it was very expensive. When we went to have lunch or dinner she always wanted to go to cheap restaurants (8) she bought pizzas and ate them in the flat.

1. A. but B. and C. or D. because E. so 
2. A. although B. and C. but D. or E. because
3. A. and B. or C. although D. but E. so
4. A. so B. because C. although D. but E. or
5. A. and B. or C. although D. but E. so
6. A. although B. because C. so D. and E. or
7. A. And B. But C. Although D. Or E. So
8. A. but B. or C. and D. because E. although

(The text was retrieved and adapted from https://elt.oup.com/student/englishfile/preint3/g_ef_pre_builder?cc=us&selLanguage=en)
**Appendix 4.** Codebook for self-evaluation reports on the research study and Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from the texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1 Contribution of Reading to Other Skills and Fields</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contribution to learning vocabulary | That reading activities in the study helped improve vocabulary knowledge | “I have learnt new words but I believe there should be more words.” N.Y  
“I had difficulty while reading because there were words that I didn’t know. But when I learn their meaning, I can grasp the meaning of the sentences.” D.G.  
“The study helped us learn different words.” E.Ç.  
“I tried to use the new vocabulary in my daily life and shared them with others, which made me happy.” K.Ş. |
| Contribution to pronunciation | That reading activities in the study helped improve pronunciation | “I think I have improved my pronunciation even if a little bit.” O.K. |
| Speedy reading | That reading activities in the study helped improve reading speed | “The study increased my speed of reading.” E.Ç. |
| Contribution to writing section in the formal school exam performance | The important role and impact of reading activities on writing | “Reading the passages had an impact on my reasoning in the writing section of the school exam.” E.O.  
“It was a systematic study. I used the words and conjunctions in the writing section of the school exam.” K.Ş. |
| **Theme 2 Increased Awareness and Strategy Use** | | |
| Passages/Handout being helpful | Participants’ positive thoughts regarding the materials used in the study | “I looked at the transitions between the sentences but with the handout I got better in understanding them.” E.Ş. |
| Increasing awareness towards making meaning process, learning sentence construction, transitions, conjunctions | Participants’ self-awareness towards elements that promote reading comprehension | “Materials facilitated my understanding process and using conjunctions.” B.K.  
“I particularly focused on transitions between the sentences. Though I performed in the final test worse I believe this study was helpful.” E.C.  
“Before the study, I wasn’t able to understand sentences but now at least I can understand some words. I can learn even if a little.” A.S.  
“I realized that there is a progress in my English level. I wanted to look up the conjunctions and the new words.” O.G.  
“I have low interest in English but still reading passages contributed to my making meaning out of the sentences.” M.B.  
“I have come to understand that I have difficulty with many rules and conjunctions.” R.Y  
“By the help of this study, I have understood that my reading comprehension is not good.” A.K. |
| Strategy use | Participants’ developing strategies to compensate for the skills that lack in their cognition | “When I read the passages, I recalled the class content. I understood which tense was used in which passage. I particularly noted down the conjunctions. E.B.  
“There were passages that I didn’t understand so I wrote the unknown words on a paper, I carefully examined the structures. And I reread them carefully by taking these into account.” N.G.  
“I translated the texts into English and I looked up the unknown words in them.” E.T.  
“I was happy when I could translate the texts without a problem.” K.Ş. |

(Contd...)
### Theme 3 Self-determination to Promote Language Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from the texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| First time for reading but enjoyable      | Participants’ first language experience with reading activities but their positive feelings about it | “This is the first time that I have been doing such a reading study. What I liked most was the handout. I was bored in the beginning but later on I enjoyed it when I saw I could do it.” C.D.  
“I haven’t done such a study before. But it was entertaining.” D.G  
“The study helped us read in an enjoyable manner and without getting tired.” E.Ç.  
“The study sounded difficult in the beginning but later I understood that it was helpful and enjoyable.” D.O. |
| Change in attitudes towards English and Plan for future performance | Participants’ not only diagnosing but also treating their problems in their language use | “I would like to improve myself in writing as I can understand the sentences but I cannot write a sentence myself.” B.K.  
“I think it will be better for me to practice to improve my reading.” A.K.  
“My vocabulary level and my curiosity regarding English has increased. I want to read a book in the semester holiday.” Y.T.  
“This study has increased my interest in English because I realized that I can do something.” E.B.  
“The initial negative bias towards English has disappeared slowly. I observe that my reading comprehension skills has improved.” İ.T.  
“I realized that I have many deficiencies in my English and I downloaded a mobile application that teaches English. Now I have less difficulty while reading.” F.B. |