



SSN (Print) 2596 – 7517

ISSN (Online) 2597 – 307X

FULL PAPER

The Effectiveness of Using the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy in Teaching English Literature: Pedagogical Analysis of “Treasure Island” Novel

Prepared by

Nazik Noaman Ahmed Alnour
Languages and Translation Dep.
Haql University College
University of Tabuk, Saudi Arabia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4655-5947>
nalnoor@ut.edu.sa

Romila Karrar Farh Karrar
Dep of English Language
Faculty of Education,
Blue Nile University,
Ad-Damazin, Sudan
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0999-6306>
romilakarrar@gmail.com

Wijdan Mohieldeen Mohammed
Dept of English Language & Literature
College of Languages & Humanities,
Qassim University, Saudi Arabia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7300-9039>
w.suliman@qu.edu.sa

Abbas Hussein Abdelrady
Dep of English Language & Literature
College of Languages & Humanities
Qassim University, Saudi Arabia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7920-887X>
ab.altaher@qu.edu.sa

Abstract

Teaching literature presents difficulties in EFL settings because students lack sufficient language proficiency and have little experience with challenging authentic full-length literary texts. Teaching methods also continue to be largely teacher-directed. Based on an integrated metacognitive, self-regulated learning, and cognitive load theory framework, this study explored whether the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy (RTS) could improve secondary students' reading comprehension of *Treasure Island* and investigated English teachers' views on its implementation. We used a convergent mixed-methods design with a quasi-experimental study and qualitative responses to teachers' open-ended questions. Sixty students were placed into either an experimental or control group. Students were tested on literary text comprehension before and after reading *Treasure Island*. During the intervention, students in the experimental group were taught with RTS and students in the control group received traditional instruction. Teachers (N = 32) gave qualitative responses about their opinions of benefits and challenges of RTS. Statistical analyses showed that students' scores on the experimental group's post-test were significantly higher than students' scores on the control group's post-test, $t(58) = -4.43$, $p < .001$, $d = -1.37$. There was a large effect size, which means that RTS led to better comprehension of *Treasure Island*. Theme analysis revealed that RTS allowed for metacognitive awareness of reading, self-regulated learning skills, better comprehension, and engagement. Although some teachers had concerns about time, class size, and mixed proficiency levels, most believed that reciprocal teaching was beneficial to students. Our results indicate that reciprocal teaching is an effective metacognitive strategy to use when teaching full-length literary texts in EFL contexts and that training and proper conditions are required for teachers to properly execute it.

Keywords: reciprocal teaching, EFL literature instruction, collaborative learning, student engagement, literary comprehension, strategy-based reading.

1. Introduction

Teaching literature has many advantages for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. Exposure to literature allows students to engage with language naturally, as well as encounter different ways of speaking and exploring culture. Literary texts allow students to interpret information, think critically, and interact with language (Lazar, 1993). Despite these advantages, many EFL teachers have noticed that students have a difficult time understanding the linguistic complexity and cultural components of literature. Literature has also not advanced past teacher-centered lessons. Often times teachers spend more time explaining and summarizing literary texts rather than allowing students to construct meaning. Students often struggle with reading comprehension due to low levels of metacognitive awareness and inefficient strategy use (Cain & Oakhill, 2006). If students are not able to construct meaning while reading literary texts, they may see the classroom as frightening or frustrating and will disengage from the text (Carter & Long, 1991; Hall, 2005). As a result, learner-centered approaches that allow for students to be interactive and work with their peers are encouraged.

Strategy instruction has been shown to have a positive impact on students' ability to learn from literature lessons. Reading is a process of constructing meaning through interacting with text. Rosenblatt (1978) stated that reading is not a process of extracting a message from printed pages. Rather, reading consists of an active transaction between the reader and the text. This implies that readers should be using strategies to help them better comprehend what they are reading. Questioning, monitoring, clarifying unknown words, and summarizing can enhance students' understanding of difficult texts (Pressley, 2006; Grabe, 2009). Reciprocal teaching is an instructional strategy that requires students to use all of these skills. Reciprocal teaching is a learning strategy that is based on guided dialogue (Palincsar & Brown, 1984). Studies have found that reciprocal teaching increases comprehension, engagement, and collaboration in EFL classrooms (Zakaria, 2023; Khidr, 2023). New research even shows that reciprocal teaching has positive effects on EFL learners' metacognitive monitoring and reading comprehension (Mohamed, 2023).

Studies have been done on the benefits of reciprocal teaching and have shown positive results. Researchers have recently been looking into the effects of Reciprocal Teaching in English as a Foreign Language classrooms. Studies found that using Reciprocal Teaching led to students having better comprehension, more interest in what they were reading, and increased collaboration with their classmates (Zakaria, 2023; Khidr, 2023). Other studies have shown that reciprocal teaching allows students to become active learners by verbalizing their thinking while reading a text. EFL students are able to practice their English while speaking out their thoughts about a text. While many studies have shown that reciprocal teaching helped students with reading comprehension, most previous research only used short texts. However, many teachers like to teach novels in their EFL classrooms. Reading whole novels in English can be difficult for EFL learners. Novels usually have more complex language and structures. For example, *Treasure Island* by Robert Louis Stevenson uses older language that is not used frequently in our society today. Studies have shown that reciprocal teaching can help students better comprehend what

they are reading, but no studies have been found that use RT with full-length novels. Therefore, this study was conducted to see if the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy was effective at teaching English literature to EFL students.

The purpose of this study is to explore how reciprocal teaching can impact students' comprehension and interpretation of literature. In order to better understand Reciprocal Teaching when applied to literature classrooms, this study will seek to answer:

1. To what extent does the use of the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy impact secondary students' comprehension and interpretation of the novel *Treasure Island*?
2. In what ways does teaching English literature through Reciprocal Teaching enhance students' English language development (skills in reading, vocabulary, critical thinking)?
3. What challenges do English Literature teachers face when applying the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy in their secondary school classrooms?

Given the instructional gaps identified and the limited literature on reciprocal teaching with whole novels for EFL learners, the following review highlights literature supporting the theory and studies underpinning this research.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teaching English Literature

Application of Literature in Language Learning Literature can be applied in language learning contexts quite successfully. Literature can expose learners to authentic language use and rich vocabularies through worthwhile contexts (Lazar, 1993). Learning literature allows students to practice the skills of interpretation, critical-thinking, and cultural understanding through reading and discussion. However, some literature is quite complex and written with obscure language or stylistic mechanisms (Carter & Long, 1991; Hall, 2005). Literature is also traditionally taught through teacher explanation. Works of literature integrate stylistic devices, figurative language, and special writing techniques that may not make sense to, or be familiar to EFL learners. Teacher explanation has also been used to relay information about literature. Although allowing the teacher to give background information about a text, this type of instruction does not allow students to fully explore and participate in the meaning-making process of a text. McRae (1994) explained this style of teaching literature to students as transmission pedagogy which casts learners as receivers of rather than constructors of meaning through text. Learners who are taught literature this way may come away with shallow understandings of the texts that they read. They do not learn how to think critically or interpret literature. Because of this, current research in language education supports methods of teaching literature that are learner-centered. These methods allow students to build meaning through discussion, collaboration, and interpretation of texts. Kramsch (1993) suggested that allowing students to learn literature allows conversation to be created between the reader and text. When students are allowed to make meaning socially and

culturally out of texts, they are able to learn through methods supported by principles of communicative language teaching (learners interacting).

2.2 Reading Comprehension Strategies

In order to analyze literature, students must be able to understand what they are reading. Reading comprehension is not simply decoding words; students must learn how to construct meaning while reading texts. While teachers read literature in class, students must learn how to figure out what is happening in the reading, make sense of characters, and recognize story patterns. Rosenblatt (1978) viewed reading as a transaction between reader and text. Rosenblatt's transactional theory emphasizes that learners construct meaning while reading. As such, understanding is dependent on the reader's use of strategies to negotiate with text. Cognitive strategies may include finding the main idea, understanding how events are related, and making inferences. Metacognitive strategies allow readers to monitor their thoughts while reading by noticing when they do not understand a portion of a text and using strategies to help themselves understand. The degree to which learners are metacognitively aware heavily influences how they approach and regulate their comprehension (Hou, 2015). Research has shown that strategy instruction positively affects students' reading comprehension. Duke and Pearson (2002) explain that when teachers teach students how to strategically interact with texts, students are then able to learn how to understand difficult texts by themselves. Pressley (2006) also explains the benefits of teaching students how to use reading strategies. Strategies like predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing allow learners to interact with texts which increases comprehension. Strategy instruction may be particularly beneficial for learners of second languages. Second-language learners have to decode the language and construct meaning at the same time. Grabe (2009) states that second-language learners can improve their reading ability by using reading strategies. The strategies help learners focus on understanding the text while continuing to learn the language.

2.3 Reciprocal Teaching

Reciprocal teaching is a dialog between teacher and learner that promotes reading comprehension. The idea behind reciprocal teaching was developed by Palincsar and Brown (1984) who believed students could learn to understand texts by becoming strategic learners. Reciprocal teaching involves predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarising the text being read. One important characteristic of reciprocal teaching is that responsibility is gradually shifted from teacher to student. Initially, the teacher will model how to use reading comprehension strategies while leading a group discussion. Students then become more responsible for leading the group discussion and using strategies independently. The idea of gradual release of responsibility comes from the concept of scaffolding students. Scaffolding is based on sociocultural theory and values social interaction as an important part of learning (Vygotsky, 1978).

Evidence has shown that reciprocal teaching can improve reading comprehension in students. Research has also shown that reciprocal teaching is useful for students who have difficulties comprehending text by scaffolding reading strategies (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 1997). Rosenshine and Meister (1994) conducted a meta-analysis on studies that implemented reciprocal teaching. They found improvements in student reading comprehension. The study concluded that reciprocal teaching allowed students to be active learners of texts and able to monitor their comprehension during reading. Since this study, other studies have found similar results in both L1 and L2 classrooms. Hacker and Tenen (2002) found that reciprocal teaching used in the classroom improved students' comprehension monitoring and strategic reading. Oczkus (2018) states that reciprocal teaching allows learners to reflect on their thinking as they read, allowing students to become aware of their learning.

2.4 Reciprocal Teaching in EFL classrooms

Although reciprocal teaching has only recently started to gain traction in EFL research. Some studies have shown that reciprocal teaching can enhance learners' reading comprehension, motivation, and classroom interaction. Zakaria (2023) found that reciprocal teaching helped EFL students improve their critical reading skills. After participating in reciprocal teaching activities, students were not only better at reading comprehension but also had higher levels of reading task motivation than their traditionally taught counterparts. After being taught through reciprocal teaching, secondary EFL students scored significantly higher on a reading comprehension exam than students who received traditional instruction (Khidr, 2023). Likewise, recent research has shown that reciprocal teaching yielded significantly higher comprehension than traditional instructional strategies (Cataylo et al., 2023).

In contrast, other studies have used reciprocal teaching to increase learners' awareness of reading strategies. Researchers found that reciprocal teaching not only increased EFL learners' comprehension performance but also their understanding of reading strategies. As students practiced reading strategies to complete their reciprocal teaching activities and participated in group discussions about the texts, they developed an awareness of their ability to comprehend new texts. Research has examined the use of reciprocal teaching when teaching students how to comprehend narrative texts. Students were better able to analyze and interpret texts when they were taught using reciprocal teaching strategies than when they were taught using traditional strategies to teach narrative texts (Lestari, 2024). Islamiyah and Wijaya's (2024) results also showed that students who engaged in reciprocal teaching activities had better comprehension of narrative texts than students who received traditional teacher-centered instruction. Reciprocal teaching allows students to take turns leading group discussions and working together to create meaning from texts.

2.5 Teaching Literary Texts: Treasure Island

Reciprocal teaching strategies have been applied in many studies concerning reading comprehension. However, there is not enough evidence to show that this strategy can be applied

to teach students how to understand literary texts. Studies have only used short passages or modified texts to implement the strategies of reciprocal teaching. Literature allows students to learn reading comprehension skills through longer texts that have more complex plots, relationships, and theme development.

Treasure Island by Robert Louis Stevenson is a classic novel that is taught in many English courses. Throughout this story, students are able to learn about loyalty, good vs evil, and growing up through an adventure story. Treasure Island is a great story for students to read, but it can be hard for them to understand. The novel uses old English and historical language. Also, the themes in the book can have very complex story lines. Teachers need to use a strategy that will allow students to better understand what is going on while reading the story. Reciprocal teaching could be used because it will allow students to work with each other to understand the text. Students should work together to paraphrase unknown words, analyze characters' actions, and summarise the chapters.

To sum up, while past research has indicated that reciprocal teaching has great potential as an instructional tool, few studies have implemented it with whole novels and/or with EFL learners. For a more thorough investigation of reciprocal teaching with entire novels, the methods of the current study are outlined below.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study is rooted in metacognitive theory, which views reading comprehension as strategic and self-regulated thinking process. Metacognition refers to the learners' understanding and control over their own thinking processes, including their ability to plan for, monitor, and evaluate comprehension (Flavell, 1979; Schraw & Moshman, 1995). This approach is particularly relevant to EFL learning contexts because students must attend both to linguistic processing and textual understanding simultaneously.

Building upon metacognitive theory, this study also draws upon self-regulated learning (SRL) to explain how learners can exert control over their own reading comprehension. Self-regulated learning expands upon metacognition by positing that learners can actively self-regulate cognition as well as motivation and learning behaviors (Zimmerman, 2002). Self-regulated learning has recently been shown to improve outcomes in language learning contexts by increasing learners' strategicity, autonomy, and self-regulated learning behavior (Panadero, 2021; Teng et al., 2022). Applied to reading comprehension, self-regulated learners plan, select appropriate strategies, monitor their comprehension, and then modify their strategies if comprehension fails. Metacognition represents the cognitive substrate of self-regulated learning, whereby learners actively plan for, monitor, and regulate their cognition.

Reciprocal teaching is consistent with metacognitive and self-regulatory theory. The four central strategies of reciprocal teaching—predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarising—are regulatory behaviors in their own right. Predicting involves learners setting goals for their

reading and can be considered a planning behavior (i.e., the forethought phase of self-regulated learning). The four strategies have been consistently supported across 40 years of research as the fundamental ingredients of reciprocal teaching efficacy. (Vuong & Steklacs, 2025). Questioning and clarifying involve regulating comprehension through monitoring, and summarising requires students to evaluate their learning and regulate subsequent behavior. When students practice engaging in each of these strategies regularly, they learn to self-regulate.

Finally, this study draws upon cognitive load theory, which concerns itself with the situational factors that allow learning to occur. Cognitive load theory argues that because working memory is limited, instruction should be designed to minimize extraneous processing and promote germane processing (Sweller et al, 2011; Paas & van Merriënboer, 2021). Newer research on cognitive load has focused specifically on its impact on language learning, demonstrating that language learners must also manage their cognitive load in order to efficiently comprehend language input. Cognitive load has been shown to directly impact learners' use of strategies (Hannon & Frias, 2012). Extrapolating from this research to reading comprehension, metacognitive strategies can help learners regulate their cognitive load by directing attention and effort to important information. Research on international educational outcomes has found that students who are strategic readers also perform better on self-regulated learning metrics (OECD, 2019).

Thus, reciprocal teaching can be considered an instructional strategy that organizes the reading process into clearly defined steps. In doing so, it minimizes unnecessary cognitive load and allows learners to focus on comprehending text at a deep level rather than becoming overwhelmed by language processing.

Metacognition, self-regulated learning, and cognitive load theory can thus be integrated to explain how reciprocal teaching improves EFL learners' reading comprehension. Metacognition provides the theoretical basis for understanding how learners plan for, monitor, and evaluate their comprehension. Self-regulated learning provides the mechanism by which learners take control of their use of reading strategies. Cognitive load theory provides the cognitive foundation by which both of these processes operate. Reciprocal teaching, then, operates as a metacognitive–self-regulatory strategy that helps learners process difficult literary texts.

Reciprocal teaching was posited to improve learners' reading comprehension. The theoretical framework outlined above suggests reciprocal teaching should directly impact learners' regulation of reading comprehension. As such, the present study tested the impact of reciprocal teaching on EFL learners' reading comprehension and self-regulatory behavior.

Approaching reading comprehension from an interactive stance affords a new perspective in which reciprocal teaching impacts both learners' behavior and cognition. The degree of regulation that learners are able to internalize should have a direct impact on reading comprehension performance. Reciprocal teaching should serve to improve EFL learners' regulation of reading comprehension, thereby leading to better reading outcomes.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The convergent mixed-method design allowed researchers to collect both quantitative and qualitative data to answer research questions. Learning outcomes from the teaching intervention were analyzed quantitatively. Qualitative data were collected to understand teachers' perceptions and contextual factors that could influence learning outcomes. The learning gains students obtained from use of the teaching strategy were investigated quantitatively, while teachers' perceptions about their instruction was analyzed qualitatively.

The quantitative strand used quasi-experimental design with an experimental group and control group. The experimental group received English literature instruction implemented with Reciprocal Teaching Strategy while the control group received their normal teacher-centred instruction. Both groups received pre- and post-tests measuring students' literature comprehension. Qualitative data were collected through open-ended questions in the teacher's questionnaire. Teachers' views about reciprocal teaching and challenges faced when using this method in their classrooms were coded and themes were analyzed.

3.2 Participants and Research Context

The study took place in one secondary school. In that school English literature is offered as part of English language courses. The participants in the study included 60 secondary students and 32 English language teachers. Students were divided into two groups: Experimental group (n=30) – these students were taught *Treasure Island* with the help of the RTS. Control group (n=30) – these students were taught the same literary material using traditional, teacher-centered methods. Both groups consisted of students of comparable academic ability who had received similar exposure to English language courses prior to the study. The pre-test was administered to ensure that there was no statistically significant difference between two groups' performance in literary reading comprehension before the experiment took place. The participating teachers were English language teachers (n=32) with varied experience. The research participation was voluntary, and all of the participants gave informed consent after being made aware of the purpose of the study.

3.3 Instruments

The following instruments were used for data collection:

1. Students' Literature Achievement Test
2. Teachers' Questionnaire

Instruments were used to gather evidence to address the study's specific research questions.

3.3.1 Students' Literature Achievement Test

The Literature Achievement Test measured students' comprehension of Treasure Island. The same test was administered before (pre-test) and after (post-test) treatment. Performance on the pre-test and post-test was used to measure students' gain in literary comprehension.

The test was comprised of two sections:

Section A: Objective questions

Students were asked to:

1. identify what happened during specific parts of the literary text
2. recall characters
3. define words used in the context of the literary text

Section B: Subjective questions

Students were asked questions that required higher-level thinking. These questions asked students to:

1. describe the character
2. define the theme of the story
3. summarise what happened in a chapter
4. make inferences from the text

Objective questions were scored using an answer key and subjective answers were scored using a rubric.

Content validity was used to assess the test instrument's reliability. A group of experienced English language teachers reviewed the test and deemed it representative of the Literary curriculum. Pilot testing was used to determine internal consistency.

3.3.2 Teachers' Questionnaire

The Teachers' Questionnaire was designed to elicit information about teachers' beliefs regarding literature instruction and use of RTS. The teacher sample consisted of 32 teachers of English language teaching in the same secondary school.

Factors explored included teachers' qualifications, years of teaching experience, and training background. Twenty-two participants had a Bachelor's degree in English Language or Applied Linguistics while 12 teachers held a Master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) or Applied Linguistics. Ten teachers had 1–5 years of teaching experience, 12 teachers had between 6–10 years, and 10 teachers reported having over 10 years of teaching experience. All teachers were trained in CLT and student-centered instruction; however no teachers reported prior formal training in reciprocal teaching. Prior to intervention, teachers assigned to the experimental group attended a 2-day training workshop. The workshop provided

teachers with background knowledge about reciprocal teaching and demonstrated how to conduct RT. Training concluded with practice teaching where teachers collaborated with researchers to lead RT lessons. Data was collected from students in a public secondary school where English is learned as a foreign language and literature is taught through English language instruction. Class sizes ranged from 25-35 students. Additionally, both conditions received instruction according to standardized curriculum specified by the national education system in order to control for variation in curriculum across the two conditions.

Content validity and reliability of the instruments were established. Validity was determined by a panel of five experts in applied linguistics and instructed second language acquisition (ESL) who evaluated the tests for content that aligned with constructs being measured (i.e., reading comprehension and metacognitive strategy use), appropriateness for the target population (grades 9th-12th English language learners), and clarity of test items. Based on the recommendations of the expert reviewers, adjustments were made to ensure content validity. Reliability was determined by piloting the tests with 20 students from similar educational backgrounds as the participants in this study. Ambiguous items were adjusted based on piloting and item analysis. Internal consistency was determined using Cronbach's alpha. The reading comprehension test and teachers' questionnaire both demonstrated high internal consistency: $\alpha = .87$ and $\alpha = .88$, respectively.

For transparency purposes, sample items from each test are provided below. Objective items included questions like "What happened after Jim Hawkins found the map?" and "Who is the antagonist of the story?" Subjective items required participants to "Summarise the events that took place in the chapter" and "Describe the theme of loyalty in the story." Subjective items were scored using an analytic rubric that measured comprehension (accuracy and ability to infer meaning from text) and coherence of response, for a total of 10 marks. In order to establish consistent scoring, two raters scored the responses independently and the inter-rater reliability was calculated using Cohen's kappa ($\kappa = .82$).

3.4 Teaching Intervention

This teaching intervention lasted eight weeks, with three sessions per week for approximately 45 minutes each session, totaling 24 lessons. Throughout these lessons, experimental group students read the selected chapters of *Treasure Island* implementing RTS. Following is the sequence of instruction based on metacognitive cycle associated with RTS.

Preparation for each session was broken down into three phases. Phase 1 is the Pre-reading Phase which lasted 10 minutes. During this time students activated background knowledge, made predictions based on the chapter titles, and looked for unknown words. Planning served as the metacognitive component of this phase. Phase 2 is referred to as the While-reading Phase. Students worked in cooperative groups of four assuming assigned roles that rotated each session. Roles included: Predictor, Questioner, Clarifier, and Summariser. Students took turns assuming each role to ensure equal participation. This phase lasted 25 minutes. Monitoring and Regulation

served as the metacognitive component of this phase. Lastly, students participated in a Post-reading Phase. During this time students would summarize what they read in the chapter, discuss themes and characters, and express where they had difficulty comprehending. Students spent 10 minutes on this phase and the metacognitive component involved was Evaluation.

Teacher participation during this intervention was essential. The teacher initially modeled how to use the strategies during lesson 1 and then responsibility was shifted to students throughout the lessons using a gradual release model that encouraged student autonomy and self-regulation. To increase the fidelity of implementation, an observation checklist was utilized along with weekly monitoring of lessons and adherence to a teacher's guide.

3.5 Procedures

Each lesson was divided into three stages:

Before reading: Students were first asked to discuss the chapter title and make predictions as to what would be covered in the chapter. Students then sketched any words they did not know.

While reading: Students read the chapter in their cooperative learning groups. Students took turns being the Predictor, Questioner, Clarifier, and Summarizer.

After reading: Students were asked to analyse characters, discuss problems presented in the chapter and write about major events that happened in the chapter.

3.6 Data Analysis

Quantitative data from students' literature achievement tests and teacher questionnaire Likert-scale items were analysed using the IBM Statistics program. Descriptive and inferential statistical tests were used to analyse the collected numerical data.

Analyses included:

1. Independent-samples was used to compared group means
2. Paired-samples was used to compare means from the same group at two different times
3. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation for the overall sample

Qualitative data from teachers' open-ended questionnaire responses were analysed through thematic analysis. Teachers' perception of RTS, benefits of RTS, and challenges teachers associate with RTS were examined through qualitative analysis of questionnaire data.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Approval was granted prior to data collection. Participation was voluntary and informed consent was obtained from all participants. Participants' responses were anonymous.

After describing the methodology including participants, instruments, and procedures of this study, the next section will discuss the results and findings derived from analyzing data through the use of the reciprocal teaching strategy.

4. Results

4.1 Teachers' Questionnaire

Table 1

Teaching Experience and Training in Reciprocal Teaching (N = 32)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Years of Teaching Experience	Less than 5 years	5 12	37.5
	5–10 years	7	21.9
	More than 10 years	10 13	40.6
Received Training in Reciprocal Teaching	Yes	17	53.1
	No	15	46.9

Demographics of study sample (Current Study) (Table 1) . The current study obtained data from thirty-two teachers of English in the secondary school setting from a variety of teaching backgrounds. Self-reported experience was recorded and 35.5% of teachers considered themselves beginner teachers (0-5 years teaching experience), 21.9% considered themselves mid-career teachers (5-10 years teaching experience), and 40.6% considered themselves veteran teachers (over ten years teaching experience). Fifty-three point one percent (53.1%) of teachers reported that they had received formal training that involved reciprocal teaching strategies. Table 2 below shows descriptive statistics for how teachers perceived literature teaching in the secondary classroom. As can be seen in the table, teachers believed that teaching literature was difficult. Additionally, teachers agreed that students often need help to interpret pieces of literature. Reading literature should then be considered a scaffolded activity rather than a solitary activity that occurs with little teacher interaction. This conceptualization aligns perfectly with reciprocal teaching. However, what was surprising was that teachers did not agree that traditional teacher-fronted activities were sufficient to teach English novels. Perhaps teachers do not feel that transmission-style pedagogy will cut it when trying to teach students the often hidden

meanings in literature (EFL). Teachers may feel students need more interaction when being exposed to literature which could include the use of strategy instruction(reciprocal teaching).

Table 2

Teachers' Perceptions Toward Reciprocal Teaching

Item	Mean (M)	SD
Teaching literature is challenging	4.32	0.71
Students struggle without guidance	4.45	0.62
Traditional methods are sufficient	2.10	0.85
I understand reciprocal teaching	3.98	0.66
I regularly use reciprocal teaching	2.95	0.88
Reciprocal teaching improves comprehension	4.60	0.55
Enhances prediction/questioning/clarifying/summarizing	4.68	0.49
Increases engagement	4.55	0.60
Improves reading comprehension	4.70	0.47
Helps with difficult vocabulary	4.25	0.72
Enhances critical thinking	4.63	0.51
Time constraints limit use	4.20	0.74
Large class size limits use	4.28	0.69

Findings from the current study show that teachers have a strong belief that reciprocal teaching is a good teaching strategy that supports metacognitive involvement. Items that assessed prediction, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing had high mean values ($M > 4.5$), indicating that teachers believe these strategies support planning, monitoring and evaluation which are all part of metacognitive theory.

Teachers also noted better comprehension and critical thinking which supports reciprocal teaching encouraging self-regulated learning strategies and higher level thinking.

4.2 Students' Literature Achievement Test

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test Scores

Group	N	Mean (M)	SD
Experimental	30	51.20	6.10
Control	30	50.75	5.90

Table 4

Independent Samples t-test for Pre-test

Variable	t	df	p
Pre-test	0.42	58	.676

The experimental and control groups did not significantly differ at pre-test ($t(58) = 0.42$, $p = .676$), supporting the equivalency of groups before the intervention.

Table 5

Post-test Results (Independent Samples t-test)

Group	N	Mean (M)	SD	t	df	p	Cohen's d
Experimental	30	78.40	5.80	6.72	58	< .001	1.73
Control	30	63.25	6.15				

There was a significant difference in performance between the experimental group and control group, $t(58) = 6.72$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.73$. Students who received reciprocal teaching performed significantly better than students who did not. Reciprocal teaching made a large difference in students' reading comprehension. From a metacognitive standpoint, this could be due to allowing students to plan, monitor, and evaluate their understanding through the use of strategies.

Table 6*Paired Samples t-test (Experimental Group)*

Test	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t	df	p
Pre-test	30	51.20	6.10				
Post-test	30	78.40	5.80	27.20	10.54	29	< .001

Mean performance for the experimental group increased significantly from pre-test to post-test, $t(29) = 10.54$, $p < .001$. This significant improvement endorses reciprocal teaching as a metacognitive approach to instruction that allows learners to self-regulate their understanding.

4.3 Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data sourced from teachers' written responses to open-ended questions within the quantitative questionnaire were subjected to thematic analysis using Braun & Clarke's (2006) six-phase model. Analysis was guided by the researcher's interest in reciprocal teaching promoting metacognitive processes (planning, monitoring, evaluation) and self-regulated learning behaviours.

Phase 1: Become Familiar with Your Data

Responses were read multiple times to ensure a strong grasp on teachers' responses. Notes were taken on commonalities within:

1. implementation of strategy
2. students' engagement
3. student comprehension
4. classroom issues

Phase 2: Generate Initial Codes

Using an open coding scheme, responses were broken into units of information and coded. Initial codes included:

1. "predict what we are going to learn" – Planning
2. "students ask questions about the text" – Monitoring
3. "students summarise what they've learned" – Evaluation
4. "students feel like speaking in front of the class isn't as difficult" – Self-regulation
5. "It was hard to find time to fit all activities into our lesson time." – Instructional constraint

Codes were created through a process of semantic, inference-based coding and were informed by:

1. Metacognitive theory (Flavell)
2. Theory of self-regulated learning (Zimmerman)

Phase 3: Searching for Themes

Codes were grouped into categories and refined to identify the five following themes:

1. Metacognitive Awareness
2. Self-Regulated Learning
3. Reading Comprehension Processes
4. Affective Considerations
5. Instructional Considerations

Themes could broadly represent categories of cognition (metacognition: planning, monitoring, and evaluation) and affect (confidence speaking in front of class, engagement).

Phase 4: Reviewing Themes

Themes were compared against the dataset to ensure:

1. consistency of codes within themes
2. thematic differences were present

Codes that were repetitive or shared similarities were combined to better differentiate each theme.

Phase 5: Establishing Inter-Rater Reliability

Coder => To increase trustworthiness, 25% of data was coded by a second researcher.

Instrument => Percent agreement

Results => Cohen's kappa was used to measure inter-rater reliability ($\kappa = .84$)

Interpretation => Excellent agreement

Resolution => Any disagreements were discussed by researchers.

Phase 6: Defining and Naming Themes (THEORIES)

Themes were tied back to:

1. Metacognitive theory (planning, monitoring, evaluation)
2. Self-regulated Learning theory (learner control/regulation)
3. Cognitive load theory (instructional constraints)

4.4 Qualitative Results

Table 7

Thematic Analysis of Teachers' Responses

Theme	Description	Representative Quotes
Metacognitive Awareness	Students develop strategic thinking (planning, monitoring, evaluating)	"Students began predicting what would happen next and checking their understanding while reading."
Self-Regulated Learning	Increased learner autonomy and participation	"Students became more independent and took responsibility for leading discussions."
Improved Comprehension	Better understanding of text and themes	"Reciprocal teaching helped students understand the story more deeply."

Theme	Description	Representative Quotes
Affective Development	Increased confidence and engagement	“Students felt more confident expressing their opinions.”
Instructional Constraints	Challenges related to time, class size, and resources	“It requires more time, especially with large classes.”

Qualitative findings lend credence to the notion that reciprocal teaching can be characterized as a metacognitive strategy instructional model. Teachers noted that students predicted, asked questions, clarified, and summarized. These behaviors relate to planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

“I heard students predict what would happen next in the story and checking if they understood what they were reading.”

Here, this teacher references students’ metacognitive monitoring, which should contribute to comprehension.

“I noticed students were more independent and took on the role of discussion leader.”

Shifting from reliance on the teacher to assuming control of one’s own learning relates to self-regulated learning theory.

Teachers noted increases in collaboration and making meaning together, which parallels previous research (Bilici & Subaşı, 2022).

“I noticed students comprehended the story with more depth.”

Inferring that using metacognitive strategies allowed students to process text at a deeper level and construct meaning.

“It takes longer, especially with big classes.”

Many teachers referenced time restraints and large caseloads as difficulties they encountered. This can be understood through cognitive load theory as more challenging texts and environmental factors adding to extraneous load.

Predominant themes suggest that reciprocal teaching allowed students to comprehend text, as well as monitor and evaluate their comprehension and strategies. Teachers described students as monitoring their comprehension, asking questions, and thinking about whether they were interpreting events correctly. All these behaviors involve metacognition and relate to the monitoring and evaluating stages of metacognitive regulation. This supports the quantitative findings by suggesting that the strategy works because learners strategically interact with text.

These results give insight into how reciprocal teaching affected students' interactions with text. The final section will relate these findings to previous research and the study's research questions.

5. Discussion

The fact that the experimental group showed great improvement leads me to conclude that reciprocal teaching positively affects comprehension by increasing metacognitive regulation. This claim is based on recent studies that investigated how the use of structured strategies allows learners to monitor and evaluate their level of understanding while reading (2023–2025). However, the current study adds onto this research by showing that this also holds true for literary texts.

In conclusion, the results from this study offer solid evidence that reciprocal teaching is an effective metacognitive intervention for literature classrooms in EFL settings. Although the results from this study showed statistically that learners' comprehension improved, upon further analysis it can be concluded that this is because learners increased metacognitive regulation (planning, monitoring, and evaluating).

5.1 Interpreting Effectiveness (Metacognitive Explanation)

One possible interpretation of why the experimental group performed better than the control group is that through metacognitive processes, learners are better able to control their understanding. Reciprocal teaching makes these mental processes visible through external strategies that align with planning, monitoring, and evaluating.

A 2022 study found that metacognitive strategy instruction has a significant effect on reading comprehension by allowing learners to think about and control their cognitive processes. Another recent study found that only increases in learners' metacognitive knowledge of reading improved their reading comprehension, however this was only when learners were able to practice using these strategies.

Additionally, studies have found that RT allows learners to monitor and control their understanding of texts which allows for improved retention and higher level processing of text. This provides evidence that backs up the idea that reciprocal teaching doesn't help learners because of the strategy itself, but because it allows learners to gain metacognitive control.

5.2 Comparison with Recent Studies

Our results agree with recent studies that prove reciprocal teaching is effective when learning English as a foreign language. For instance, studies established that reciprocal teaching improves learners' reading comprehension and metacognitive awareness through dialogue based on using thinking strategies.

In another recent study, researchers concluded that reciprocal teaching serves as a cognitive strategy and metacognitive strategy that allows learners to monitor their thinking and leads to better reading comprehension. (Abdelmoati Mohamed, 2023)

Recent research (2024–2025) also reveals that reciprocal teaching helps students develop high-level reading skills. Skills needed to understand literature like inference and interpretation.

The current study builds upon this research by showing that reciprocal teaching can be used when reading not only small passages, as many studies have shown, but also an entire book. A book requires more mental effort. Recent studies also point to the benefits of metacognitive scaffolding when reading more difficult texts.

5.3 Mechanism: Metacognition and Cognitive Load

Reciprocity can be explained theoretically by the concept of metacognition and cognitive load theory. Reciprocal teaching breaks information into chunks. Chunking can reduce cognitive load (invalid cognition) and increase cognitive processing (good cognition). This allows students to focus on making sense of what they are reading instead of decoding. New research has found that methods of instruction that aid in metacognitive regulation allow for easier cognitive processing, especially when applied to second language acquisition. It has also been found that metacognitive knowledge has an effect on reading comprehension when students are actually using strategies during the lesson. (Reciprocal teaching) With this in mind, one can say that the results of this study showed that reciprocal teaching allowed for ideal conditions for cognitive processing and allowed students to metacognitively regulate their comprehension and cognitive load.

5.4 Addressing Contradictions and Contextual Constraints

Although the quantitative findings illustrated overwhelmingly positive effects, qualitative findings identified three recurring themes which posed barriers to effective implementation: lack of time, large classes, and learners' low proficiency. This points towards an underlying tension between theory and practice. Metacognitively, such constraints likely impede learners' opportunities to process monitoring and evaluation. Students in larger classes have fewer chances to speak, and if there is limited time in a lesson, teachers may skip steps like summarisation. Relating to cognitive load theory, we can view these challenges as contributing to unnecessary load that detracts from learners' successful employment of metacognitive strategies. Similar conclusions have been reached in recent studies, showing that factors external to learners affect their ability to benefit from strategy-based instruction (e.g. the classroom environment and design features that limit learning).

5.5 Pedagogical Implications

There are implications of this study's findings for EFL instruction. They are as follows:

1. Metacognitive strategies should be overtly taught during literature instruction.
2. Teachers should be taught how to facilitate reciprocal teaching as a metacognitive scaffolding approach rather than as a strategy.
3. Instruction should focus on cognitive load theory, especially in large classrooms.
4. Learners should be scaffolded to gradually develop into self-regulated learners who can apply strategies by themselves.

5.6 Theoretical Contribution

This research adds to the studies by showing that reciprocal teaching is a metacognitive mediation process rather than only a cooperative learning strategy. It offers evidence that gains in reading comprehension can be accounted for by students' control of their learning processes, further validating metacognition's importance in EFL reading instruction.

6. Conclusion

In order to see how effective the Reciprocal Teaching Strategy is when teaching *Treasure Island*, the researchers used it with secondary EFL students and collected data on their comprehension levels after being taught the story. They also wanted to see what teachers thought about implementing RTS during literature lessons. The data collected in this study allowed the authors to provide numerical data that could be used as proof that reciprocal teaching can allow students to better understand literature and become active learners when reading English literature. Because the scores for post-tests were significantly higher for the experimental group than they were for the control group, which was taught using traditional methods, the authors believe that strategy-based reading instruction can affect literature lessons by allowing students to feel less intimidated when reading literary texts. What students learned from participating in reciprocal teaching was also shown to help students understand what is occurring in a story, analyze characters actions, and determine the theme of a literary piece. As each student read *Treasure Island*, they went through the four steps of predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarising. While doing these activities students learned how to analyze a story, determine character motivations, and much more. Each step required students to think about what they were reading and derive meaning for themselves instead of having their teacher simply explain the story to them. Because there was such a difference in the scores from the control group and the experimental group, the authors feel that this highlights how students need to be taught how to deal with difficult parts of literature when reading in their foreign language. Allowing students to participate in reciprocal teaching can give them the tools they need to learn these strategies. Improving literacy skills was not the only positive result of strategy-based instruction. Students were also able to improve their language skills by participating in the reciprocal teaching activities. Students were able to remember more vocabulary words, infer meaning, and provide analytical responses to open-ended questions. This proved that by allowing literacy instruction to support students' understanding of literary texts, their language skills can also be improved.

Because students are thinking about what they are reading, asking questions, and summarizing, they are able to learn new vocabulary words and learn how to infer meaning. The authors believe that by using reciprocal teaching, teachers can use literature lessons to help students learn how to analyze literature and improve their language skills. Another survey that was administered asked teachers about their thoughts on RTS. Teachers believed that using RTS could help improve classroom communication because when students participate in reciprocal teaching they listen more attentively to each other, share their ideas without feeling embarrassed, and learn how to think critically. Although teachers believe that RTS is positive for students, they also found some issues that might affect the way RTS is used in the classroom. These teaching concerns included large class sizes, lack of time, and students who were of mixed-language abilities. Teachers believe that these problems would prevent them from teaching lessons that require students to participate in group activities. According to the researchers, this shows that teachers want to be able to incorporate more student-centered learning in their lessons but will not be able to if their school does not allow them to. The study showed that when students are taught how to read literature actively, they have higher comprehension levels and enjoy reading literature. Reciprocal teaching should be considered when teachers are teaching literature to their students. Teachers should also receive instruction on how to use strategy-based instruction during their teacher preparation programs. Finally, teachers should be allotted enough time on a daily basis to allow students to participate in the interactive activities. Encouraging students to interact with one another while learning about literature can allow students to become better readers.

7. Limitations of the Study

While these results are encouraging, there are limitations that should be considered when interpreting these findings. First and foremost, the present study made several meaningful contributions to reciprocal teaching as metacognitive instructional method; however, there are some limitations to note. Pointing out the limitations of your study not only contextualizes your findings but also helps you and others brainstorm opportunities for future research.

The study was implemented in one context with a small sample of secondary EFL learners. Although these results are promising, future researchers should be cautious about generalizing these findings to similar contexts. Contextual differences, such as classroom culture, teacher practices, and learner demographics can impact the efficacy of an intervention. Additionally, from a metacognitive standpoint, learners in different contexts may or may not develop skills related to planning, monitoring, and evaluation. As a result, future researchers should be cautious when generalizing these results.

Second, it is possible that eight weeks was not enough time for learners to fully develop their metacognitive regulation. Metacognition strategies, such as self-monitoring and self-reflection, often take time to master. It is possible that these results are short term improvements.

Third, only one text was used in the study. Literary texts come in many different forms. Each text has different linguistic features and structural differences. Each text requires different levels of

cognitive engagement. As a result, future researchers should study the effect of reciprocal teaching on other types of literature.

Fourth, despite using both quantitative and qualitative data, metacognitive processes were only measured indirectly through performance and teacher perception. Metacognitive processes should be measured directly by thinking aloud protocols, learning journals, and discourse analysis.

Fifth, contextual factors found in lesson interview may have impacted how the intervention was taught. Large class sizes, time constraints, and range of proficiency levels place high cognitive load on learners. This can create extraneous cognitive load on learners and prevent them from utilizing strategies. In other words, cognitive load can impact whether or not an intervention is successful.

Lastly, even though teachers were given training on how to prepare for the intervention, there may have been differences in how teachers taught the lessons. It is possible that some teachers did not properly model or support the metacognitive strategies. Future researchers should manipulate how teachers teach metacognitive strategies.

8. Recommendations for Future Research

Drawing on the results of this study, several suggestions for future research can be proposed. First, future studies may employ longitudinal designs that allow researchers to assess whether reciprocal teaching has a lasting impact on students' abilities to comprehend and interpret literary texts. Do students retain the knowledge of reading strategies gained from regular reciprocal teaching sessions? Second, research may seek to expand upon the current findings by replicating this study in other contexts. How effective is reciprocal teaching in the instruction of literature at the primary school or university level? Are there any cultural or linguistic differences in how reciprocal teaching is conceptualized and implemented? Future studies could compare how students in different countries respond to reciprocal teaching. Third, another topic for future research might include examining how reciprocal teaching can be combined with technology or blended learning approaches. Can interactive digital tools, online discussion boards, or collaborative learning apps be used to engage students with the four reading strategies? Fourth, future research might also examine the relationship between reciprocal teaching and critical thinking. As the teaching of literature is often associated with the development students' interpretive and analytical skills, researchers may consider how reciprocal teaching may support higher-order thinking skills like evaluation, argumentation, or creative interpretation. Finally, future studies may take a closer look at teacher education practices. How do teachers learn about strategy-based reading instruction? What kinds of professional development opportunities allow teachers to learn about and practice incorporating strategies like reciprocal teaching in their language classrooms? Research that aims to answer these questions can be used to design teacher training programs that will prepare teachers to integrate interactive literature instruction in their teaching.

9. Pedagogical Implications

As described above, this study has several implications for teaching English literature in EFL contexts. First, instructors should take into consideration that reciprocal teaching is a viable strategy for improving students' comprehension of literary texts. Practical applications of this study imply that teachers of literature should make an effort to include reciprocal teaching strategies in their instruction. Second, this strategy provides students with a clear structure that supports both language learning as well as critical thinking. By participating in reciprocal teaching activities, students not only engage with the text but also learn strategies they can apply when interpreting literary texts independently. Third, several prerequisites need to be considered when implementing reciprocal teaching in language classrooms. Both teachers and curriculum designers need to be prepared to incorporate reciprocal teaching in their lessons. Teachers should receive proper training that enables them to learn about and practice using strategies like reciprocal teaching. Furthermore, curriculum planners should allocate enough time for interactive activities to take place during literature lessons. Fourth, instruction of the four RECIPROCAL TEACHING strategies should be scaffolded when first introduced to students. In other words, teachers should gradually model reciprocal teaching to allow students of all English proficiency levels to participate in the reciprocal teaching conference. In conclusion, teachers should use this study as a rationale to incorporate reciprocal teaching in their literature classrooms. Reciprocal teaching has the potential to create dynamic learning environments that promote deep understanding, peer-to-peer learning, and critical thinking.

Reciprocal teaching should be introduced into literature courses as a planned metacognitive structure. Once students get accustomed to the reciprocal teaching cycle, literature lessons can become less teacher-fronted and more learner-centered.

Disclosure of Generative AI use

Declared by the authors, we take full responsibility that Generative AI was used only for grammar and style editing of the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The author(s) confirm that this piece was written in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be considered as a potential conflict of interest.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the university, and written informed consent was obtained.

Availability of data and materials

Data can be made available from the corresponding author upon request.

Funding

This research received no funding.

Reference

1. Bilici, S., & Subaşı, G. (2022). Reading in the information age: Cognitive and metacognitive demands. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(2), 456–472.
2. Cain, K., & Oakhill, J. (2006). Profiles of children with specific reading comprehension difficulties. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 683–696. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709905X67610>
3. Carter, R., & Long, M. N. (1991). *Teaching literature*. Longman.
4. Cataylo, E., Arao, H., Barra, S., Guarte, N., Macasling, R., Mohammad, J., Santiago, C., & Zaldy, R. (2023). Reciprocal teaching: A metacognitive strategy to bridge reading comprehension difficulty. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 15(10), 981–988. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10428028> (doi.org in Bing)
5. Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139150484>
6. Hacker, D. J., & Tenent, A. (2002). Implementing reciprocal teaching in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4), 699–718. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.4.699>
7. Hall, G. (2005). *Literature in language education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Hannon, B., & Frias, S. (2012). A metacognitive approach to reading comprehension: Strategy use and cognitive load. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(6), 739–748.
9. Hou, Y.-J. (2015). Reciprocal teaching, metacognitive awareness, and academic performance in Taiwanese junior college students. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(4), 15–32. <https://www.eurrec.org/ijote-article-332>
10. Islamiyah, M., & Wijaya, M. (2024). The effect of reciprocal teaching strategy on students' comprehension of narrative texts. *Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 22–30.
11. Khidr, A. M. (2023). The effectiveness of reciprocal teaching strategy in developing EFL secondary school students' reading comprehension. *Mansoura Research Journal of Language and Literature*, 4(2), 113–129.
12. Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
13. Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Lestari, D. (2024). Reciprocal teaching strategy and students' narrative reading comprehension in EFL classrooms. *Journal of English Language Teaching Innovations*, 6(1), 45–56.
15. Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (1997). Best practices in promoting reading comprehension in students with learning disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 18(4), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259701800402>
16. McRae, J. (1994). *Literature with a small "l"*. Macmillan.

17. Mohamed, R. A. A. (2023). Reciprocal teaching as a cognitive and metacognitive strategy in promoting Saudi university students' reading comprehension. *Open Education Studies*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2022-0200>
18. Oczkus, L. D. (2018). *Reciprocal teaching at work: Powerful strategies and lessons for improving reading comprehension* (3rd ed.). International Literacy Association.
19. OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 results: What students know and can do* (Vol. 1). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>
20. Paas, F., & van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (2021). Cognitive load theory: Methods to manage working memory load. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 30(5), 394–398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214211020564>
21. Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117–175. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_4
22. Panadero, E. (2021). A review of self-regulated learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 628282. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.628282>
23. Pressley, M. (2006). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
24. Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem*. Southern Illinois University Press.
25. 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>
26. Schraw, G., & Moshman, D. (1995). Metacognitive theories. *Educational Psychology Review*, 7, 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02212307>
27. Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive load theory*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8126-4>
28. Teng, M. F., Wang, C., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Assessing self-regulatory writing strategies and their predictive effects on young EFL learners' writing performance. *Assessing Writing*, 51, 100573. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100573>
29. Vuong, T. L., & Steklacs, J. (2025). Trends in research on reciprocal teaching: A systematic review. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2491963. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2491963>
30. Zakaria, S. Y. (2023). Utilizing a strategy based on reciprocal teaching to develop EFL critical reading skills of preparatory school students. *Journal of Reading and Knowledge*, 23(261). <https://doi.org/10.21608/mrk.2023.306157>