Reciprocal Teaching for English and Arabic Language Learners in Recent Studies

Subhieya Abu Hatab[1]

[1] Community College Girls-Rafha, Northern Border University, Arar, Northern Border, KSA

Correspondence: Subhieya Abu Hatab, Community College Girls-Rafha, Northern Border University, Arar, Northern Border, KSA. E-mail: sbhia_hatab@yahoo.com

Abstract

The current paper aimed to compile studies of Reciprocal teaching for English and Arabic language learners. We searched in the ERIC and EBSCO Databases, through recent studies. We found that reciprocal teaching is as method rather close and somewhat paradoxical, hence the interest of examining the movement of those who were the promoters. An approach that, indispensable as it is, needs to be complemented by studies on the use, interest, contributions and limitations of this teaching method in the educational field. Comparative analyzes are also needed to identify its distinguishing features and possible commonalities. It was there that appear essential, for example, when one leads a working partner to appropriate text, the other aid in the discovery of an activity. There are many advantages and disadvantages in it but, more profoundly.

Keywords: reciprocal teaching, learning strategy, social behavior

1. Introduction

Reciprocal teaching assumes that the students are gathered to work together, so that it enjoys conditions allowing mutual exchange of information or procedures to carry out an academic task. The principle of reciprocity is the basis of the approach and it should be understood in the sense given by Pléty (1996, p. 153): "What students can bring to each other. It appears to be linked to the activity of professional education (Finkelsztein & Ducros, 1989, p. 15). How can students play the role of professionals? Act in place of the teacher? These questions certainly arise for reciprocal teaching. In principle, an instructor cannot help a student anytime, "What can a instructor, if not more advanced in learning that his student?. There is a strong chance that the expected results (including progress) or failure." (Baudrit, 1999, p. 102). Clearly, we have reciprocal teaching that should be examined more closely, before studying the work that specifically relate to its contributions or limitations, mainly in the field of learning.

2. Reciprocal Teaching

Reciprocal teaching is a pedagogical method primarily used in the field of reading and introduced to the school by two American authors in the early eighties (Brown & Palincsar, 1982; Palincsar & Brown, 1984). The method reciprocal teaching is to associate a teacher and a student that alternate in conducting a dialogue on a piece of text. The role of the teacher which is here in question may be held by a student or adult, the main one being that person has a level of player higher than his partner. The both separately so read the passage from a text, then the "teacher" questions the "student" in this passage, to test his level of understanding. He asks her to make a summary order to retain the essential exchange with him to clarify possible difficulties of interpretation and, ultimately, leads him to make predictions about the text below. The following passage is approached in the same way, but the roles are reversed: the "teacher" finds "student" and vice versa. Furthermore, the strategy of the "teacher" is to let more and more initiatives to the "student" as follows: "First, an expert (parent, teacher, master) guide the activities of the child, making himself most of the activity. The child remains first spectator, then novice responsible for a small part of the work. As the child becomes more experienced and able to perform more complex aspects of the task [...], the adult shows less and less influential. Adults and children come to share the cognitive activity, the child taking initiatives and providing adult corrections and guides when he hesitates. Finally, the adult helps the child to take a leading role and arises listener support and [...]. In doing so, the critical and questioning is taken by the child." (Palincsar & Brown, 1984, p. 12).

"Teacher" and "pupil" commute regularly and the first causes the second is to invest more in the process of understanding: the principle of alternation one hand, the principle of phasing the other (Baudrit, 1999). Two kinds of implementation of the method reciprocal teaching have been the subject of study.

The first form includes the appraisal process during the dialogues (Palincsar & Brown, 1984): this is where "information on the procedure are provided to students, words like" how "or" when "to help to ask questions. It was during the dialogues that their instructions are given to help summarize or clarify the meaning of a word" (Rosenshine & Meister, 1994). In this first case, the "teacher" thus initiating the "student" in the method reciprocal teaching ongoing activity, they study together a text to have a better understanding. The second form is based on a process of instruction located before the dialogues and the reading activity itself: It is likely to introduce students to the language of reciprocal teaching.

This can help mitigate the competing cognitive demands of word processing, which requires a high level of thinking, and verbal interaction that requires a high level of language skills (Fung, Wilkinson, & Moore, 2003, p 27). Thus worksheets are given to students to familiarize them with the four specific cognitive strategies to the method: question, summarize, clarify and predict (Palincsar, Brown, & Martin, 1987). Reciprocal teaching: it lends itself to numerous adaptations in the area of reading. For example, an adult can be associated with a student (see study 1 Palincsar & Brown, 1984), an adult can also be assigned a group of students (see the paper 2 Palincsar & Brown, 1984), or small groups of students to implement alone (Palincsar & Brown, 1986; Lederer, 2000). But each time, the roles of "teacher" and "student" are alternately occupied by the participants for working understanding of the business.

3. Reciprocal Teaching with Students "Ordinary"

This method was tested early in elementary school, particularly in the first education (Coley et al., 1993). But an attempt completely original is visible with very young children attending a kindergarten (Myers, 2005). This teacher has adapted the technique to make it accessible to his students and to improve the understanding of home business. First, it is not they who read texts or stories, but the mistress makes it aloud. That said, the purpose of the method is preserved: "The students have a first glimpse of the text so that they can make predictions about what they can find in reading [...]. [They] ask questions to help clarify the understanding of problems." (Myers, 2005, p. 315) Then this colleague uses four puppets to encourage speaking out of his students: "The Storyteller princess summarizes the history, querying and Clara clarifer Wizard and predicts what will happen later in the story." (Myers, 2005, p. 316) We recognize there the four strategies for reciprocal teaching: summarize, question, clarify and predict. All students in the class participate together in the business and, in turn, they use puppets sitting in front of their peers. Exchanges, questions and answers are well favored among some (four pupils users puppets) and others (the class). In general, the teacher reads texts already presented to students so they linger over the details of the story. His study lasted three months and four students are under observation: both have English as their first language (Jesse and Melissa), the other two (Oscar and Filiberto) have as a second language their first language is Spanish. All have difficulties in English except Melissa, shy student who takes little part in the discussions begun in class. The teacher asked them before and after the implementation of reciprocal teaching, trying to find out what they learned from this experience. She also kept a diary in which she commented on the progress of mutual instruction sequences, the reactions of students and their ways of implementing the study method. Trying to find out what they have learned from this experience. She also kept a diary in which she commented on the progress of mutual instruction sequences, the reactions of students and their ways of implementing the study method. Trying to find out what they have learned from this experience. She also kept a diary in which she commented on the progress of mutual instruction sequences, the reactions of students and their ways of implementing the study method.

Myers (2005) makes the following findings of his investigation: "At the end of three months the research project, students were able to think for themselves and control their own understanding [...]. The complex process of listening and comprehension of texts read aloud has become easier for them. They were able to retell stories, briefly but with appropriate details. They asked questions when they needed to clarify their understanding." (Myers, 2005, p. 320) Broadly encouraging results, albeit with differences from one student to another: Filiberto appreciate the stories, Oscar and Melissa have a weakness for those for animals, Jesse prefer the funny books. After the study, when the teacher asked what they do when they do not understand a word or a part of history, Oscar stated: "It would be better if I knew what all the words mean." (Myers, 2005, p. 321) But the four students report using the teacher to "explain the word misunderstood or ask for clarification" (Myers, 2005, p. 321). Finally, the students seem to have incorporated the role of games offered through the use of puppets, and this individually. In the role of Clara clarifer, Oscar asked the class: "Do you find that the pig has eaten the wolf at the end of the story?" In the same role, Jesse asked the class: "I do not understand why the boy gingerbread

wants to run away. What think that boy" (Myers, 2005, p. 322) Opinion on one side, the other explanation: each acts in its own way. And if the fact of addressing the mistress is the ultimate remedy for any major difficulties, the fact remains that the method seems to have been fairly well understood and exploited by these young children, hence this final note from the author: "in kindergarten, students are not too young to learn strategies that will help them to take responsibility for their own acquisitions and lead discussion groups for their peers." (p. 323) However, reciprocal teaching has been studied in more conventional forms with older students. For example, Spörer, Brunstein, & Kieschke (2009) have tested with German student's school from third to sixth levels. Again, this is to improve the understanding of business from text readings. A control group following the usual teaching master and three parallel "conditions" are considered experimental. The first (RT) is to introduce students to the conventional operation of the method. They gathered in small groups (four to six partners), introduced to strategies for reciprocal teaching (question, summarize, clarify and predict) and aware of the principle of alternation. Then they work alone. The second condition (IG) always provides an association in small groups but, this time one, an adult instructor prepares the same method and the guide when implementing it. Finally, the third condition (RTP) is similar to the first, except that students are associated with two instead of being integrated into groups. The authors make two assumptions.

First, they provide a superior of the three conditions Experimental on the control condition, as regards improving the understanding. The second hypothesis gives an advantage to RT conditions and RTP compared to IG (presence of an adult instructor), always at the level of understanding. For the test, a sample of 210 students was established; they were assigned to the control group and three experimental conditions. All have passed a pre-test, post-test and retention test (12 weeks after the post-test). These tests used to evaluate the process of understanding on the basis of readings of texts. After each read text, students must answer nine questions on the information to exploit and the main ideas contained in the text. Thus the progress (or lack of progress) of each can be identified. following. Each sequence, they read and study a text with eight paragraphs on the social sciences. These passages include between 179 and 312 words for students in third and fourth levels, between 236 and 368 words for students in fifth and sixth levels. Their counterparts in the control group working on the same texts as the usual instruction from their teachers. What are the main results obtained by the authors?

Spörer, Brunstein, & Kieschke (2009) first confirm their first hypothesis by the control group, the three experimental conditions are more students grow in the area of understanding. By cons, their second assumption is not entirely true: the RT condition (small groups) ahead of the other two conditions (dyads; guidance by the instructor), always in the same field. A superiority which the authors attribute to the fact that in the first case, "students have the opportunity to lead the discussion" (Spörer, Brunstein, & Kieschke, 2009, p. 384). Indeed, they do not have this feature when the adult instructor's guide. But then what about the RTP condition? Here, students are associated in pairs and also have time to interact as they wish; they should therefore be at par with their counterparts in the condition RT, but this is not the case. This unexpected result is interpreted in the following way by the authors: "One possible explanation is that students derive more benefits of the activity in small groups because they have more space to study a paragraph, and share ideas. In pairs, the exchange is naturally limited to two students" (Spörer, Brunstein, & Kieschke, 2009, p. 384). Thus the dyadic structure appears more restrictive in terms of internal communication, the organization in groups, when it comes to running the technique of reciprocal teaching. These are the main lessons learned by the authors following this study.

4. In the Field of Reading

The study by Mastropieri and colleagues (2001) concerns 24 college students, school the seventh level and whose learning difficulties were found. Readers skills are below those of their counterparts in the same age group. They are assigned in two groups. In the group tutoring, they are brought to interact with a partner, according to the principle already met the alternating every day for five weeks, at 50 minutes each time. Previously, they were prepared to play the roles of tutor and tutored that is to say, in the first case, to intervene when the partner is mistaken reading, to make him correct his mistakes, to summarize the passages read; in the second case, to read in the presence of the other, to listen to his advice, learn to identify important words in the text. In the group traditional, the conditions are the same except that the trade is between the teacher and his students in the class group. Again, all students individually pass tests before and after the experiment to check their progress in understanding. In addition, students were asked to express themselves on reciprocal mentoring sequences they could live. Mastropieri and colleagues (2001) noted more progress among college students group tutoring.

Their skills in reading comprehension will improve more than their counterparts in group traditional. Moreover, during the interviews, the students rather express their satisfaction with this form of tutoring because it allows

them to spend more time reading and also read aloud to one friend and not for the whole class group. However, some say they are struggling to rectify the mistakes made by their partner. Let us not forget that it is students who initially have significant reading difficulties. The authors also point to a weakness of tutoring in the case where "two members of the tutoring dyad have low drive powers [...] [a situation which should make them] up his hands to request assistance from the teacher" (Mastropieri et al., 2001, p. 25). In the area of writing activities, as we have seen, Duran & Monereo (2005) are exactly the same remarks.

The study by Sutherland & Snyder (2007) also deserves some attention. Her peculiarity is that it covers only four college students who exhibit academic and behavioral deficits in the area of reading or emotionally. In general, this type of student maintains an uneasy relationship with teachers (Ladd & Burgess, 1999; Hamre & Pianta, 2001) and the exchanges they have with them are limited and very unfavorable to learning (Wehby, Symons, & Shores, 1995; Van Acker, Grant, & Henry, 1996). To counteract these negatives, a form of reciprocal mentoring that we know (PALS) method has been used repeatedly to support acquisitions in reading (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001; Mathes, Torgesen, & Allor 2001) but also in the field of mathematics (Franca et al., 1990 ; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Karns, 2001). Sutherland & Snyder (2007) propose to test its effects mainly at the current reading at the college, including the implications in terms of understanding the texts are far from negligible for students in this age group (Strong et al., 2004).

To do this, Sutherland & Snyder (2007) thus selected, with a teacher, four teenagers with the following characteristics: poor readers, often distracted and not focused on school activity to achieve. Three dyads are made: Latasha and Mel are the first, Dee and a second classmate, James and another comrade of the last class. All these students are introduced to the principle of rotation, clean the reciprocal mentoring. The reader, tutored position, reads aloud the passage of a text that its partner, tutor status, will ask him to summarize. The following passage, the roles are reversed. Individual capabilities drive these students are assessed on the basis of a test, the qualitative reading inventory (Leslie & Caldwell, 2000). This involves reading texts aloud for one minute and identify words correctly or incorrectly pronounced. The experiment lasts several weeks (86 tutorship sequences) and, in the end, students are also asked to answer the following questions: What do you like about your partner drive? What you do not like to drive your partner The authors note that in 72% of cases, students take advantage of the sequences.

Van Keer & Verhaeghe (2005) also tested a tutoring strategy reciprocal, parallel to others in Belgian elementary schools (the second and fifth levels of education), still learning to read. Following comments made by Almasi (1995) and Gourgey (2001), they rely on mutual mentoring to make the students more active, to foster in them a collective commitment in the reading activity and also improve the understanding of processes. The study method, named STRAT, is based on the principles of explicit instruction including several authors tested the effects (Brown et al., 1996; Klingner & Vaughn, 1996; Fuchs et al., 1997; Fukkink et al., 1997; Corte, Verschaffel & Van De Ven, 2001). The explicit instruction presupposes a number of strategies on the part of the person using it. Here are the six main "(a) activate the initial knowledge to be related to the text [read], (b) predict and control the outcome of the story, (c) distinguish important data ancillary data, (d) monitor and review the understanding of words and phrases, (e) monitor and review the understanding by tracking the ideas expressed with difficulty and badly assimilated phrases or passages, (f) classifying types of texts and adapt the behavior of drive accordingly" (Van Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005, p. 302). This method has been implemented by the authors in three different conditions:

5. Teacher Makes It Work at the Class Group (Condition STRAT)

It concerns two separate age students but the student of the fifth level is all the time tutor position, the second level is always tutored (STRAT + CA). Meanwhile, a control group consists of students who follow the teaching usual master read, that is to say without any STRAT procedure. Only classes of the second and fifth levels participate in the experiment. The latter mobilizes all 898 students who passed the tests for comprehension (Verhoeven, 1993; Staphorsius & Krom, 1996), the decoding activity (Chard, Simmons, & Kameenui, 1998), the collection of player skills (Harter, 1985; Veerman et al., 1997), both before and after the experiment (pre-test and post-test), and six months thereafter (retention test). All stakeholders (teachers and students) involved in the STRAT method were trained based on presentations of tutorship sequences of lessons viewings during which this method is implemented. Tutorship sessions are held from October to June of the school year, or once a week (50 minutes), twice per week (25 minutes each). The main results obtained by the authors of this study.

As regards the understanding of operations, the pupils of the second level Conditions STRAT STRAT + CA and make more progress than the control group, fact which certainly tends to disappear with time, given the data provided by the retention test. By cons, students in the control group and those of STRAT + SA group are at par:

they are progressing in an equivalent manner in the area of reading comprehension, hence the remarks made by the authors: "Either the chosen strategies were too difficult to use independently by dyads of students of the second level concerned with the mutual mentoring; or students of STRAT + SA group needed more time to integrate the social, cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies specific to the presence of classmates; is still the reciprocal peer tutoring is not an appropriate technique for this age group." (Van Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005, p. 319) The first interpretation seems to be the most plausible in view of the previously discussed work. The presence of the teacher and the use thereof could prove crucial in the case of young students asked to help each other, but whose skills as readers are sometimes insufficient to complete this mutual support, observation already identified in Mastropieri and colleagues (2001) and Duran & Monereo (2005). Let's see the results recorded with the students of the fifth level of education. The first interpretation seems to be the most plausible in view of the previously discussed work.

The three experimental conditions these students advance equivalently in the area of understanding, they also give them an advantage over their counterparts in the control group, including at the end of the school year. Six months later, the retention test revealed a continuity of purpose and only for STRAT, STRAT + CA terms, with an advantage for the latter. STRAT group of students + SA therefore no longer seem to benefit from the explicit instruction on the long term. The method STRAT + CA reveals some effectiveness which the authors attribute to the nature of mentoring: "[It] requires tutors sustained attention on the play activity of their tutored a watchful eye on their reading process, control of understanding. It is certainly easier [...] to control and regulate the process of reading in someone, especially if it is a young student." (Van Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005, p. 320) The strength of the STRAT + CA method seems to be there in the age difference between student tutor (fifth level) and tutored fellow (second level), significant age difference of one standard drives skills. This difference may actually allow the first control read of activity of the second and, where appropriate, to help him to improve. The condition STRAT + SA does not allow this kind of assistance and support given the proximity of the ages of the partners. In the latter case, the authors made the following comments: "The texts were read relatively complex for tutors, possibly causing reading difficulties [...], and therefore they could hinder the control and regulation of behavior tutored reader" (Van Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005, pp. 320-321), excluding the effects more or less negative alternation. "Taking into account the permutations of roles and lack of age difference, we could expect an unclear distinction between the roles of tutor and tutored" (Van Keer & Verhaeghe, 2005, p. 320). Moreover, they do not fail to report positive results, substantially equivalent, obtained in the field of reading through the use of two methods: STRAT + CA on one side; reciprocal teaching of the other (Palincsar & Brown, 1984; 1994). The one and the other are based on the principle of asymmetry, although the first place students in fixed roles (mentor or mentee) when the second alternately moved into those of "teacher" or "pupil".

Van Keer & Verhaeghe (2005), remember, counting on the tutoring strategy Reciprocal (STRAT + SA) to make students more active, for more involved in the activity of reading and encourage in them the understanding process. The results do not really meet these expectations, although students have received training in the use of this method. From this point of view, the technical STRAT + CA is more effective but, so far, is it appropriate to dispense with the mutual tutoring? To consider as irrelevant in terms of learning? Let us not forget that it is also the source of positive results, particularly in the area of reading comprehension (Sáenz, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005; Sutherland & Snyder, 2007). These authors noted many positive impact at this level, phenomenon due by them to the interactive aspect of the method. The principle of symmetry indeed encourages students to participate fairly equally in the reading activity, to help each other in a rather balanced and in doing so they feel more involved in the task proposed. So where is the real problem? It is found in the skills of the partners involved: do they have a sufficient level in reading in order to exchange, correct their errors, provide each other with the necessary information or advice? The challenge is there and it affects naturally less dyads composed of students whose reading skills match those of their age group. A difficulty which, however, does not necessarily present an unacceptable character. The teacher can always supplement the student who is struggling to help his partner, a kind of strategy "relay guardians" rather common when the so-called students "at risk" are involved in tutoraux programs or devices (Baudrit, 2010).

6. Further Comparative Data

Some explanatory tracks have been made but for the deeper. Thus, with four preset strategies, reciprocal teaching appears rather as a demanding and formulaic method. How to avoid type of intervention procedures: question, summarize, clarify and predict? How to get out of this scenario? How else to access the understanding of a text?. In this matter, all they need to respect the principle of alternation, flexible principle to lend themselves to the use of several strategies (reciprocal peer tutoring, Peer-assisted learning strategies or classwide peer tutoring). As a result, the weak point of this method is to find paradoxically in the notion of "competence". It places students in

a situation of teachers who apply, according to an established order, four to peer intervention strategies. Under these conditions, it is virtually impossible for them to take initiatives or responsibilities: they simply follow the learning process imposed by their "teachers". Sometimes weighted rigor by developments (introduction of visuals, illustrations or RPGs) likely to further involve particular public school, as students in special education or very young students. Quid mutual aid when partners are readers of a low level? What can they give each other? How reliable information or advice given in such cases? An offset disadvantage, if appropriate, by the presence of the teacher to the students concerned to supplement a deficient or guardian to provide details in a tutored in trouble. Here are many adjustments can compensate the respective weaknesses of the examined method, however, have strengths.

One of the strengths of reciprocal teaching is in the records of possible communication: the dyad, the group, the whole class; What a variable geometry may offer some relational diversity even open spaces conducive to the exchange of ideas (Spörer, Brunstein, & Kieschke, 2009). For its part, the reciprocal mentoring works based on the dyadic dimension, but it seems to guarantee individual assistance, tutorship of interventions delivered in each case. The quality of support provided to tutored seems to be at this price (Baudrit, 2007; Barley et al., 2002; Lauer et al., 2006). Moreover, when reciprocal teaching is visible only at the level of learning in reading, reciprocal mentoring is in the most varied areas (reading, but also writing, math puzzle or type of activities). So the first method appears to be suitable for a specific use (promote understanding of texts read by students), the second being more cross given the flexibility that characterizes and its possible variants. Finally they appear to be based on reciprocity rather different forms. The principle of alternation the governing both, but separately: the inherent reciprocity in reciprocal teaching appears to be the result of the "student", which invests more in the proposed task but that after his "teacher" in response to four cognitive strategies used by it (question, summarize, clarify, predict), excluding space left widening reflection, over time, to the "student" to "teacher" through its phasing. A way of reciprocity that we could call diachronic and that is not found in the reciprocal mentoring. The latter, with mutual aid and mutual support rather reveals a reciprocity based on co-management of the task, on exchanges symmetrical character, a brief collaborative-oriented activity, synchronic reciprocity therefore, which does not involve a time lag marked between interventions and actions of each other and whose characteristic is mostly nest and associate.

7. Discussion

These comparative studies certainly have the merit of clarifying the situation, to distinguish two methods which, at first, may appear as relatives and bearers of some paradoxes. That said, such an approach can reveal deeper aspects, particularly on the scientific traditions from which they originate and currents of thought from which they emanate.

Al-Osseil (2010) conducted a study aiming at investigating the relative effect of the reciprocal-teaching strategy on achievement of 1st grade secondary-school students in exegesis as well as content material retention. Results revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group that used the reciprocal-teaching strategy and the control group that used the traditional method in the post administration of the achievement test. Harb (2011) investigated the effect of reciprocal teaching on reading awareness of 10th grade students in Jordan. Study sample composed of (77) students divided into two groups: control (n=37) which was taught reading texts by traditional method, and experimental (n=40) which was taught the same texts by reciprocal teaching strategy. A reading awareness test composed of (20) items distributed to (4) domains (planning, regulation, evaluation, and conditional knowledge) was applied. Results revealed that there were significant differences in reading awareness in favor of experimental group which was taught by reciprocal teaching, and these differences were in favor of high achievement students. It is recommended that reciprocal teaching be employed in teaching reading texts and various subject-matters. Al-Khawalida (2012), also, conducted a study aiming at identifying the effectiveness of an instructional program based on the reciprocal-teaching strategy in developing reading comprehension skills of students with learning difficulties in Jordan. Results proved that there were statistically significant differences at .01 level between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in the post administration of the test.

Freihat & Al-Makhzoomi (2012) studied the effectiveness of the Reciprocal Teaching Procedure (RTP), a reading comprehension instructional technique, on enhancing 50 students' reading comprehension behavior in a university setting. The researchers used the Nelson Denny Reading test (NDRT), forms G and H as pre-and post tests to assess subjects' reading comprehension behaviors before and after the (RTP) sessions. Subjects completed pre and post questionnaires to record information about their general and EFL backgrounds as well as their attitudes to reading before and after the implementation of (RTP) sessions. Comparison of the results of the pre-and post tests and questionnaires showed a marked improvement in the students' reading comprehension

behavior. The students also believed the (RTP) was beneficial to their reading comprehension in an EFL university setting throughout the study. In 2013, Al-saeed studied the effectiveness of the reciprocal teaching strategy in developing six grade primary stage students, reading comprehension skills. The sample of Study consisted of (80) students randomly selected from Primary school in Cairo. They were distributed into two groups: (The experimental group: No= 40 students, and the control group: No= 40 students). After the treatment (Applying the Reciprocal teaching strategy on the experimental group), a post-reading comprehension test was applied on both groups. The analysis proved positive results in favor of the experimental group; Reciprocal teaching strategy had Positive effects on developing some reading comprehension skills among six grade primary stage students.

Abu Serhan (2014) studied in Jordan, the effect of Reciprocal Teaching strategy on improving Critical Listening skills of ninth grade students. To achieve the aim of the study the researcher designed a test consisted of (25) multiple choice items to measure critical listening skills. The sample of the study consisted of (121) from 9thgrade students distributed on (4) sections: (2) representing the experimental group and the other (2) representing the control in the school year 2013/2014. The sample was selected using purposeful sampling from Zarqa. Results of the study indicated significant differences at (α=0.05) due to the instruction strategy used, in favor of those taught using Reciprocal Teaching and significant differences due to gender, in favor of females. No significant differences were found due to the interaction between Strategy and gender. Hafez (2015) studied the effect of Reciprocal Teaching strategy on improving literature texts and appreciation achievement among (70) male and female students form the first secondary stage in Egypt, the study adopted a quasi-experimental approach through experimental and control groups, the findings showed that there are significant statistical differences in favor of the experimental group due to the teaching strategy. Gheith & Mustafa (2015) studied the effect of using reciprocal teaching strategies for developing secondary students' listening comprehension skills. Participants of the study consisted of (45) in 1st year secondary stage female students .A program based on reciprocal teaching strategies for developing listening comprehension skills was designed. A listening comprehension test was designed to use as a pre / post test for participants. Results proved that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre /post test in the overall and each listening comprehension sub skill in favor of the post/test scores. There was statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group related to reciprocal teaching strategy training in the pre-test and the posttest in overall listening in favor of the post-test. There was statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group related to reciprocal teaching strategy program in the pre-test and the post -test in each listening sub-skill in favor of the post-test.

Al-harby (2016) studied in Saudi Arabia the effectiveness of the reciprocal-teaching strategy in learning outcomes and attitudes of Qassim-University students in Islamic culture. The study was conducted in Oqlat Al-Soqour Faculty of Sciences and Arts for paucity of research conducted in such a faculty, as well as for being the researcher's workplace which can offer him needed facilities. Statistical analyses of the data revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in the post administration of the learning-outcomes test as well as in the attitude scale in favor of the experimental. The magnitude effect was big which proved the effectiveness of the reciprocal-teaching strategy.

Reciprocal teaching, we have seen, is rooted in psychology vygotskiennne recovery by "successors" American by this author. In this movement, interaction between child and adult are preferred, they have in fact an asymmetric view of the gap between the first and the one who "knows best" (Gilly, 1989, p. 163). The originality of reciprocal teaching seems to be there and this method has aimed to promote learning from that "less known". To control these acquisitions, the researchers use pretests type protocols, tests, post-tests and they compare data collected at a control group and an experimental population. In sum, reciprocal teaching is assessed in the light of its results in terms of learning, effects produced by students to whom it is intended. The interaction between "teacher" and "student" are not particularly considered by the authors, the latter appearing to favor the result of the interaction at the expense of the same interactive process. The "work to learn" perspective is well- developed, it results in a qualified form of collaboration reciprocal teaching is assessed in the light of its results in terms of learning, the effects produced by students for whom it is intended. "Constructive" (Baudrit, 2007, p. 30), in that the development of knowledge and knowledge is the dominant aspect.

"Learning to work" is the other identified perspective it gives to see a collaborative mode centered on "discursive thinking and reasoning to many" (Baudrit, 2007, p. 30), but that's not all. Investigations by Sáenz, Fuchs & Fuchs (2005) and Sutherland Snyder (2007) indicate another effect of the symmetrical relationship, which shows that students are more concerned by the proposed activities, simply because their holdings are relatively balanced (no real disproportions in interventions and actions performed by each). Bilateral aid also

works this way, resulting in a greater commitment to finding the solution to a problem or carry out a collective task. Moreover, this effect seems amplified by another dimension of uncertainty. Damon & Phelps (1989) noted this about peer collaboration: it lends itself to some "formulas or procedures that can be transmitted through direct assistance, such as addition or subtraction problems or imitation tasks" (Damon & Phelps, 1989, p. 149). Recessed these remarks suggest that the direct intervention of the adult is rather unwelcome in such circumstances. Why? Because it blocks the activity of research conducted jointly by the students, the more important activity that relates to "new concepts for them" (Damon & Phelps, 1989, p. 155). So they have to find their own means those unfamiliar concepts and in doing so they are "faced with problematic situations which, to be understood, assume some initiatives of their own. Brainstorm, express points of view, discuss together, experience the content and validity [...]. This logic slow collective breakthrough of a problem well enough characterizes collaborative learning" (Baudrit, 2007, p. 69). Put another way, it is mainly to let students self facing a task or situation that problem for them, in order that they manage to find the solution or solutions themselves. Equality associated with autonomy, that is very much a Piaget's thesis on the collective activity displayed by children when they engage in fun activities (Piaget, 1992) or when they are involved in school learning (Piaget, 1969).

Acknowledgements

References

Abu Serhan, A. (2014). The Effect of Reciprocal Teaching Strategy on Improving Critical Listening Skills of Ninth Grade Students at Zarqa Directorate. *Jordanian Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(4), 445-457.

Al-harby, J. (2016). The Effect of Reciprocal-Teaching Strategy on Learning Outcomes and Attitudes of Qassim-University Students in "Islamic Culture". *Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(6), 213-232.

Almasi, J. (1995). The nature of fourth graders' social-cognitive conflicts in peer-led and teacher led discussions of literature. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(3), 314-351. https://doi.org/10.2307/747620

Al-Osseil, A. (2010). *The Effect of the Reciprocal-Teaching Strategy on Achievement and Retention of Secondary 1st Grade Students in Exegesis*. M. A. Thesis, King Saud University.

Al-saeed, E. (2013). The effectiveness of the reciprocal teaching strategy in developing six grade primary stage students, reading comprehension skills. *Arabic Study in Psychology and Education, 41*(4), 203-241.

Barley, Z., Lauer, P., & Arens, S. et al. (2002). *Helping at-risk students meet standards: A synthesis of evidence-based classroom practices*. Washington: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Baudrit, A. (1999). *Tutor: a place, functions, a trade?* Paris: PUF.

Brown & Palincsar, A. A. (1982). Inducing strategic learning from texts by moyen de Informed, self-control training.

Brown & Palincsar, A. A. (1989). Guided, cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition. In L. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 393-451). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Brown, R., Pressley, M., Van Meter, & Schuder, T. P. (1996). A quasi-experimental validation of transactional strategies instruction with low-Achieving second-grade readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(1), 18-37. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.88.1.18

Chard, D., Simmons, D., & Kameenui, E. (1998). Word recognition: Research bases. In D. Simmons & E. Kameenui (Eds.), *What research tells us about reading children with diverse learning needs: Bases and basics* (pp. 141-167). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Coley, J., De Pinto, S. T., & Craig, G. R. (1993). From college to classroom: Three teachers' accounts of Their adaptations of reciprocal teaching. *Elementary School Journal, 94*(2), 255-266. https://doi.org/10.1086/461765

Damon & Phelps W. E. (1989). Strategic uses of peer learning in children's education. In T. Berndt & G. Ladd (Eds.), *Peer relationships in child development* (pp. 135-157). New York: John Wiley & sons.

De Corte, E., Verschaffel, L., & Van De Ven, A. (2001). Improving text comprehension strategies in upper primary school children: A design experiment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*(4), 531-559. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709901158668

Duran, D., & Monereo, C. (2005). Styles and sequences of cooperative interaction in fixed and reciprocal peer tutoring. *Learning and Instruction, 15*(3), 179-199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2005.04.002

Finkelsztein, D., & Ducros, P. (1989). A device to fight against school failure: teaching by tutors students. *French Review of Education, 88*, 15-26.

Freihat, S., & Al-Makhzoomi, K. (2012). The Effect of the Reciprocal Teaching Procedure (RTP) on Enhancing EFL Students' Reading Comprehension Behavior in a University Setting. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2*(5), 279-292.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., Mathes, P., & Simmons, D. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 174-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2005.04.002

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., & Karns, K. (2001). Enhancing kindergartners' mathematical development: Effects of peer-assisted learning strategies. *Elementary School Journal, 101*(5), 495-510. https://doi.org/10.1086/499684

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M., & Jenkins, J. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*(3), 239-256. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532799XSSR0503_3

Fukkink, R., Van Der Linden, S. A., & Vosse, V. K. (1997). *Stap Door! Handeleiding [Step out! Manual]*. Utrecht: Sardis.

Fung, I. I., & Wilkinson, M. D. (2003). L1-assisted reciprocal teaching ESL to Improve students' understanding of English expository text. *Learning and Instruction, 13*(1), 1-31. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(01)00033-0

Gheith, A., & Mustafa, F. (2015). The effect of using reciprocal teaching strategies for developing secondary students' listening comprehension skills. *Educational Journal, Ain Shams University, 39*(2), 23-46.

Gilly, M. (1989). About the theory of socio-cognitive conflict and psychosocial mechanisms of cognitive constructions: current perspectives and explanatory models. In N. Bednarz & C. Garnier (Eds.), *Construction of knowledge. Obstacles and conflicts* (pp. 162-182). Ottawa: Ed. Agency of Arc.

Gourgey, A. (2001). Metacognition in basic skills instruction. In H. Hartman (Ed.), *Metacognition in learning and instruction* (pp. 33-68). Dordrecht: Kluwer academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-2243-8_2

Hafez, W. (2015). The Effect of Reciprocal Teaching Strategy on Improving Literature Texts and Appreciation Achievement. *Reading and Knowledge Journal, 165*(4), 195-304.

Hamre, B., & Pianta, R. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development, 72*(2), 625-638. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00301

Harb, M. (2011). The effect of reciprocal teaching on reading awareness of 10th grade students in Jordan. *Derassat: Educational Sciences, 38*(X), 1740-1749.

Harter, S. (1985). *Manual for the self-perception profile for children*. Denver: University of Denver.

Khawalida, N. (2012). The Effectiveness of an Instructional Programme Based on the Reciprocal-Teaching Strategy in Developing Reading Comprehension of Learners with Learning Difficulties in the BasicStage in Jordan. *The Specialized International Educational Magazine, 1*(7), 78.

Klingner & Vaughn, J. S. (1996). Reciprocal teaching of reading comprehension strategies for students with learning disabilities Who uses English as second language. *Elementary School Journal, 96*(3), 275-293. https://doi.org/10.1086/461828

Ladd, G., & Burgess, K. (1999). Charting the relationship trajectories of aggressive, Withdrawn, and aggressive / Withdrawn children during early grade school. *Child Development, 70*(4), 919-929. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00066

Lauer, P., Akiba, S., & Wilkerson et al. (2006). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(2), 275-313. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076002275

Lederer, J. (2000). Reciprocal teaching of social studies in inclusive elementary school. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 33*(1), 91-106. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940003300112

Leslie, L., & Caldwell, J. (2000). *Qualitative reading inventory*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Mastropieri, M., Scruggs, T., & Mohler, L. et al. (2001). Can middle school students with serious reading Difficulties help Each Other and learn anything? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 16*(1), 18-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940003300112

Myers, P. (2005). The princess Storyteller Clara clarify, Quincy questioner and the wizard: Reciprocal teaching adapté for kindergarten students. *The Reading Teacher, 59*(4), 314-324. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940003300112

Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-Fostering understanding and-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*(2), 117-175. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221940003300112

Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. (1986). Interactive teaching to Promote independent learning from text. *The Reading Teacher, 39*(8), 771-777.

Palincsar, A., Brown, A., & Martin, S. (1987). Peer interaction in reading comprehension instruction. *Educational Psychologist, 22*(3&4), 231-253. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1987.9653051

Piaget, J. (1969). *Psychology and pedagogy*. Paris: Denoel

Piaget, J. (1992). *Moral Judgment of the Child [1932]*. Paris: PUF.

Pléty, R. (1996). *Learning cooperating*. Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon.

Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 64*(4), 479-530. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064004479

Sáenz, L. L., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Peer-assisted learning strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 231-247. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064004479

Sporer, N., Brunstein, J., & Kieschke, U. (2009). Improving students' reading comprehension skills: Effects of strategy instruction and reciprocal teaching. *Learning and Instruction, 19*(3), 272-286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.05.003

Staphorsius, G., & Krom, R. (1996). *Toetsen Begrijpend Lezen [Reading comprehension tests]*. Arnhem: Cito.

Strong, W. J., Falk, K., & Lane, K. (2004). The impact of a structured curriculum reading and repeated reading on the performance of junior high school students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *School Psychology Review, 33*(4), 561-581.

Sutherland, K., & Snyder, A. (2007). Effects of reciprocal peer tutoring and self-graphing on reading fluency and classroom behavior of middle school students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 15*(2), 103-118. https://doi.org/10.1177/10634266070150020101

Van Acker, R., Grant, S., & Henry, D. (1996). Teacher and student behavior as a function of risk for aggression. *Education & Treatment of Children, 19*(3), 316-334.

Van Keer, H., & Verhaeghe, J. (2005). Effects of explicit reading instruction strategies and peer tutoring were second and fifth graders' reading understanding and self-efficacy perceptions. *Journal of Experimental Education, 73*(4), 291-329. https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.73.4.291-329

Veerman, J., Straathof, M., & Treffers, P. et al. (1997). *Competentiebelevingsschaal voor Kinderen (CBSK) [Self-perception profile for children]*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Verhoeven, L. (1993). Lezen puts begrip 1 [Reading with comprehension 1]. Arnhem: Cito.

Vygotski, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of Higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wehby, F. J., & Symons, S. R. (1995). A descriptive analysis of aggressive behavior in classrooms for children with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 20*(2), 87-105.

Copyrights