

Text Structure and Its Teaching Implications: An Analytical Study

Ala'a Mohammad Abu Hamameh

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Jordan

Dina Al-Jamal

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Jordan

Abdallah Baniabdelrahman

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Jordan

Abstract

The way information is organized in a text enables students to read effectively. As such, the current study content analyzed the first and the second stage secondary English as a foreign language (EFL) textbooks taught at public schools in Jordan. This descriptive analytical research design was carried out to explore the means and frequencies of text structure types included in both textbooks and the extent of fairness in presenting these structures within the reading texts of both textbooks. The main aim of the study is to provide insights for both EFL teachers and book designers to expose students to varied types of text structure. A content analysis sheet for coding the material based on the criterion of inclusion was used. The reading passage was the unit of analysis. The analysis of the study revealed that the Jordanian secondary stage textbooks include a variety of text structure types that are not fairly distributed; nevertheless, the descriptive structure was the most frequent structure in both textbooks. Starting from this premise, the current study discussed the pedagogical implications of text structure teaching. Accordingly, the study recommends that book designers should integrate reading texts of varied text structure types without ignoring some structures in favor of others, also it recommends that EFL teachers should be trained to use text structure strategy in EFL reading classes.

Keywords: content analysis, implications, text structure, EFL

Cite as: Abu Hamameh, A. M., DAl-Jamal, D., & Baniabdelrahman, A. (2018). Text Structure and Its teaching Implications: An Analytical Study. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (1).

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no1.26>

Introduction

Textbooks are undoubtedly the most popular teaching materials used in English as a foreign Language (EFL) classes and reading is an integral skill in these textbooks. However, it is understandable that many EFL students encounter difficulties in understanding a piece of EFL reading text. Accordingly, EFL reading researchers have presented many reading strategies used by readers; some of these strategies are traditional like skimming and scanning, and other strategies are recent like activating schemata, recognizing text structure, using mental imagery, generating questions, monitoring comprehension and visualizing (Blachowicz & Ogle, 2008; Kern, 2002).

Reading is highly significant in the learning process; nevertheless, it is very demanding in EFL contexts as it involves being well-equipped with the knowledge base that enables students to control the reading passage; in order to achieve the ultimate goal of reading which is comprehension. In this concern, Urquhart and Weir (1998, p. 22) define reading as "the process of receiving and interpreting information encoded in language form via the medium of print". Accordingly, comprehension can be achieved with such interaction between the reader and the text. In such interaction, the meaning is elicited from the text which is beyond the printed words (National Reading Panel, 2003). Now, teachers need to play a significant role in developing their student's reading comprehension through text structure acknowledgment (Lyon, 2001).

Grabe (2009) states that reading texts is not only a collection of words; it is rather more by making sense of such words. Successful readers approach a text based on their knowledge of how a particular text is organized. The schema then guides them in organizing the text during the process of encoding. In this regard, Kintsch and VanDijk (1978) believe that students build a kind of hierarchical representation of the ideas in the text with an emphasis on the order in which sentences are read. During the last decades, reading comprehension instruction, or the lack of it, has been given considerable attention from reading researchers, teachers and educators (Pearson, 2009). One of the problematic facts about student's low performance in reading is that they cannot see the underlying structure of text as they are lost in the words and cannot see the whole picture. In this respect, Tovani (2000) argues that students' knowledge of text structure can reduce any confusion related to the lack of clarity in meaning. As a result, this can enable them to anticipate the main ideas of the text easily.

Typically, a text is read considerably in the same manner a house is built. In this respect, Pearson and Fielding (1991) assert that texts are organized in different patterns and any sort of attention to clues that show how authors relate ideas to one another or any attempt to trace the structure imposed upon a text, especially written texts reveal the relationships between main ideas, facilitates comprehension and recall in terms of both short term and long term memory of the text. In this context, readers should recognize that any text has a structure and they should be familiar with the signal words that exist in a text, and be practiced to acknowledge the structure of the text in the light of the signal words (Williams, 2007).

Each reading text has its own text structure; if students are aware of the underlying structure; they will be able to get the main message of the text. Such types of structure may include

events and results, compare and contrast, and problem and solution text-structures (Meyer & Freedle, 1984). Besides, raising the students' knowledge of text structure, according to Tompkins (2007), helps them to identify main ideas without exerting much effort on less important details. Further, considering the text structure enables students to understand how the important ideas of a text are inter-related, which may in turn increase their ability to decode the data based on such relationships. Here, Grabe and Stoller (2002) give examples of these relations; such as those found in comparison, causation, sequence or problem and solution. As a result, the process of meaning-making becomes easier.

Meyer and Ray (2011) state that understanding multiple text structures comes only from purposeful instruction using a variety of texts. The rationale behind teaching students the structure strategy is that it enables students to follow a logical structure of the text in order to understand how an author organized and emphasized ideas. Readers who are unaware of text structures often approach text reading without any plan, while readers who are familiar with text structures have more expectation of what may read in the following paragraphs in a particular text. Villanueva de Debat (2012) claims that making students aware of the rhetorical organization of texts contributes to both reading fluency and efficiency; as it is a rational instrument in the hands of those who can use it.

As students reach the secondary level, it is expected that they may read challenging texts for the purpose of identifying information. Consequently, teachers need to teach their students how to identify various text structures as it helps them to have control over main ideas and other supporting details in a particular text. Moreover, Carrell (1984) asserts that passages are easier to be recalled when they have a clear organizational text structure.

In this regard, effective teachers need to show their students how to deal with a variety of text structures. For example, they may teach them to identify the signal words or clues that show the relationship between sentences or paragraphs. In this respect, Koda (2005) highlights the significance of teaching text structures where explicit instruction helps students to be exposed to various structures of texts which may make them ready to handle the demands that await them later on. Likewise, Dymock (2005) emphasizes teaching the structure of the text as a reading comprehension strategy that facilitates recall and comprehension. Furthermore, in order to show mastery over written texts for the purpose of comprehension, Meyer (2011) asserts there is no doubt that teaching text structure can definitely increase understanding and raising the student's tests scores.

What is more, knowledge of text structure is related to reading achievement. Students' lack of understanding of text structure causes difficulties (Gersten, Fuchs, Williams & Baker, 2001). Broadly speaking, EFL students at the secondary stage struggle to comprehend expository texts. In this concern, McNamara (2008, p. 140) states that "in contrast to narrative texts, expository texts tend to place increased processing demands on the reader due to their greater structural complexity, greater informational density, and greater knowledge demands".

Additionally, Toledo (2005), Guthrie and Davis (2003) mention that a significant percentage of students are unaware of text structure; they do not use the basic structure of a particular text to understand and remember information; those students cannot be as successful in comprehension as those who received instruction on text structure. In this concern, Hall, Saby and McClellan (2005) point out that teaching students to identify common text structures can help them to improve their comprehension. This is explained by the assumption that denotes that once readers have the knowledge of the organizational patterns of text, they will be aware of text structure and they will use it as a strategy to comprehension.

Analyzing curricula in general and text books in particular plays a significant role in EFL learning process. It helps textbook's authors and researchers to find the points of strength and weakness in the textbook and to what extent it is suitable for both students and teachers. Cunningsworth (1995) states that knowing strengths and weaknesses in textbooks, excellent use can be made of strong points and weaker points can be adapted or substituted from other books. The textbook occupies a basic position in the learning process. Thus many evaluation studies were conducted on the currently taught EFL series *Action Pack* in Jordanian schools. Therefore, the continuous evaluation of the content of the textbook is needed by using different criteria. When it comes to teacher practices, there is clear evidence that reading comprehension instruction is highly beneficial for students of all levels. When teachers explain a comprehension strategy accompanied by providing them with guided practice with feedback, students begin to use the strategy independently and eventually their reading levels will be improved (Stevens, 2003; Biancarosa & Snow, 2006).

Alvermann (2002) believes that the rationale behind explicit instruction of text comprehension is that comprehension can be improved by teaching students to use specific strategy when they encounter barriers to comprehension when reading. Teachers make the difference in effective reading instruction by helping learners make sense of written language. Effective instruction is grounded in a professional knowledge of how we read and how we learn to read. It is best provided by knowledgeable teachers who organize instruction to meet the varying needs of all their students, read to students using a variety of text types, including various types of fiction and nonfiction and multicultural literature, on a variety of topics to build their student's familiarity with written language and their background knowledge on a variety of topics, freeing the instruction from stereotypes (National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction, 2003).

To perform precisely, text structure is the rhetorical organization of ideas in text. It specifies the inter-relationships among the main ideas and supporting details which compose the text. Other terms which are used to refer to text structure are: rhetorical organization, rhetorical structure, or organizational pattern (Talbot, 2004). In the present study, text structure refers to the way the ideas are arranged and organized and the relationship that connect these ideas. Text structures in *Action Pack 11* and *Action Pack 12* were investigated by using a content analysis sheet developed by the researcher.

Theoretical background

Views of reading comprehension have changed over few decades, comprehension was thought to be a process of decoding. Developments in the analysis of text organization were in line with developments in schema theory. Schema theory is considered one of the most influential theories from the mid-1970s on as it provides new insights of text structure. The gist of schema theory lies in that reading provides directions as to how readers should make sense of the text based on his/her previous knowledge (Carrell,1992)

According to Brown (2001), the main premise of schema theory, with regards to reading, is that a text does not by itself have meaning. The reader brings information, knowledge, emotion, and culture, to the text. More meaning is contributed by the reader than by the words of the text. Consequently, this would all point to the fact that the reader's understanding of a text depends on how much related schema a reader possesses while reading. However, failure to make sense of a text is caused if the text doesn't include sufficient clues or if the reader doesn't possess the appropriate schemata that can easily fit with the content of the text.

Any piece of written text has a text structure which is considered part of the formal schema that include in addition to text structure, orthography, syntax, and cohesion. based on the theory of formal schema, the primary belief is that once readers develop specific knowledge about the organizational structure of a particular genre, these schemata make the readers' task easier in constructing meaning and doing predictions while they read because they make connections with their previous knowledge. In relation to comprehension, Lynch and Mendelsohn (2002) define the term schema as “a package of prior knowledge and experience that we have in memory and can call on in the process of comprehension”.

Meyer (1975) argues that text structures are considered integral part of the readers' formal schemata because good readers can comprehend a text based on their previous knowledge of the conventional organization of a piece of reading. For example, readers may look for any given text in their repertoire to guide them in organizing the text during the process of encoding. In this context, if a reader reads a problem-solution text being aware with structure of the text, he/ she will look for the problem and the solution. Further, he /she will also look for the causes of the problem and other details relevant to the problem and the solution. Meyer also argued that the inclusion of transition words in a text can make the text structure more identifiable.

Text structure and reading comprehension

Sharp (2004), in an experimental study, examined a large number of ESL secondary students from Hong Kong to determine the effect of rhetorical organization on reading comprehension. The researcher used four rhetorically different texts namely; description, cause-effect, listing and problem solving. The students were asked to read and to write a recall in a given time. Then, they were required to do a cloze test. Cloze testing showed significant differences between the four texts, while the results of recall protocols indicated no significant differences between the text

types. Sharp argued that this phenomenon is due to the education system in Hong Kong, where the emphasis is on memory related -tasks.

Newman (2007) investigated the effect of explicit instruction of expository text structure on reading comprehension. The participants were third grade EFL students who were divided into three groups of experimental group and a control group. The experimental groups received training on text structure with the use of graphic organizer. The students in the control classroom received regular guided reading instruction. The trainer used different reading strategies such as thinking aloud and graphic organizers during the treatment of experimental groups. After the post test, there was a significant difference in their ability to comprehend expository text.

Additionally, Hirai (2008) explored the effect of providing Japanese EFL readers with two different rhetorical structures (namely; temporal order and problem/solution) in order to reveal which rhetorical structure is more feasible to EFL readers. A written recall was managed for the participants who were two groups, in order to measure their reading comprehension. The results indicated that the upper group recalled significantly more information than the lower group even when the rhetorical structures and paragraph orders were changed. In addition, problem/solution structures were recalled more than temporal order structures.

Ting and Tee (2008) studied student's awareness and familiarity on the structure of academic text types among second and fourth year undergraduates at a Malaysian university. The findings indicated that a significant percentage of the participants lack familiarity with academic texts due to insufficient exposure to the structure of such text type. This suggests the importance of the use of expository type of texts in reading instruction and simultaneously taking into account the grade-level factor. All in all, it was reported that secondary school students need to be exposed to discourse structure in expository texts as it best suit their level

In another study, Latawiec (2010) studied the effects of text structure awareness as a metacognitive strategy on (EFL/ESL) reading comprehension and academic achievement over three years of tertiary education of 115 Polish EFL learners at an English Teacher's Training College. The rationale of the study stands on the theory of strategic text processing, and on the paradigm for teaching the text structure, which when taught explicitly, it enables better comprehension and better information recall. The researcher utilized pre-test and post-test to examine the relationship between student's awareness and use of text structure strategy. The results obtained from statistical calculations suggested that the awareness of text structure is a significant predictor of academic achievement along with other available predictors.

Chalak and Asfahani (2012) examined the effect of text-structure strategy instruction, compared to that of traditional instruction, on the reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. The participants were forty Iranian advanced level students. They were divided into a control group

and experimental group. The participants were pre-tested to make sure that there are no statistically significant differences in reading skill and no text-structure knowledge. Then, the students in both groups were taught four reading comprehension passages. The students in the control group were taught traditionally and the students in the experimental group were taught through text-structure awareness instruction. At the end of the fourth week, the students were post-tested. The results showed that the students who received the text-structure awareness instruction showed a significant improvement in the reading comprehension skill over time.

Content analysis and reading texts in EFL contexts

Sidek (2009) examined the reading passages in a Malaysian EFL textbook in order to determine how well an EFL secondary textbook prepares students for tertiary reading in English. The researcher categorized reading comprehension passages in the EFL secondary textbook as either narrative texts or expository texts. By using the data obtained from a content analysis of the textbook in focus, the author established that the textbook does not prepare students for university education as it overemphasizes narrative passages which are below the student's level. Also, the study showed that students needed to be exposed to expository texts in order to be prepared for tertiary reading.

Sholichatun (2011) carried out a study entitled content analysis of reading materials on *Sky Textbook* for junior high school. The purpose of the study was to find out the kind of genre of the reading passage found in the book under study and to find out the lexical density of these reading texts. The researcher used content analysis to collect the required data. The results showed that the book includes three genres, They are procedure, report, and narrative text. In terms of lexical density of reading texts, the results showed quite lexical density; which means that the text is suitable and not difficult.

Smadi and Alghazo (2013) content analyzed *Action Pack 11* in terms of authenticity; to determine to what extent the reading texts are authentic in the light of the specific reading outcomes under the Reading Section in the General Guidelines and General and Specific Outcomes for English Language in Jordan of 2006. The researchers used frequencies and percentages to present the results of the question of the study. The findings of the analysis showed that the reading texts of the student's book in *Action Pack 11* are highly authentic. Also the results revealed that there is a strong match between reading specific outcomes and the reading text's authenticity in *Action Pack 11*.

Kheshta and Seif (2013) evaluated the availability of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) in the reading exercises of *English for Palestine Grade 8* in order to find out to what extent the reading exercises in the student book and workbook match the suggested criteria. The descriptive analytical approach was adopted by the researchers to achieve the purpose of the study by showing various frequencies and percentages supported with examples from the books under study, the

researchers found that the skills available are not well-distributed in the student book neither in the work book. In the light of these data, the researchers recommended reviewing the reading exercises in order to modify it by providing them with rich material that includes HOTS.

More recently, Freahat and Al-Faoury (2015) examined the appropriateness of the reading content in *Action Pack 11*, *Action Pack 12* and an EFL textbook that is taught for *Communication Skills* module at Yarmouk University. The researchers analyzed the types of the reading passages included in the three textbooks by using content analysis instrument entailing expository, descriptive, narrative and persuasive text structures. The results showed that the three textbooks in focus exposed the students more to the descriptive and expository types of passages than to the narrative passages. However, descriptive texts were reported as scoring the highest occurrence across the three textbooks, while persuasive texts were reported as not to be. Furthermore, Rohmatillah (2015) used content analysis to determine the types of the reading texts in an EFL textbook entitled *English Alive* for Senior High School where the result of the analysis showed that there are five kinds of text, namely; recount, narrative, procedure, descriptive and news items texts.

These studies have attempted to content analyze reading texts for many purposes using variety of criteria. Further, a lot of studies investigated the effect of teaching text structure on students' reading comprehension. However, studies which content analyzed the types of text structure and the degree of fairness in presenting these structures in the secondary EFL textbooks are scarce particularly in Jordan. Thus, the current study has been done to fill this gap.

Being a teacher herself, the researcher felt student's problem in comprehending written texts. Due to its difficulty, reading comprehension passages in the secondary stage EFL textbooks become more and more complex as the texts are longer and fuller of themes. It likewise turns out to be gradually more diverse in lexis. Now the secondary stage in Jordan consists of the eleventh and twelfth grades which is very crucial as it is supposed to prepare students to the General Secondary Stage Exam (GSCE). Research findings in Jordan shed the light on reading comprehension deficiency. For example, Alkhawaldeh (2012) concluded that Jordanian students struggle in comprehending what they read. Further, Amoush (2012) stated that there is a general dissatisfaction among parents and school teachers from the poor level of reading comprehension achievement of Jordanian students in reading English texts; she added that a large number of Jordanian students face problems while trying to understand written texts in the reading lessons. The students' reading performance can be attributed to many factors as confirmed by relevant research. One of the essential factors related to the instruction associated with the structure of the reading passages. Myer (2003) asserted that EFL learners of all levels must be familiar with text structure in order to gain academic success. Accordingly, the present study is steered towards stating pedagogical implications through which reading comprehension may be mastered and in order to truthfully visualize such implications.

Method

The design followed by the present research on text structure is analytical descriptive where the researcher content analyzed reading texts and probed into how text structure should be employed by secondary stage teachers. Specifically, the current study aimed to answer the following questions:

1-What are the text structures types included in *Action Pack 11*? To what extent have the included text structure types been fairly presented in *Action Pack 11*?

2- What are the text structures types included in *Action Pack 12*? To what extent have the included text structure types been fairly presented in *Action pack 12*?

Materials

The materials of the present study consist of the reading passages in *Action Pack 11*, and *Action Pack 12* textbooks. Both textbooks provide many international topic-based contents which are designed to appeal to the educational needs and interests of students in Jordan. The following, however, is a detailed description of each:

Action Pack 11: consists of six thematic modules based on a carefully graded language syllabus. This approach makes it possible for students to develop all four language skills: listening, speaking. Each of Modules 2–6 in the textbook contains two units, which develop the theme in different ways. At the end of each module, there is a project

Action Pack 12: is a recent developed version by Cheryl Pelteret, Liz Kilbey and Judith Greet. Five units have to be covered each semester with a total of 10 units. The Ministry of education decided to adopt this book for 12th Jordanian students with the beginning of the scholastic year 2015/2016.

Instruments

In order to elicit the required data, a content analysis sheet was developed by the researcher. The applicability of content analysis made it so appropriate to be utilized in this study as Krippendorff (2004, P. 18) maintains that “Content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts or other meaningful matter to the contexts of their use”. That is why content analysis is effective in the current study; it is not merely to determine the frequency of the incorporated structures, but also to provide information for the textbooks writers.

Moreover, Holsti defines the term content analysis as any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages (1969, P.14). The present study is restricted to the analysis of text structures of the reading texts in two secondary textbooks; namely: *Action Pack 11* and *Action Pack 12*.

The categories of the analysis are the eight text structures which are sequential, enumerative, compare and contrast, problem and solution, cause and effect, compare and contrast, question and answer, descriptive and argumentative structures. The unit of analysis is the reading passages included in the textbooks in focus and the criterion of analysis is the inclusion of the eight text structures.

To establish the validity of the content analysis sheet, the researcher defined the terms operationally, prepared the criterion, units and the categories for analyzing the books under study. To establish the intra-rater reliability of the content analysis, the researcher analyzed the reading content of the textbook under study according to the categories of the study and repeated the analysis after two weeks by using the same units and categories of analysis. To establish the inter-rater reliability, however another analyst was asked to conduct the analysis using the same categories and units of analysis. The second analyst is an assistant professor in TEFL who published two content analysis studies and volunteered to take part in this study.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher analyzed the reading sections content of both *Action Pack 11* as well as *Action Pack 12* textbooks. The aim was to find out text structures included in each. Thus, systematic steps for content analysis were followed, that is the inclusion criteria was used for the analysis of the reading passages in focus. Then the researcher constructed a coding scheme by counting the presence and absence of each category in the whole units of the textbooks in focus, the coding unit is assigned to a particular category, that the recording unit should fit into only one category.

Findings

The first research question was: *What are the types of text structures included in Action Pack 11?* To what extent the included text structures have been fairly presented in *Action Pack 11*? To find out the answer, the researcher analyzed the reading passages of the student's book of *Action Pack 11* in the light of the eight structure types. Frequencies and percentages for every structure were calculated then the data are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequencies and percentages of the text structures of the reading passages in *Action Pack 11*

Categories	Module 1		Module 2		Module 3		Module 4		Module 5		Module 6		T	P
	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8	Unit 9	Unit 10				
Sequential			2					1	3	1			7	22%
enumerative	1								1	3			5	16%
Compare/contrast				1									1	3%
Cause/effect							1		1				2	6%
Problem/solution	1												1	3%
Question/answer						2	1						3	10%
Descriptive	1	2	3		1	1		1	1	1			11	34%
Argument												2	2	6%
Total													32	100%

Table 1 shows the frequencies and percentages of the text structures in *Action Pack 11*. The descriptive structure has the highest frequencies in all content analyzed units; it has 11 frequencies with percentage of 34%. An example of descriptive structure can be found in the first unit, the reading text describes flower festivals in different places in the world using sensory and descriptive language such as "the colorful flower", "beautiful black Iris", "magnificent tulip gardens". Moreover, the reading text in unit 2 page 20 has also descriptive structure of custom and traditions in different countries are presented such as: polite and impolite behaviors, eating rules and time respect.

After that, the sequential structure characterizes seven occurrences with a percentage of 22%; there are seven reading texts that organize the information using this structure. More specifically, these texts are distributed in units 3,7,8 and 9. On page 64 for example, the reading text traces the development of means of communication from the fifth century till recent days, more than one signal word indicate the sequence of the events such as: after many years, in 1821, nowadays. Another example of sequential structure is in unit 9, the text traces the history of pizza from the past till today. The sequential cues in this text are marked by using "In" followed by the year or the century six times in the text, each time refers to a specific historical period, for instance: in the third century, in the 16th century, in 1522 and the last paragraph includes the signal word "today" which refers to the development of pizza in our time.

Concerning compare/contrast and problem/solution structures, these types received the least frequencies and percentages as they occurred once with 3% each. The only example of compare and contrast is in unit four page 37; the reading text investigates cycling in the past, the present, and on the future. The text uses "ten years ago" and "nowadays" to hold a comparison between cycling in Jordan in the past and in our present day. Also the only example of problem and solution structure is on page 11; the text discusses the problem of three individuals who have no time to relax because of hard work, the text refers to the problem by using the word "the problem is" then the text presents three solutions for the three individuals to enable them to relax.

Regarding cause\effect structure; it was characterized in two occurrences, the first is in unit six page 52, where the reading text is about "water resources in Jordan" which sheds the light on scarcity of water resources in Jordan. The text shows the government's policy to raise the awareness of this matter. Signal words in the texts are clear such as "consequently", "accordingly". The second text is in unit 8 page 68; the text sheds the light on the reason behind doing research on "wild chimpanzees" and the results of such research; the text includes cues like "in order to", "the results suggest".

Concerning the enumerative structure, it characterized five occurrences with a percentage of 16%. In texts that have this structure, the main idea is followed by examples that are not in a defined order. For instance, in page 72, the main idea in the text involves different cultures and different food as the title of the text tells, then the writer exposes four examples on this idea from four different countries. Another text structure illustrated in the Table is question\answer structure which is characterized in three occurrences in units 5 and 6 consequently. For example, the information in the reading text in page 46 has been organized in a question and answer format between an interviewer and a nuclear physicist. However, the last structure which is characterized only twice is the argument structure with a percentage of 6% out of the total.

In *Action Pack 11*, both reading texts that have an argument structure are in unit 10. The first text discusses some information about the Nabateans who built Petra, their origin and culture. Here, the argument used by the signal word "might" two times in the text. Similarly, the second text is also organized in an argument structure investigates more than one view behind the disappearance of the Minoan civilization. The signal word "might" has been mentioned five times to support each view in the reading text. All in all, the result of the content analysis demonstrates that the textbook under study contained a varied number of text structures, the result also showed that the text structures were presented in the following order according to their inclusion namely; descriptive, sequential, enumerative, question\answer, argument and cause effect, compare\contrast and problem\solution). Reading passages that have descriptive structure were dominant, it had the highest occurrence across the ten units being analyzed. However, the text embedded structures were these of compare \ contrast and problem \solution structures.

The second research question was "*What are the types of text structures included in Action Pack 12?* To what extent the included text structures have been fairly presented in *Action pack 12?* To answer this question, the researcher analyzed the reading passages of the student's book of *Action Pack 11* in the light of the eight structure types. Frequencies and percentages for every structure were calculated then the data are reported in Table 2

Table 2: The frequencies and percentages of text structure of the reading passages in *Action Pack 12*

Categories	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8	Unit 9	Unit 10	Total	percentage
Sequential	1				1			1			3	13%
Enumerative	1		1				2		1		5	21%
Compare/contrast		1				1					2	8%
Cause/effect		1									1	4%
Problem/solution											0	0%
Question/answer								1	1		2	8%
Descriptive			2	2	1	2	1			2	10	42%
Argument		1									1	4%
Total											24	100%

Action Pack 12. The descriptive structure appeared most frequently, while cause\effect and argument structures received the least frequency and percentages. However, problem\solution structure has no frequency in the book under study.

More specifically, the descriptive structure has 10 frequencies with a percentage of 42%. In the textbook under study, two descriptive text structures are in each unit of 3, 4, 6 and 10. Yet, in units 5 and 7 there is one descriptive structure in each. An example of this structure is on page 24, the text describes one of cancer treatment center in Jordan. The text involves sensory and linguistic description of this center such as "its excellent reputation, lower costs, cultural and language similarities, the Journey to and from the hospital is often difficult". Another example of descriptive structure is on page 46, the text is entitled *Space schools* which describes a new kind of schools using signal words like "students follow a tailor-made curriculum", lessons are a mixture of small-class tutorials.

Table 2, also, shows that the enumerative structure has five frequencies with a percentage of %21. This structure implies that the ideas are not organized in a defined order like the sequential structure. For example, there is a text in unit1 that gives some ideas about using technology in Jordanian classrooms, the author uses signal words like "also, then, for example, another" to organize the ideas. Another example on this structure is on page 52 where the author talks about the benefits of learning a foreign language, the author moves from one point to another using "also" before each point and "finally" before the last point.

Regarding sequential structures, it appears in 3 texts in the textbook under study. For instance, the author uses the chronological sequence on page 6 to tell the reader about the history of computers. The author uses many signals to guide the reader in his/her reading. Signal words like "first, then, today" have been used in the text to tell the reader about the history of computers from its first invention till today. The author also uses "in" followed by a year seven times to refer to each period. Another example on this structure can be found on page 34, where the text traces the cultural heritage in Jordan since 1966 till now, each cultural activity in the text is preceded by the year in which it was happened.

Compare\contrast and question\answer structures occurred twice with a percentage of 8% each. An example of the comparison structure is on page 14 as there is a comparison between complementary medicine and conventional medical treatment where the author guides the reader to such comparison using signals like "in recent years", "these days" and "whereas". Moreover, the reading text in page 58 is a question and answer structure where the author starts the article by asking two questions followed by more than one answer.

The structures that have minimal representation in the textbook under study are cause\effect and argument structures with 4% each as shown in Table 2. A reading text on page 18 includes signal words like "due to", "as a result" to show the results that Jordanians gained because of Jordan health conditions are the best in the Middle East. Furthermore, the reading text on page 16 is an argument that investigates whether emotions affect one's health or not, the writer of the text argues that this matter is still controversial.

The results revealed that the textbook under study expose students to varied number of text structures but with varying degrees in light of their inclusion namely; descriptive, enumerative, sequential, compare\contrast and question\answer, cause\effect and argument text structures. However, problem\solution structure was not incorporated in the reading passages in the textbook in focus.

Discussion

Based on the findings of the first question, there are a variety of text structure types incorporated in *Action Pack 11* and no ignored structures have been scored which means that the twelfth grade students are exposed to different structures distributed in all of the textbook's units. However, the structures under analysis haven't been fairly included. For example, the reading passages that have descriptive structure were dominant as it had the highest occurrence across the ten units being analyzed; but students are hardly exposed to problem\solution and compare\contrast structures,

both types have been incorporated only once across the whole analyzed units. With reference to the other structure types like cause\effect and argument structures, the shortcomings were related to the insufficiency of the reading texts that follow these structures in the textbook in focus, there are two reading passages organized as cause and effect in addition to other reading passages organized argumentatively. Sequential and enumerative structures are satisfactorily included as there are seven occurrences for sequential structures and five concurrences for enumerative structures. Such occurrence enables the students to recognize these structures better in every time. This is in line with many other studies in the field that recommend presenting the reading texts in a specific structure; so that a better comprehension would be attained.

Based on the findings reported in Table 2, *Action Pack 12* (SB) includes a variety of structures with different distribution among the units. However, problem\solution structure had been ignored as it scored no frequency. Generally speaking, the textbook in focus uncovered different structures to twelfth grade students which is very crucial in increasing the comprehension of each text. A shortcoming would be noticed is the inclusion of a particular structure in favor of the other which means that the eight types of text structures are not included fairly. For example, the descriptive structure had the lion share based on the results tallied in the table. All in all, each reading text in *Action Pack 12* (SB) has a specific pattern that would facilitate comprehension if it is really recognized by the students and the teachers as well. As learners become aware with the way the texts are structured, they create mental templates that make it easier for them to access future texts that contain the same structures (Lems, Miller, & Soro, 2010).

Pedagogical implications

In the light of the content analyzed data, There are some important implications in teaching text structure as a reading strategy in EFL reading classes (Alkhondi, et al, 2011). Firstly, the teacher should identify the text structure of the text at hands. Then, signal words should be highlighted and emphasized in each text. Also the teacher may elaborate on additional signal words for each text structure telling the students that each structure has specific signal words and phrases. Being familiar with these signal words and phrases, the teacher asks them to find such clues in the structure of every text they read. Then, they may write some short paragraphs and use some of the signal words and phrases appropriate to each text structure.

Teaching reading requires activating the students' schema by their teachers. For example, teachers may help students at pre-reading phase to recall the knowledge that they already have about the topic of a text; because the reader who is not actively using his/her background

knowledge, the process of comprehension fails (Abraham, 2002, P. 6). Moreover, teachers must provide their students with the appropriate schemata that they lack, and must also help them create a match between their existing and new knowledge. Moreover, teachers themselves need to be provided with sufficient training formal or informal to guides them in the systematic utilization of the text structure as a reading strategy aimed at enhancing reading comprehension. In this context, the teacher 's book can play an essential role in providing many examples and guidelines of how to teach reading comprehension based on the organizational structure of the text (Carrell & Floyd ,1987).

Another important point is that the teacher should work with graphic organizers. For the first few lessons of working with graphic organizers, the students should complete graphic organizer before they start working on the text. This will help them create a good image of the hierarchy of ideas and their interrelationships presented in the passage. Once students became familiar with different kinds of graphic organizers, the teacher can give them blank or incomplete graphic organizer after they have finished reading the passage in order to complete it on their own. At this stage, it would be better for the students to work on a blank graphic organizer independently, elicit the ideas from the text, and assign the hierarchy of the ideas in a graphic organizer.

More specifically, the following procedures are put forth for each structure per se. Regarding the **sequential** structure, the purpose is to show how to do something or make something, or to relate a series of events that happen over time, it is also known as time order or temporal order. This structure is organized from one point in time to another; signal words such as first, next, later, after, before, following, then, in addition to, followed by, and finally are included in the text to help the reader understand how events relate to one another. Besides, dates and times are also used if the order is chronological. Another crucial step in teaching text structure is to ask questions that help the students to grasp the structure of any given text. For example, the teacher may ask the following questions about the sequential structure: How are the steps organized? What is the time span from the first event to the last? How does the author signal the change from one event to the next? What do all of the events explain?

To teach **cause\effect** structure; the teacher should at first teach the students the purpose of using this structure that is to show why something exists or things that happen as a result of an action or to show how one or more causes led to one or more effects. This text structure also has a strong time component that the student should recognize since causes come before effects. Signal words such as cause, effect, as a result, consequently, so, so that, because of, since, in order to, are

used in reading texts organized in cause\effect structure; It would be better to remind the students that many texts do not include just one cause leading to one effect; there may be several causes and several effects. The teacher could ask the students some questions about this structure like: What is the cause? What are the effects? Were there several causes and several effects? How did the cause lead to the effects?

In terms of **problem\solution** structure; the text's purpose is to present a problem, and show how it can be (or has been) solved. This text structure can be confused with cause and effect so the teacher may highlight the main difference that problem and solution always has a solution, while cause and effect does not. Signal words may include problem, solution, solve, effect, hopeful, concern, challenge, resolve...etc. Critical questions to be asked may be: What is the problem? What are the solutions? Who worked to solve the problem? Has the problem been solved yet, or will it be solved in the future? What caused the problem?

Concerning **compare\contrast** structure, the teacher should assign the purpose of this structure that is to present how two topics are the same or different. This text structure is considered somehow easy for students to understand. However, the teacher would pay the student's attention to key thing that the text may use a clustered approach, with details about one topic followed by details about the other or it may also show an alternating approach, with the author going back and forth between the two topics. Signal words to be taught may include like, similar, unlike, on the other hand, also, same as, different from, resembles, yet, as well as, alike, however and too. The teacher could ask questions like: what is being compared? what are the similarities? what are the differences? which similarities and differences are the most significant? are the details alternating or clustered?

Furthermore, the **descriptive** structure can be taught by presenting its purpose. For example, to tell what something is, to present an item's attributes or properties, to show what an item or place is like. Signal words include any sensory or linguistic cues that help the reader to visualize and understand a topic or to explain the Characteristics of a subject. The teacher may ask questions like: What is being described? how does the author organize the description? which detail is the most important? how do all of the details fit together?

Regarding the **argumentative** structure, the purpose is to make a claim or a statement and support it with details. This structure attempts to convince or persuade the reader to follow the views or ideas of the author. Signal words include clearly, logically, surely, in conclusion, might, therefore. Important questions would be asked during the class like: what is the key idea or theme

of the text? what is the evidence that support the idea? how did the author develop the argument? are there any opposing views/do you agree with the author's claim?

Regarding the **enumerative** structure, the purpose is to identify a main idea followed by examples that are not in a defined order. Signal words include first, second, third, then, also, for instance, for example, to begin with, furthermore, in addition, more importantly, more, next, finally, in fact, at last, another, other, etc. Many questions would be asked by the teacher like: what is the first idea mentioned in the text, what is the last idea? how many examples are in the text?

Finally, the purpose of **question\ answer** structure is to get information from posing questions and giving answers. Signal words include how, why, where, when, what, who, the question is, the answer is...etc. To acknowledge this structure, important questions would be raised during the class like: what is the answer of the first question? how many questions raised in the text? who asks this question (if any)? is there any question that have many answers?

Conclusions

This study confirms that *Action Pack 11 & Action Pack 12* include variety of text structure types. However, the included text structure types are not fairly distributed; some types of text structure are introduced in favor of other types like the descriptive structure which was the most frequent structure in both textbooks. Based on the results of the study, text structure is an important variable that has to be considered in secondary textbooks and teachers should practice teaching reading texts based on a particular structure through series of pedagogical implications

Recommendations

In light of the results of this study, the researchers feel that it is necessary to submit the following recommendations:

- 1-Book designers should integrate reading texts of varied text structure types without ignoring some structures in favor of others.
- 2-EFL teachers should be trained to use text structure strategy in EFL reading classes.
- 3-It is recommended that other research studies about text structure be conducted on earlier stages.

About the authors

Ala'a Abu Hamameh is a PhD candidate at Yarmouk University, Irbid (Jordan). Her research is focused on text structure of the reading texts in EFL secondary textbooks in Jordan.

Dr. Al-Jamal is an associate professor at Yarmouk University, Irbid (Jordan). Her research focuses on applied linguistics and teacher education.

Prof. Baniabdelrahman is a professor at Yarmouk University, Irbid (Jordan). His research focuses on TEFL, teacher education and CALL.

References

- Abraham, P. (2002). Skilled Reading: Top-down, bottom-up. *Field Notes*, 10 (2). SABES/World Education, Boston, MA.
- Alkhalaf, A. (2012) The EFL Reading Comprehension Challenges Faced by Secondary School Students in Jordan. *European Journal of Social sciences*.2(3),454-465.
- Alvermann, D. (2002). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(2), 189-208.
- Amoush, K. H. (2012). The effectiveness of using semantic mapping strategy on reading comprehension of Jordanian University students. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(6), 714-719.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2006). *Reading Next – A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Blachowicz, C. & Ogle, D. (2008) *Reading Comprehension: Strategies for Independent Learners*, (2 nd edn), New York: The Guilford Press.
- Carrell, P. (1992). Awareness of text structure: effects on recall. *Language Learning*, 42(1), 1-20.
- Carrell, P. (1984). The effects of a rhetorical organization on ESL readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 441–469.

- Carrell, P., & P. Floyd (1989). Effects on ESL reading of teaching cultural content schemata. *Language Learning*, 37, 88-108.
- Chalak, A & Asfahani, N. (2012). The Effects of Text-Structure Awareness on Reading Comprehension of Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation (LCT)*, 1(2), 35–48.
- Cunningsworth, Alan. (1995). *Choosing your course book*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Duke, N. K., & Palincsar, A .S. (2004). The Role of Text and Text -Reader Interactions in Young Children’s Reading Development and Achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 183-197.
- [14] Dymock, S. (2005). Teaching expository text structure awareness. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(2), 177–181.
- Freahat, N. & Alfaoury, O. (2015). Reading passages and skills in Jordanian high school and university EFL textbooks: A comparative analytical study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(1), 16-27.
- Gambrell, L. B., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (2007). *Best practices in literacy instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Gersten, R., Fuchs, L. S., Williams, J. P., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching reading comprehension strategies to students with learning disabilities: A review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(2), 279-320.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language moving from theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow: Longman.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Davis, M. H. (2003). Motivating struggling readers in middle school through an engagement model of classroom practice. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19, 59-85.
- Hall, K. M., Sabey, B. L., & McClellan, M. (2005). Expository text comprehension: Helping primary-grade teachers use expository texts to full advantage. *Reading Psychology*, 26(3), 211- 234. Hirai, N. (2008) Effects of rhetorical structure and paragraph order on EFL reading comprehension, *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 38, 437-444.

- Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Johnson, E. (2015) *Action Pack 11*, Student's book. London: York press.
- Kern, R. (2000) *Literacy and Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keshta, A. Saif, A. (2013). Evaluating the higher order thinking skills in reading of English for Palestine grade eight. *Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning*, 1, 47 – 69. Retrieved from Asian Online Journals www.ajouronline.com
- Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T.A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85, 363-394.
- Koda, K. (2005). *Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- [29] Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Latawiec, B. (2010). Text structure awareness as a meta cognitive strategy facilitating ESL/EFL reading comprehension and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning*, 17(5), 25-48.
- Lems, K., Miller, L. D., & Soro, T. M. (2010). *Teaching reading to English language learners: Insights from linguistics*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Lynch, T. & Mendelsohn, D. (2002) Listening, in Schmitt, N. (ed.) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*, London: Arnold.
- Lyon, G.R. (2001). Towards a definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 45, 3-27.
- McNamara, D. (2008). Improving adolescent student's reading comprehension with iSTART. *Educational Computing Research*, 31, 147-171.
- Meyer, B.J.F., & Freedle, R. O. (1984). Effects of discourse type on recall. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, 31, 83-92. Retrieved April 20, 2012 from <http://www.eurojournals.com/ajsr.htm>.

- Meyer, B. J. F., & Ray, M. N. (2011). Structure strategy interventions: Increasing reading comprehension of expository text. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 4, 127–152.
- Meyer, J. B. F. (2003). Prose analysis: purposes, procedures, and problems. In B. K. Britten & J. B. Black (Eds.), *Understanding expository text: A theoretical and practical handbook for analyzing explanatory text*, (pp. 11-64). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction (2003). *Prepared to Make a Difference*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- National Reading Panel. (2003). *Put reading first: The research building blocks for teaching children to read*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Newman, L. M. (2007). *The effects of explicit instruction of expository text structure incorporating graphic organizers on the comprehension of third-grade students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland.
- Pearson, P. D., & L. G. Fielding. (1991). "Comprehension Instruction." In *Handbook of Reading Research: Vol. II*, edited by R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and P. D. Pearson. New York: Longman.
- Pearson, P.D. (2009). The roots of reading comprehension. In S.E. Israel & G.G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 3–31). New York: Routledge.
- Pelteret, C. Kilbey, L. Greet, J. (2015) *Action Pack 12*, Student's Book. London: York press.
- Rohmatillah, R. (2015). Readability Level of Reading Texts in the English Textbook Entitled English Alive for Senior High School Grade X. English education: *TadrisBahasaInggris*. 7(1) .81-104.
- Sharp, A. (2004). Strategies and predilections in reading expository text: the importance of text patterns. *RELC Journal*, 35(3), 329-349.
- Sholichatun, S. (2010). *Content analysis of reading material in English on Sky Textbook for Junior High School*. Unpublished thesis. Semarang: Bachelor program of English language Education of Walisongo State Institute for Islamic Studies.

- Sidek, H. M. (2009). Reading attitudes: A case study in Malaysia. In Shafaei, A. & M. Nejati (Eds.), *Annals of Language Teaching*, (pp. 209-215), Boca Raton, Florida: Universal Publishers.
- Smadi, O. & Alghazo, A. (2013) A content analysis of English reading text's authenticity in student's book of *Action Pack 11* in Jordan. *European scientific Journal*. 9, (29), 342-359.
- Stevens, R. J. (2003). Student team reading and writing: A cooperative learning approach to middle school literacy instruction. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 9(2),137-160.
- Talbot, D. C. (2004). *Metacognitive strategy training for reading: Developing second language learners' awareness of expository text patterns*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Hong Kong.
- Taylor, B. M., and Samuels, S. J. (1983). Children's use of text structure in the recall of expository material. *American Educational Research Journal*, 20, 517-528.
- [52] Ting, S-H.& Tee, P-F. (2008). TESL undergraduates' ability to handle academic text type at University Malaysia Sarawak. *Asiatic*, 2(2), 85-100.
- Toledo, P. F. (2005). Genre analysis and reading of English as a foreign language: Genre schemata beyond text typologies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1059–1079.
- Tompkins, G.E. (2007). *Literacy for the 21st century: Teaching reading and writing in Prekindergarten through grade 4* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson.
- Tovani, C. (2000). *I read it, but I don't get it: Comprehension strategies for adolescent readers*. Portland, ME: Sten house.
- Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice*. (1st ed.). London and New York: Longman.
- Villanueva de Debat, E. (2012). Applying current approaches to the teaching of reading. Online, Available in:
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/98645273/Applying-Current-approaches-to-the-Teaching-of-Reading>.
- Williams, J. P. (2007). Literacy in the curriculum: integrating text structure and content area instruction. In Danielle S. McNamara. *Reading comprehension strategies: theories, interventions, and technologies*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.