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Abstract

Students leaving school do not seem to be adequately prepared to read and comprehend academic material at the required level for higher education (Department of Education, 2008). The purpose of this exploratory research was to gain understanding of the influence of reciprocal teaching strategies on comprehension of academic reading. The sample comprised of eight second year B. Commerce (B.Com) respondents majoring in marketing management at a private institute of higher education. The student’s ability to succeed in higher education is closely linked with their ability to read and comprehend academic material (Dreyer, 2003). An assignment case study was used to teach the use of reciprocal strategies. The respondents were thereafter required to apply reciprocal strategies to the prescribed academic material. Each respondent answered a questionnaire to establish their perception of the effect these strategies had on their comprehension of the case study. The initial findings are encouraging and would warrant further research.
1. Introduction

The Department of Education (DoE, 2008) states that reading competence affects a student’s writing competence and their comprehension levels which in turn, affects their academic performance throughout the education system. Access to new information and knowledge through reading assists students to engage in a process of lifelong learning (DoE, 2008). According to statistics released by the DoE (2008) only 51% of students are able to read at a level appropriate for their age groups. The DoE (2008) further suggests that for 49% of students the learning outcomes are not achieved due to a below age appropriate level of reading competency. The source concludes that students at higher education level are not competent readers, mainly due to their limited proficiency in English.

Related to the information released by the Department of Education (2008), Geyser (2012, p.79) states that 43.7 % of first year higher education students have poor comprehension and 31.1% of students have an average to poor vocabulary, confirming that many students are not able to read efficiently. The author suggests that the majority of students need assistance in their ability to use language in order to graduate and function as productive members of the economy.

This leads to the use of reciprocal teaching strategies in academic reading and comprehension which is a strategy that encourages readers to adopt skills that effective readers already have, such as summarising, clarifying, questioning and predicting while reading (Adlit.org,2015; Richardson, n.d.). In line with this Education Scotland (n.d.) states that reciprocal reading strategies are often used to develop students reading skills as well as ensuring all students gain access to the curriculum. According to Adlit.org (2015) reciprocal teaching is a strategy that allows both students and educators to share the role of educating by allowing both parties to enter a dialogue about specific pieces of reading. The source suggests these strategies work particularly well with text in textbooks and works of nonfiction.

This aim of this research is to explore the effect of reciprocal teaching methods in improving the reading and comprehension abilities in second year B. Com Marketing Management students at an institute of Higher Education.

2. The Problem

Hernon (2007) explains the problem statement is an indication of the central focus of the study. The central focus of this research was to establish whether the application of reciprocal teaching strategies would have an effect on the respondent’s perception of their level of academic reading and comprehension literacy. The measurement of the respondent’s perception of their academic reading literacy was assessed with a post intervention questionnaire.

The problem as Howie (2015) suggests is that reading comprehension in South Africa, is not a guarantee of academic success itself, but lack of reading comprehension ability is definitely a barrier to academic success. This is in line with the DoE’s (2008) concern that a lack of reading and comprehension ability undermines a student’s ability to successfully educate themselves at Higher
Education level. Adlit.org (2015) suggests reciprocal strategies as a possible solution to this lack of ability to comprehend reading material. This source believes reciprocal strategies work particularly well with academic material.

This leads to the research question: How do the respondents perceive a reciprocal teaching intervention as having an influence on their academic reading and comprehension ability?

The research objective was in what way students perceived reciprocal teaching intervention and its influence on their reading and comprehension ability.

3. Literature Review

Howie (2015) believes that reading comprehension skills are only improved when there is a focus on learning reading skills, this focus in turn will improve language proficiency. The author suggests that learning to read is neither natural nor easy, but is linguistically complex and requires much effort on the part of the student and ‘incremental skill development’. Howie (2015) and Dreyer (2003) both discuss how important intervention strategies are in comprehension ability and academic performance. In addition, Howie (2015) proposes that a critical factor in improving comprehension ability and thus academic achievement is to give a central focus to comprehension ability in the South African classrooms.

Adding to this Dreyer (2003) comments on research that confirms students registering for undergraduate qualifications are underprepared in their comprehension ability. The author considers how this puts pressure on educators to develop effective reading strategies and teach comprehension to students. Dreyer (2003) suggests that comprehension ability is not only important for academic success but professional success and the ability to engage in life-long learning. The author states that little focus is placed on comprehension in the school system and comprehension skills can only be learnt if they are ‘explicitly taught’.

In 2008 the DoE released a National Reading strategy document that acknowledges the reading literacy problem in South Africa education. The DoE (2008) documents the reading literacy problem in South African education by discussing the fact that systematic evaluation of reading literacy was conducted which showed that students did not perform well when tested for age appropriate reading literacy. The DoE (2008) suggests this ‘crisis’ of reading literacy needs to be addressed through educating strategies or methods that assist to develop reading literacy to age appropriate levels.

Further to the DoE, Boughey (2009) wrote a report to suggest that university students in South Africa have a problem with their lack of ability to read. The author emphasises that reading at tertiary level is not the same as reading per se. At tertiary level respondents are required to make inferences, draw conclusions and read critically which is very different from the day to day type of reading. The author discusses how the National Benchmark tests show that South African school leavers cannot read or write at a level acceptable for universities. According to the author responsibility for this lack of ability to read and write has fallen on the academic staff at universities, who have come to realise that this situation is not easily rectified. It is necessary to reflect and ask
probing questions with regards to methods and strategies to deal with language literacy in South African university students.

Research by Van der Slik’s (2007) agrees with Boughey (2009) and clearly suggests that it appears there has been a decline, over recent years, in the literacy levels of students entering institutes of higher education, leaving much of the pressure on lecturers at this level to ensure that students are able to critically assess academic material, through reading and comprehension.

Van de Poel’s (2013) made a number of observations about first year higher education students; such as a legacy of political socio economic factors based in the educational policy during apartheid, the education in South African schools has much to be desired in preparing students for higher education. The author does point out that this phenomenon of under preparedness in terms of academic literacy in higher education students is universal. The aim of the author’s study was to provide evidence linking academic reading ability to the academic achievement of students in South African higher education. The research findings suggest that academic reading ability is a factor in the student’s academic success regardless of their socio-economic circumstances and other differences. The author concluded that academic reading ability should be supported through reading strategies in order for the students to progress to their full potential.

According to Fung (2002) respondents with academic learning difficulties, who consider English their second language, exist in many other diverse educational settings. The author suggests that learning becomes a challenge for students with limited English language proficiency. The author believes that few school programmes focus on higher level reading strategies and focus instead on the student’s oral proficiency and their ability to decode text. Research was conducted by the author in a number of Australian schools with the purpose of investigating the effects of reciprocal strategies on the reading comprehension literacy of students with limited English language proficiency. The findings of the author’s research confirmed that reciprocal teaching strategies had a positive effect on the reading comprehension literacy of students who were exposed to the intervention.

Klapwijk (2012) believes that reading literacy objectives are not being met in the South African curriculum. The author suggests research makes a strong case for reading strategies improving reading comprehension. She further states that despite the evidence of the benefits of reading strategies they are seldom employed by educators thus depriving students of the ability to make advances in their reading comprehension.

Bharutram (2012) states that many students entering higher education in South Africa are not prepared for the independent reading required at higher education level. The author suggests that students need to read with enough comprehension to analyse, critique, evaluate and synthesise information. The author’s article highlights the need for reading strategies across the curriculum in order to increase the student’s comprehension ability to a level acceptable at higher education level.

Considering the extensive research done in South Africa on the state of academic reading and comprehension literacy the evidence suggests that a problem does exist in higher education. While conducting research on previous studies no evidence could be found that reciprocal teaching
strategies have been researched in the South African higher education context, although there is a possibility that studies have been conducted but were inaccessible to the researcher.

Considering the amount of evidence suggesting a strong need for intervention in reading and comprehension ability at higher education level in South Africa, coupled with strong international evidence suggesting that reciprocal reading strategies are superior to traditional classroom techniques, it seems valuable to investigate the effect of reciprocal teaching strategies in a South Africa Higher education context.

4. Research Methodology and design

Dissertationhelpservice.com (2015) describes research methodology as a way to find a solution to a research problem. While van Wyk (n.d.) indicates that research design speaks to the data required and methods used to collect and analyse this data in order to answer the research question.

4.1 Research Paradigm and Methodology

The multi-paradigmatic paradigm appears to be suitable for this research as it allows the researcher to use a combination of methods and standards of quality drawn from a few of the newer paradigms, in other words a number of different paradigms can be referred to in the research, therefore not tying the researcher down to one single paradigm (Tatlor, 2013). This research is educational and therefore a sociological type of quantitative research thus using a multi-paradigmatic approach will result in flexibility in the approach towards the research, more specifically flexibility in term of methods and quality standards. This flexibility will allow for quantitative research to be used for this project.

Cresswell (2002, p.1) describes quantitative research as a method to collect numerical data to explain phenomena, the data collected is usually analysed and turned into statistics. The author further discusses how quantitative research has been used in educational research to gather data that doesn’t appear to be represented in a numerical way. This is done by designing research tools that converts information not presented in a numerical way, into quantitative data that can be converted and analysed as statistics. The author goes on to explain how attitudes and beliefs do not naturally present themselves as quantitative data, but by designing a questionnaire we can collect this data and turn it into statistics. A quantitative approach was taken to measure the cause and effect relationship between reciprocal teaching strategies (cause) and ability to read and comprehend the prescribed academic material (effect), as well as to ensure objective, reliable and replicable research. Within the quantitative approach, the research remained exploratory due to its limited scope.

Exploratory research is explained by the Educational Portal (2014) as being initial research that comes from an idea either hypothetical or related to theory. Educational Portal (2014) suggests that exploratory research often lays the groundwork for further research. This research project falls
under the category of exploratory research and is limited in scope. If there is a strong correlation between the ability to read and comprehend prescribed academic material and reciprocal teaching strategies in this research, then the possibility of conducting more in depth research on this subject should be considered.

4.2 Research Design and Data Collection Method

According to Mitchell, (n.d.) there are a number of non-experimental research designs to choose from of which Ex Post Facto, Correlation Studies and Survey Design are three. A survey design is considered descriptive and is frequently used in educational research to measure problems of a sociological context (Cohen, 2007 p.205). A survey design was chosen for this research.

Hall (2008) describes cross sectional survey design as a survey that takes a ‘snapshot’ at one point in time. As this research is considered sociological a survey design was chosen, in specific, a ‘snapshot’ approach was appropriate, as the impact of an intervention is only being measured by a questionnaire post intervention at one point in time. Therefore a cross sectional survey design was used.

A structured questionnaire will allow for faster coding of quantitative data. (Cohen 2007, p.322; Evaluation Toolbox, 2010). For this research problem a structured questionnaire was applied to the sample post intervention, to obtain perceptions and rate the effectiveness of various aspects of the intervention. If the respondents perceive their ability to read the academic material has improved after the intervention, this can then be seen as evidence of a causal relationship between improved reading and comprehension ability and the reciprocal teaching intervention.

The questionnaire consists of eight closed questions, a dichotomous question, a multiple choice question and six questions using a Likert rating scale. Five open questions were used to collect quantitative data.

4.3 Research Population and Sampling

According to Ross (n.d) the population in survey research consists of members of a defined target. He further states that the population description has to be precise and will consider the people, the organisation or the object the study (survey) will focus on. According to Exporable.com (n.d) there can be two types of populations in research; a target population and an accessible population. The target population is the entire group of individuals, organisations or objects that the research can be generalised to. The accessible population is the people, organisations and objects that researchers can apply their conclusions to. The defined target for this research was the accessible population.

For the purposes of this study the population was all students at a Higher Education Institution who were registered for a B. Com degree. Purposive (non-probability) sampling was used to include only second year students, majoring in Marketing Management.
Non-probability (purposive) convenience sampling took place as the entire group of second year marketing management students were sampled as they were conveniently accessible to the researcher who is lecturer of this module.

Characteristics of the sample include that respondents are from a Higher Education Institution, and are currently registered for B. Com degree, second year with a Marketing Management major. These respondents are diverse in both ethnicity and home language. The respondents range from the ages of 20 to 24 years old.

4.4 Limitations Applicable to the Research

Baltimore County Public Schools (2015) discusses limitations as effects, inadequacies and circumstances the researcher cannot control, these limitations could affect the research results. Firstly, this research is limited scope exploratory research and therefore the biggest delimiting factor in this research is the fact that the result is not able to be generalised to anyone other than the respondents. Secondly the results of this research could be affected by the fact that the research will take place over a limited period, as opposed to being delivered over an extensive period. This limitation may affect the results of the research negatively. Thirdly, there is the possibility that when using rating scales in a questionnaire the respondent’s perceptions of the different ratings mean could vary and therefore affect the result.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

According to Stringer (2008, p.44) every research project should consider ethics in order to protect the rights of those involved (the respondents). Stringer (2008, p. 45) further states that ethical considerations should cover issues of confidentiality, sensitivity and care as well as permissions. Trochim (2006) states that ethical protection should take the form of voluntary participation, informed consent, no risk to participants, protection of confidentiality, a person’s right to service and the principle of anonymity. Resnik (2011) suggests the following principles should be adhered to in order for research to be ethical; honesty, objectivity, openness, confidentiality, respect for colleagues, social responsibility, responsible mentoring, non-discrimination and protection of human rights.

In order for this research project to be ethical written permission was requested to conduct the research. In order to gain permission information was disclosed as to the purpose and scope of the research (Stringer, 2008, p. 45). A process of informed consent was engaged in with all participants a short document was signed by participants which included information of the purposes and nature of the project, getting the participants permission to participate, permission to use the information they provide as data, assurance of confidentiality of information, confirming their right to withdraw from the project at any stage (Stringer, 2008, p.46).
5. Data Analysis

According to Du Plooy-Cilliers (2014) quantitative data analysis allows a researcher to prove or disprove a research question.

5.1 Discussion of findings

Du Plooy-Cilliers (2014) posits that in this section of the report displays the research results and a relevant discussion around these results.

The results are described in the graphics and discussions that follow:

5.1.1 Mother tongue

The first question is dichotomous and the results were put in a table and counted. Any errors were taken into consideration and counted separately and depicted in the results as a bar chart.

Do you speak a language other than English at home?

![Mother Tongue of respondents](Image)

**Fig 1: Question 1 Mother Tongue of respondents**

Fig. 1 represents how many respondents consider English their mother tongue and how many don’t. The result was that 50% of the respondents consider English their mother tongue, for 38% of the respondents their mother tongue is not English. Twelve percent (12%) of the respondents failed to respond to this question. Therefore we can conclude a minimum of 50% of the respondents
consider English their mother tongue and a minimum of 38% consider a language other than English their mother tongue. 

As the DOE (2008) suggest a lack of proficiency in academic comprehension ability could possibly stem from the respondents home language varying from the language of learning, in this case English.

5.1.2 Matric Symbol for English

Question 2 was a closed question with the possibility of six options. However the respondents only used three answers which were put in a table and counted and depicted in the results as a bar chart.

What symbol did you get in Matric for English?

Fig. 2 Question 2: Matric symbol for English

Fig. 2 represents the symbols or results that the respondents received for English in their Matric year. The results indicated that 12% of the respondents received an A symbol, 50% of the respondents received a B symbol and 38% of the respondents received a C symbol, inferring that all respondents received at least a C symbol for their English Matric results and the majority of the respondents (50%) received a B symbol for English.

These respondents all passed matric English, but as suggested by Dreyer (2003) although the respondents passed Matric English, this does not mean they start undergraduate qualifications with an ability to comprehend academic material.
Questions 3-8 were closed questions measured on a Likert Scale. Once again these were tabulated and due to the small population, easy to count, these and the results are depicted as pie charts. The possible answers were Excellent. Good, Average, below average, weak and very weak. The results for each question were as follows.

5.1.3 Reading and comprehension ability

![Pie Chart](image)

**Fig3. Question 3: Reading and comprehension ability**

In question 3 the lowest rating in this question was ‘average’ and the highest ‘good’. No respondents chose ‘Excellent’, ‘below average’, ‘weak’ or ‘very weak’.

Seventy five percent (75%) of respondents rated their understanding of the prescribed reading as good and 25% of the respondents rated their understanding of the prescribed reading as ‘average’. Therefore 75% of the respondents considered their ability to read and understand the prescribed material above average.

The positive reaction to this question relates back to the findings of Richardson’s (n.d.), Education Scotland’s (n.d.), Fung 2002) and Adlit.org’s (2015), suggesting that reciprocal teaching strategies develop respondent’s ability to better comprehend academic (or other) reading material.
5.1.4 Ability to pick out the main point from every paragraph

In question 4 the lowest rating on question 4 was ‘average’ (12%) and the highest ‘Excellent’ (38%), 50% of respondents chose ‘good’. There were no responses for ‘below average’, ‘weak’ and ‘very weak’.

From the above response, we can conclude and 88% of the respondents perceived their ability to pick out the main point in a paragraph as above average post the reciprocal teaching intervention, linking back to Adlit.org’s suggestion that summarising results (finding the main points) is improved through the application of reciprocal strategies.

Fig.4 Question 4: Ability to pick out the main point from every paragraph
5.1.5 Improved understanding of vocabulary

**Fig.5 Question 5: Improved understanding of the vocabulary used in the academic material post the reciprocal teaching strategy.**

In question 5 the lowest rating in question 5 was ‘average’ (12%) and the highest ‘excellent’ (12%), there was an error in 12% of the respondents rating. The majority of the respondents (64%) chose ‘good’. There were no responses for ‘below average’, ‘weak’ and ‘very weak’.

From the above data we can conclude that a minimum of 76% of the respondents perceived their ability to understand the vocabulary in the prescribed reading was above average, which relates directly to Adlit.org’s (2015) belief that reciprocal teaching strategies clarification aspect assists with clarification of vocabulary, resulting in a positive effect on the respondent’s ability to comprehend the vocabulary in academic material.
5.1.6 Ability to answer questions

![Ability to answer questions](image)

**Fig.6: Question 6: Ability to answer questions**

In question 6 the lowest rating was ‘average’ (38%), the highest rating was excellent (12%), the majority of the respondents answered ‘good’ (50%). There were no responses for ‘below average’, ‘weak’ and ‘very weak’.

Sixty two percent (62%) of respondents felt their ability to answer questions related to the academic material was above average post a reciprocal teaching intervention. This finding corresponds with Richardson’s (n.d) view that questioning is a skill that leads to respondents having better reading comprehension ability.
5.1.7 Ability to ‘read between the lines’

In question 7 the lowest rating was ‘average’ (38%), the highest rating was ‘excellent’ (12%), the majority of the respondents chose ‘good’ (50%). There were no responses for ‘below average’, ‘weak’ and ‘very weak’.

Sixty two percent (62%) of respondents felt their ability to ‘read between the lines’ was above average after implementing reciprocal reading strategies, this closely relates the ability to predict and question as mentioned by Richardson (n.d.) and his view that reciprocal strategies encourage students to adopt skills effective readers already have.
In Question 8 the respondents lowest rating was ‘average’ (25%) the highest rating was ‘excellent’ (25%), the majority of the respondents chose ‘good’ (50%). There were no responses for ‘below average’, ‘weak’ and ‘very weak’.

Van der Slik (2007), suggests that the ability to critically read academic material and therefore the ability to form an opinion appears to be limited in respondents entering higher education. Related to van der Slik’s (2007) findings, overall 75% of the respondents perceived an above average ability to form an opinion about the prescribed reading material post the reciprocal strategy intervention.
Fig. 9 Questions 3-8: Overall response to questions 3-8.

Fig. 9 represents the overall response to the Likert scale questions 3-8. In these questions, overall ‘average’ was the lowest score given (56%) and ‘excellent’ was the highest score given (17%). The majority of scores recorded throughout these questions was ‘good’ (56%). There was a 2% error and no respondents scored ‘below average’, ‘weak’ and ‘very weak’.

Overall 73% of the respondents recorded an above average perception of the overall benefit in their ability to comprehend the academic material post the reciprocal strategy intervention. This result appears to confirm the beliefs of Richardson (n.d.), Education Scotland (n.d.), Fung (2002) and Adlit (2015) that reciprocal strategies can have a positive effect on the reading and comprehension of academic material at higher education level.
5.1.10 Open ended questions

Question 9-13 were open questions.

In order to get quantitative data from open ended questions, they were coded as follows: Positive response – Benefit was seen in the reciprocal teaching strategy intervention by the respondents. Neutral response – Neither a benefit or lack of benefit was seen in the reciprocal teaching strategy intervention by the respondents. Negative response – a lack of benefit was seen in the reciprocal teaching strategy intervention by the respondents. Answers were then tabulated and appear in the following pie charts.

5.1.11 Understanding other modules

Question 9: How has this the guidance you received from the reciprocal teaching interventions improved your ability to understand other modules?

Fig. 10 Question 9: Understanding other modules

One hundred percent (100%) of the respondents suggested that learning how to use reciprocal strategies will assist them in comprehension of other modules. There were no neutral or negative responses. These findings affirm Fung’s (2002) suggestion that the use of reciprocal strategies improves the overall comprehension ability of students.
5.1.12 Learning to summarise

**Question 10:** How has learning to summarise prescribed material benefitted your comprehension?

![Learning to summarise](image)

**Fig. 11: Question 10: Learning to summarise**

Education Scotland (n.d.) and Adlit.org’s (2015) suggest that the use of reciprocal strategies improve the student’s ability to summarise academic content. One hundred percent (100%) of the respondents agreed with these sources, suggesting their ability to summarise academic material had improved after being exposed to the strategies. There were no neutral or negative responses.

5.1.13 Repeat question

**Question 11:** This was a repeat of question 10 due to a typing error on the questionnaire and therefore no data was admitted from this question.
5.1.14 Clarification and prediction

**Question 12:** How has clarifying and prediction assisted you to understand your prescribed material?

![Clarification and Prediction](image)

**Fig. 12 Question 12: Clarification and prediction**

One hundred percent (100%) of respondents had a positive response to this question, which confirms Richardson (n.d.), Education Scotland (n.d.) and Adlit.org’s (2015) conviction that reciprocal strategies improve both prediction techniques and clarification of academic material. There were no neutral or negative responses.
5.1.15 Overall benefit of intervention

**Question 13:** What was the overall benefit (if any) that you think you gained from being exposed to the reciprocal teaching interventions?

![Overall benefit of intervention](image)

**Fig. 13 Question 13: Overall benefit of intervention**

The above data records 100% of respondents as perceiving their overall comprehension benefitted from being exposed to reciprocal strategies. There were no neutral or negative responses. This endorses opinions of Richardson (n.d.), Education Scotland (n.d.), Fung (2002) and Adlit.org’s (2015), that reciprocal strategies can be instrumental in improving comprehension ability.

5.1.16 Open questions overall

The response to questions 9-13 were coded as positive and there was a one hundred percent (100%) positively framed response, no negative or neutral responses were recorded.

Due to this positive response from all respondents, it is possible to deduce that reciprocal teaching strategies were perceived by all respondents as having a positive influence on their reading and comprehension ability when reading academic material. This result appears to confirm Richardson (n.d.), Education Scotland (n.d.), Fung (2002) and Adlit.org’s (2015) belief in the use of reciprocal strategies to improve the overall comprehension ability of students when reading academic material.
6. Conclusion and recommendations

The conclusion and recommendation section of a report takes a look at the implications of the research findings and connections are made between wider issues and recommendations (Du Plooy-Cilliers, 2014).

The DoE (2008) and Geyser (2012) both testify to the lack of comprehension ability in higher education students. This leads to the objective of this research which was to confirm Richardson’s (n.d.), Education Scotland (n.d.), Fung (2002) and Adlit.org (2007) beliefs that reciprocal teaching interventions have a positive influence on the ability of the respondent’s ability to comprehend academic reading material at higher education level. The objective of the research was achieved and it was found that the sample respondents perceived reciprocal strategies as benefitting their academic comprehension ability.

The research question asked in this research was: Do the respondent’s perceive a reciprocal teaching intervention as having an influence on their academic reading and comprehension? In answer to this question, the evidence collected points to the fact that reciprocal teaching strategies do indeed have a positive influence on the respondent’s perception of their reading and comprehension of academic material. These findings confirm the opinions of Richardson (n.d.), Education Scotland (n.d.), Fung (2002) and Adlit.org (2007) that the four skills; summarising, clarifying, questioning and predicting was perceived by the sample to benefit their comprehension ability.

Although the results of this research are not generalisable to students other than the sample, the respondent’s tendency to perceive reciprocal teaching interventions as a positive influence on their academic comprehension ability could lead to further more conclusive research into the effects of reciprocal teaching interventions. In terms of broader issues reciprocal strategies could, through future research; Firstly, present a solution to issues such as the current pressure on educators at higher education level to ensure the reading and comprehension ability of students (Van der Slik, 2007, Boughey, 2009), secondly, lead to educators proactively experimenting with interventional strategies which both Klapwijk (2012) and Bharutram (2012) feel are required to improve the comprehension ability of students in higher education, finally it could assist the DoE, policy writers and educators to design possible solutions, preventative measures and intervention measures to improve students’ academic reading and comprehension skills.

The aim of this exploratory research was achieved. The findings support a need for further research into reciprocal strategies as a teaching intervention to address the lack of comprehension ability in higher education students as documented by DoE (2008) and Geyser (2012).
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Dear Respondent:

My name is Jane Pinnoy and I am a lecturer and graduate respondent at an n Institute for Higher Education. For my final research project I am exploring the effect of reciprocal teaching methods as an intervention in the Marketing Management 2. Reciprocal teaching refers to a educating strategy that includes learning skills such as summarising, questioning, and clarifying and predicting while reading classroom. The aim of the research is Reciprocal teaching refers to a educating strategy that includes learning skills such as summarising, questioning, clarifying and predicting while reading. The aim of the research is to assess its effect on the respondent’s academic reading and comprehension literacy.

Because you are a Marketing Management 2 respondent, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached survey.

The following questionnaire will require approximately 15 minutes to complete. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk. Anonymity is ensured and all information provided will be treated as confidential. Therefore do not include your name on the questionnaire.

If you choose to participate in this research, please answer all questions as honestly as possible and return the completed questionnaire promptly to myself before you leave the classroom.

Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavours.

Sincerely,

Jane Pinnoy

Cell: 082 882 0554

Email: jane@strappini.co.za
Instruction: Please answer all the questions.

Section 1: Language Information

**Question 1: Your Mother tongue**

Do you speak a language other than English at home?

a) No  

b) Yes  

(if yes please specify language)

**Question 2: You’re Matric Symbol for English**

What symbol did you get in Matric for English? Please select the appropriate box with an X

A  B  C  D  E  <E

Section 2: Rate your Reading and Comprehension Ability

Make one cross in one box per question below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. How would you rate your reading and understanding ability of your, prescribed reading etc. after the guidance you received from the reciprocal teaching interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How would you rate your ability to pick out the main point from every paragraph when you read academic material after the guidance you received from the reciprocal teaching interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How would you rate your improved understanding of the vocabulary used in the academic material you are reading after the guidance you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received from the reciprocal teaching interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How would you rate your ability to answer questions around the prescribed material after the guidance you received from the reciprocal teaching interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How would you rate your ability to ‘read between the lines’ when reading academic material after the guidance you received from the reciprocal teaching interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How would you rate your ability to form an opinion about what you read after the guidance you received from the reciprocal teaching interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How has this the guidance you received from the reciprocal teaching interventions improved your ability to understand other modules?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. How has learning to summarise prescribed material benefitted your comprehension?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

29
11. How has summarising your prescribed material benefitted your comprehension?
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

12. How has clarifying and prediction assisted you to understand your prescribed material?
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

13. What was the overall benefit (if any) that you think you gained from being exposed to the reciprocal teaching interventions?
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

End of questionnaire, thank you for your time.