

## 摘 要

本文将“支架”理论运用于英语阅读教学，探索阅读教学的有效方法。正德学院非英语专业两个班级的大一新生（实验班和控制班）参加了为期一个学期的实验。采用定量与定性相结合的研究方法进行实验，试图解决以下问题：第一，采用“支架”理论教学的班级与传统教学班级相比，是否能够提高学生英语阅读水平？第二，采用“支架”理论教学模式能否激发学生的英语阅读动机和兴趣？第三，采用“支架”理论教学模式能否增强学生在英语阅读课堂中的合作学习能力？第四，英语阅读教学采用“支架”理论教学模式在学生之间是否有差异？

数据分析分为三部分：教学实验数据，访谈数据和个案研究数据。教学实验数据是通过实验前后所进行的期末考试得出，通过 SPSS16.0 计算出 P 值小于 0.05，说明实验前后学生成绩有显著差异。访谈数据是通过 24 名采用“支架”理论教学班级的学生进行的谈话得出，学生普遍反映采用“支架”理论可以很好地激发他们的英语阅读动机和兴趣，加强自主学习和合作学习的能力。个案研究数据是通过两位同学研究对比得出，两位同学的英语阅读水平一高一低，采用课堂观察，访问以及作业和考试卷成绩的对比等方法进行比较。

教学实验数据显示：较之于传统普通模式，支架模式能有效地提高学生阅读理解能力；访谈数据显示：支架模式更能激发学生英语阅读的动机和兴趣，并在此过程中形成有效的阅读方法，达到自主学习的能力；通过小组活动，老师以及同伴的指导与协助，在英语阅读课堂中学生合作学习能力显著增强。个案研究数据显示：英语阅读水平较高者的提高更为显著，因为他们的阅读理解能力和阅读速度均优于英语阅读较低水平者，在小组合作学习中获益更大。

**关键词：**支架理论；最近发展区；英语阅读

## Abstract

The researcher conducted an experiment applying “Scaffolding” on non-English major freshmen for one semester. These students were divided to two classes as experimental class (EC) and control class (CC). The thesis is centering on the following questions:

1. What are the differences between “Scaffolding” reading class model and the traditional reading class model in facilitating students’ reading competence?
2. Can “Scaffolding” increase the students’ motivation and interests in English reading class instruction?
3. Can “Scaffolding” facilitate students’ cooperative skills in English reading class instruction?
4. Whether there are differences between students or not in English reading classroom.

Data analysis was dependent on three instruments which are test, interview and case study. Major findings of the research are as follows:

Firstly, “Scaffolding” proves more proper and effective to be implemented in college English reading class to improve students’ comprehension ability of English reading.

Secondly, “Scaffolding” can significantly stimulate student’s motivation and interest for English reading.

Thirdly, “Scaffolding” helps to enhance students’ collaborative learning and allow them to navigate their own paths in English reaing.

Fourthly, “Scaffolding” can especially benefit the advanced students in English reading class.

However, small size of the subjects and the limitation of the understanding and teaching experiences of the researcher will have some influence on the experiment. The future research will focus a lot on the links about applying “Scaffolding” in the other four language learning competences (listening, speaking, writing and translation).

## Applying Scaffolding in English Reading Classroom Instruction

---

**Keywords:** Scaffolding, Zone of Proximal Development, English Reading

## List of Tables

<b>Table 4.1 Independent samples t-test: differences of the total scores of EC and CC in the pre-test .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Table 4.2 Independent samples t-test: differences of EC and CC in each section of the pre-test.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Table 4.3 Independent samples t-test: differences of the total scores of EC and CC in the post-test.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Table 4.4 Independent samples t-test: descriptive statistics of EC and CC in each section of the post-test.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Table 4.5 the score of each part of Student A and B in pre-test and post-test .....</b>	<b>35</b>

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to those who have offered me all kinds of help in completing the thesis. Without them, the completion of this thesis would have never been possible.

First of all, I owe great gratitude to my supervisor, Tao Yun, whose primary guidance gave me a bright direction to push forward.

I am grateful to Prof. Li Xiaoxiang and Chen Zhengrong, whose enlightening guidance, constructive suggestions and extraordinary patience have contributed to the completion of the thesis. Without their concern and encouragement, I would have quitted halfway.

I am obliged to my colleagues and friends, especially to Fan Yanmei, and Pan Yanyan, who helped me to solve problems in statistical analysis.

Finally, my special thanks also go to all my students who have participated in the empirical study and offered their cooperation in data collection.

# Chapter One Introduction

## 1.1 Background of the Study

The teaching of English reading in China has achieved a great deal of success under the guidance of constructive teaching theories in these decades. However, the increasing demand of students makes it a difficulty for English reading instructors. At present, it is less satisfactory to see the performance of the students. According to the data of CET4, CET6 and other English level-tests from National Examination Committee, many students cannot achieve the norm of reading. Reading ability consists of the comprehension ability and the reading speed according to Professor Hu Zhuanglin (2001). These two intertwining elements carry fundamental role in the process of supplementing each other. Since reading is in the pursuit of meaning, comprehension ability becomes the most important factor which includes three transitional levels ranging from literal comprehension, inferential comprehension to critical comprehension. Three problems weigh heavily on the development of comprehension ability in the present classroom instruction.

First, students always misunderstand the conception between English reading and intensive English reading. In today's colleges, there are no other special reading courses for non-English majors but only intensive reading course which obviously cannot meet the standard of English learning as a second language due to the shortage of time and training. Once teachers have no comprehensive teaching programs or arrangements, English reading class always fall into the explanation of grammar. Without much task design, most teachers only give the assignment on the textbook which mostly consist of multiple-choice and True or False. Teachers only check the correctness of these answers with no concentration on the interpretation and cohesion of the whole article. Under the misunderstanding of English reading, students put more effort to words and sentences on their textbooks which provide few opportunities for them to gain other information and materials to increase their

comprehensions of other articles.

Second, students' actual levels are not tentatively considered. In traditional English reading instruction, every student accepts the same knowledge no matter it is suitable for each level of the students or not. Students just take notes and finish the tasks on the textbooks. This kind of teaching instruction greatly blocks the input and output of English reading. Although the differences among students exist, multi-models should be injected for the integrated classroom instruction.

Third, students are lack of motivations and interests. Many topics in their textbooks are out-fashioned as well as some "fossil" words. What they learn can not mostly meet the demand of communication but only examination. In the process of reading, they have to conquer many unavoidable obstacles by themselves. The failure of approaching the meaning of each individual word fades their passion for comprehension.

Third, traditional evaluation system is less powerful to identify the students reading ability. Students were always judged according to their final scores. They have few effective reading comprehension trainings. The interpreting and reviewing of reading passages and the difficulties of students in the reading process fall into neglect. Sometimes, the score-winner can not be proved as the successful meaning interpreter. The side effect of "accuracy" without "fluency" was underestimated. Too much concentration on "quality" will cause the decline of "quantity". If teachers focus on the language accuracy of the learner's reading, students may give up the chance to exploring the language.

English teachers in China have to ask themselves the question: what is the ideal way of teaching students to read? In 1970s, the original idea of "Scaffolding", from the work of Jerome Bruner, was set in child growing. It is a vivid metaphor for ladder in the construction. Then, "Scaffolding" has been gradually applied in other fields especially in education. This thesis tries to apply "Scaffolding" to seek an effective way for English reading in classroom instruction.

## **1.2 Significance of the Study**

The present research was inspired due to the following aspects.

First, English reading development is largely determined by reading comprehension. As a matter of fact, effective measures have been made to meet the requirements of reading comprehension. And competence-oriented teaching has been highly stressed today. In 2001, the new National Curriculum Standards for English Education was issued by the national Ministry of Education, in which “Scaffolding” strongly advocated to enable students “to sense, experience, practice and cooperate under the teacher’s instruction” so as to motivate students, cultivate their interests in learning English and develop their communicative competence.

Secondly, roles between teachers and students should be altered to some extent. It is widely believed that the traditional teacher-centered model neglects students’ initiatives and contributions. Teachers should arouse students’ interests and bring their initiatives in to full play by letting them do interesting and meaningful tasks that are close to real life events. College English Curriculum Requirements (2004) prescribes, “the aim of teaching and learning English is to develop students’ comprehensive abilities to use the language...”, “...not only to teach basic knowledge and skills of language but also to put emphasis on the development of students’ language comprehensive and autonomous learning,” which expresses an explicit call for the change from the former traditional teaching model to the integration of students’ language skills and the development of their communicative competence.

Thirdly, “Scaffolding”, as a new teaching method, owns its advantages to be planted in Chinese colleges. “Scaffolding” aims to engage students in experiencing and exploring the target language and therefore requires students to have language competence and learning ability to some degree. College students are adult learners who lay a solid foundation for the implementation of “Scaffolding”. After several years of English education in primary school and secondary school, they have already achieved linguistic competence to some extent, and their previous educational experiences have equipped them with extensive knowledge beyond books and the ability to analyze and solve problems. After their entry into college, students, on one hand, need to extend and strengthen their linguistic knowledge. However, the EFL

context in China fails to provide sufficient input and opportunities causing a great imbalance between the receptive skills and the productive skills. On the other hand, they feel compelled to improve their communicative competence. Once a while, they just finish the assignment given by the teacher in spite of their actual needs. So it is significant to apply “Scaffolding” at tertiary level to meet their demands.

### **1.3 Layout of the Thesis**

The thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter One serves as an introduction and an overview of the thesis. Chapter Two is a literature review covering the definitions of some key terms and related studies conducted both at home and abroad in the field of “Scaffolding”. Chapter Three illustrated the methodology of the present study. The research questions are raised and the subjects, instruments, procedures and data analysis are described and demonstrated respectively in the chapter. Results and discussion are provided in Chapter Four. The major findings derived from the study are summarized in Chapter Five. Furthermore, the limitations, pedagogical implications and suggestions for future research are recognized and advanced in the final chapter.

## Chapter Two Literature Review

### 2.1 Zone of Proximal Development

“Scaffolding” as a teaching strategy originates from Lev Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory and his concept of ZPD (zone of proximal development). ZPD is understood as the difference between what an individual is able to accomplish functioning alone (i.e. actual level of development) and what that person is capable of in collaboration with other, more expert, individuals (i.e. potential level of development) (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). For Vygotsky, an individual’s actual and potential level of developmental levels vary independently with the potential level playing a more central role because it represents a window into the person’s future mental growth. As Vygotsky saw things, a learner who responds to help (or regulation) from someone else, “must be considered to be at a more advanced developmental level than the one who fails to do so, because the learner who responds to help can be expected to show a more rapid rate of actual development” (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994, p. 468).

Determining a learner’s ZPD is an act of negotiated discovery that is realized through dialogic interaction between learner and expert. In other words, the learner and expert engage each other in an attempt to discover precisely what the learner is able to achieve without help and what the learner can accomplish with assistance, or regulation, from the expert. Importantly, the help negotiated between the novice and the expert is graduated and contingent in the sense that it moves from more explicit to more implicit, or strategic, levels, is only offered when needed and is withdrawn once “the novice shows signs of self-control and ability to function independently” (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994, p.468), or even rejects help when it is offered (Wertsch & Hickmann, 1987).

Situating L2 development within the ZPD means that micro-genesis, one of four genetic domains proposed by Vygotsky (see Vygotsky, 1978 and Wertsch, 1985 for a full discussion) of a learner’s interlingua is not simply determined by the relative

accuracy of linguistic performance, but, crucially, is a function of the frequency and quality of regulation (i.e. help) negotiated between novice and expert. In other words, not only is actual development an inadequate measure performance resulting from implicit and/or less frequent forms of assistance reflects a process that is closer to maturation, in the sense that the learner is about to assume independent control over a particular feature of the L2 than is performance arising from more frequent or more explicit forms of regulation.

A novice learner under the guidance of an expert who provide support in the completion of the task by adjusting the difficulty of the task (Radziszewska & Rogoff, 1991; Wertsch, Minick,& Arns, 1084). In working within the ZPD, it is not the successful completion of the task that is of importance, but “the higher cognitive process that merges as a result of the interaction” (Lantolf & Appel, 1994, p. 10)

Teaching may be viewed as “assisting performance through the Zone of Proximal Development” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), where, in collaboration with others, another person controls one’s behavior (a case of other-regulation) until learners become self-regulated and eventually performance becomes automatized. Thus, the ZPD constitutes “a potential for learning that is created in the interaction between participants in particular settings” (Wells, 1998, p. 345).

In the ZPD, the expert (teacher or another peer) offers scaffold assistance to learner, providing a framework to solve the problem. The scaffold assists the learner in carrying out new components of the task which the learner would not be able to complete without assistance (Rogoff & Gardner, 1984; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) use the metaphor of scaffold to refer to the expert’s control of elements of the task that are above the learner’s ability, thus allowing the learner to focus on those elements of the task that are within his or her capacity. The help that the expert provides the novice is characterized by six Scaffolding functions:

1. Recruitment: enlisting the learner’s interest in the task
2. Reduction in degrees of freedom: simplifying the task
3. Direction maintenance: keeping the learner motivated and in pursuit of the goal

4. Marking critical features: highlighting certain relevant features and pointing out discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution.

5. Frustration control: reducing stress and frustration during problem solving

6. Demonstration: modeling an idealized form of the act to be performed by completing the act or by explicating the learner's partial solution (Wood et al., 1976, p.98)

Although the concept of ZPD and the metaphor of "Scaffolding" were originally constructed to describe child development in interaction with adults in first language situations, they are useful in analyzing L2 learning situations, as well. However, the current view of the ZPD has been expanded beyond novice-expert interaction. According to Wells (1998, p. 345) "the ZPD as an opportunity for learning with from others applies potentially to all participants, and not simply to the less skillful or knowledgeable." Indeed, several empirical studies of L2 learning situations show that, in collaborative interaction between language learners, assistance can be provided equally between nonexperts (e.g., Donato, 1994; Ohta, 1995; Swain & Lapkin, 1998).

Stone (1993) points out the need to specify the communicative mechanism involved in scaffold interaction, mechanism which are critical to Vygotsky's theoretical framework. He acknowledges that the semiotics of Scaffolding are complex, involving such communicative mechanisms as conversational implicature, prolepsis, presuppositional triggers, and other nonverbal communicative devices such as gestures, pauses, and so forth.

The concept of prolepsis is important in understanding interaction within the ZPD. According to Rommetveit (1974, 1979), prolepsis refers to a communicative move which indicates presupposition of some information on the part of the speaker. It is argued that presupposition challenges the listener to make some assumptions in order to interpret the intended meaning of the speaker's utterance. Thus, in the dialogic process, prolepsis leads the participants in the interaction to reach an understanding of each other's view of problem and solution. Stone (1993) states that prolepsis can be understood as "a special type of conversational implicature in which the necessary context is specified *after* the utterance rather than before it" (p. 174). He adds that, by

challenging the listener to reconstruct the speaker's view, prolepsis introduces an element of tension in the communicative exchange which may have the effect of transforming the situation.

Adhering to the view that scaffold interaction within the ZPD leads to cognitive development, this study tries to shed light on the verbal and nonverbal devices deployed in teacher-learner interaction to achieve the functions of Scaffolding.

A growing number of studies haven applied the sociocultural framework to the investigation of L2 acquisition (Lantolf, 1994; Lantolf & Appel, 1994). Of particular interest to the present study are those that have concerned themselves with the analysis of classroom discourse. Studies of learner-learner collaboration dialogue in the production of oral or written tasks (Brooks & Donato, 1994; Donato, 1994) have focused on uncovering how learners use speaking activity as a cognitive tool for linguistic development.

Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) showed how negotiation of corrective feedback in the ZPD during tutorial sessions promotes learning. Donato and Adair-Hauck (1992) and Adair- Hauck and Donato (1994) studied teacher-learner interaction during the presentation of grammatical concepts, showing how formal explanation can be co-constructed by teacher and learners through a negotiation process.

Addressing similar issues, the present study of interaction in L2 classroom builds on previous studies by focusing on the discursive devices used by teachers in learner-centered classrooms to achieve the functions of Scaffolding and, thus, to construct effective scaffold assistance within the ZPD.

## **2.2 Theoretical Foundations of “Scaffolding”**

### **2.2.1 Origin of “Scaffolding”**

Creating contexts for linguistic and academic learning in the ZPD (zone of proximal development) occurs in part through the “Scaffolding” of social interaction. “Scaffolding” is closely related to the ZPD. In fact, it is only within the ZPD that “Scaffolding” can occur. As we saw above, working in the ZPD means that the learner

is assisted by others to be able to achieve more than he or she would be able to achieve alone.

“Scaffolding” refers to the detailed circumstances of such work in the ZPD. According to David Wood, Scaffolding is tutorial behavior that is contingent, collaborative and interactive (Wood, 1988: 96). Behavior is contingent when an action depends on (i.e. influences and is influenced by) other actions. It is collaborative when the end result, whether it is a conversation or the solution to a problem, is jointly achieved. And it is interactive when it includes the activity of two or more people who are mutually engaged.

The original idea of “Scaffolding” comes from the work of Jerome Bruner, who defines “Scaffolding” as follows:

*a process of ‘setting up’ the situation to make the child’s entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it. (Bruner, 1983: 60)*

Bruner’s notion of “Scaffolding” was developed in the 1970s in the context of an intensive investigation of six infants (ages 7-18 months) over a period of 10 months, as they and their mothers played games. The researchers focused particularly on the game of “peekaboo”, which was played frequently over the entire period. The game consists of an initial contact, the establishment of joint attention, disappearance, reappearance and re-establishment of contact. These are the obligatory features of the ‘syntax’ of the game, whereas other features, such as vocalizations to sustain the infants’ interests, responses to the infants’ attempts to uncover the mother’s face, etc. are optional. These ‘non-rule bound’ parts of the game are an instance of the mother providing a “scaffold” for the child (Bruner & Sherwood, 1975: 280).

### **2.2.2 “Scaffolding” in Education**

In pedagogical contexts, “Scaffolding” has come to refer to both aspects of the construction site: the supportive structure (which is relatively stable, though easy to

assemble and reassemble) and the collaborative construction work that is carried out. Some educators are uneasy with the term “Scaffolding”, because in normal usage it refers to a rigid structure, not the fluid dynamics of collaborative work that we associate with working in the ZPD (Gibbons, 2003). Indeed, if we think only of the support structure without focusing on the actual construction work, then such a reservation is justified. Most importantly, then, the dynamics between the “Scaffolding” structure and the “Scaffolding” process must be kept in mind. The process is enabled by “Scaffolding” structure, and a constant evaluation of the process indicates when parts of the “Scaffolding” structure can be dismantled or shifted elsewhere.

In education, “Scaffolding” can be thought of as three related pedagogical “scales”. First, there is the meaning of providing a support structure to enable certain activities and skills to develop. Second, there is the actual carrying out of particular activities in class. And, third, there is the assistance provided in moment-to-moment interaction. Schematically, this can be represented in the following ways:

Scaffolding 1 Planned curriculum progression over time (e.g. a series of tasks over time, a project, a classroom ritual)

Scaffolding 2 the procedures used in a particular activity (an instantiation of Scaffolding 1)

Scaffolding 3 the collaborative process of interaction (the process of achieving Scaffolding 2)

We can see how the sequence here moves from macro to micro, from planned to improvised, and from structure to process (Gibbons, 2003; Van Lier, 1996). As we all know, plans have a way of changing as they are being carried out. In particular, pedagogical action is always a blend of the planned and the improvised, the predicted and the unpredictable, routine and innovation.

So, even though the three scales suggest a top-down structure, there is also bottom-up change that can affect and transform “Scaffolding” at the top.

The term “Scaffolding” was first used by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) in their examination of parent-child talk in the early years. “Scaffolding” — in its more

---

usual sense — is a temporary structure that is often put up in the process of constructing a building. As each bit of the new building is finished, the scaffold is taken down. Scaffold is temporary, but essential for the successful construction of the building. Burner (1978) describes “Scaffolding” in the metaphorical sense in which we are using it here, as “the steps taken to reduce the degrees of freedom in carrying out some tasks so that the child can concentrate on the difficult skill she is in the process of acquiring” (1978). In the classroom it portrays the “temporary, but essential, nature of the mentor’s assistance” in supporting learners to carry out tasks successfully (Maybin, Mercer, and Stierer 1992, 186). “Scaffolding”, however, is not simply another word for help. It is a special kind of help that assists learners to move toward new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding. “Scaffolding” is thus the temporary assistance by which a teacher helps a learner know how to do something, so that the learner will later be able to complete a similar task alone (Vygotsky, 1978). It is future-oriented: as Vygotsky has said, what a child can do with support today, she or he can do alone tomorrow.

It can be argued that it is only *when* teacher support — or “Scaffolding” — is needed that learning will take place, since the learner is then likely to be working within his or her zone of proximal development (Wood *et al.*, 1976). Vygotsky (1978) suggests that the only “good” ignore learning is learning that is ahead of actual development. While this idea does not ignore the notion that teaching experiences should not be completely beyond the capacity of the learner, it does challenge the notion of learner “readiness” by suggesting that it is the teacher who is largely responsible for initiation each new step of learning, building on what a learner is currently able to do alone. It challenges teacher to maintain high expectations of all students, but to provide adequate “Scaffolding” for tasks to be completed successfully (Maybin *et al.*, 1992). In terms of ESL students, it suggests a somewhat different orientation to learning tasks than has often been the case in the past. Rather than simplifying the *task* (and ultimately risking a reductionist curriculum), we should instead reflect on the nature of the “Scaffolding” that is being provided for learners to carry out that task. As far as possible, learners need to be engaged with authentic and

cognitively challenging learning tasks; it is the nature of the support which is responsive to the particular demands made on children learning through the medium of a second language- that is critical for success.

“Scaffolding” as a teaching strategy is amply supported by research and theory. Of particular relevance are Piaget’s cognitive constructivism theory and – more than any other theory – the social constructivism ideas generated by Vygotsky and Bruner’s beliefs about how students build upon prior knowledge might also be considered.

Cognitive constructivism was developed by a Swiss psychologist named Piaget, who theorized that children develop in a series of ordered, age-dependent stages- sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete operations, formal operation-until they are able to reason logically, advancing through mechanisms of assimilation, accommodation and equilibrium. “Possibly the most important role for the teacher is to provide an environment in which the child can experience spontaneous research. The classroom should be filled with authentic opportunities to challenge the students. The students should be given the freedom to understand and construct meaning at their own pace through personal experiences as they develop through individual developmental processes” (Sandwell, nd). Piaget’s research emphasized active discovery over passive reception, and the importance of intrinsic motivation, practical learning situations, and creative and critical thinking. Each of these echoes an element of successful Scaffolding: Active discovery when a teacher initiates and models an activity that students then “take over”; Intrinsic motivation and practical learning situations when a “scaffolded” student develops and nurtures his/her own learning momentum and applies new knowledge or skills to everyday life; And creative critical thinking emerges when instructional Scaffolding falls away and the student relies on his or her emerging ideas and direction (Gibbons, P. 2002).

Piaget’s emphasis on active discovery over passive reception was shared by Vygotsky, who developed the second strand of construction – “social construction – whose ideas particularly stressed the role in the development of cognition.” And social activity—, of which Scaffolding is certainly an example, is crucial to a child’s development as a learner. The learner does not learn in isolation. Instead, learning is

---

strongly influenced by social interactions, which take place in meaningful contexts. Children's social interaction with more knowledgeable or capable others and their environment significantly impacts their ways of thinking and interpreting situations. A child develops his or her intellect through internalizing concepts based his or her own interpretation of an activity that occurs in a social setting. The communication that occurs in this setting with more knowledgeable or capable others helps the child construct an understanding of the concept. The communication helps the child develop inner or egocentric speech. The inner speech directs personal cognitive activities. Vygotsky believed that any child could be taught any subject effectively using Scaffolding techniques by applying the scaffolds at the ZPD (Mercer, 1995). "Teachers activate this zone when they teach students concepts that are just above their current skills and knowledge level." (Jaramillo) Therefore, students are guided and supported through learning activities that serve as interactive bridges to get them to the next level. The learner develops the ability to construct new understandings by elaborating on their prior knowledge through the support provided by more capable others such as their teacher or advanced peers. Vygotsky's theory and research are instrumental in understanding how and why "Scaffolding" works.

Bruner (1983), like Vygotsky, believes that socialization plays an integral role in intellectual development; he says that children as they grow must acquire a way of representing the recurrent regularities' in their environment, he suggests that they must also invent "concepts, categories, and problem-solving procedure" of their own. Educational implications of Bruner's research include the supposition that material must be made ready for the child. And it's not that the child will intrinsically know how to interpret the material. Bruner thinks that the instructional challenge is to provide problems that both fit the manner of the child's thinking and tempt him/her into more powerful models of thinking, which is similar to Vygotsky's notion that learning should lend development (1983).

## **2.3 Scaffolding as a Teaching Model in Reading Instruction**

### **2.3.1 Previous Models in Reading Instruction**

Before “Scaffolding” being promoted as a teaching model in reading instruction, many experts have already showed their own attitudes towards reading model. Reading model has witnessed several stages.

The first stage is “bottom-up” model. In 1972, Gough, an American psychologist, proposed his “bottom-up” model. We can also call it text-based model. For this method, reading was regarded as a process that human felt and identified the letters, words and some larger units, and associated the information constantly. In the view of Gough, two Readers have to follow the fixed order, begin with the identity of words and phrases, and then transit to understanding of paragraphs and the whole passage step by step. However it puts undue stress on information which imported by the sense of sight, and neglects the effect of context .The teaching of English reading which based on this "bottom-up" model pay much attention to the understanding of letters, words, and sentences while neglect the textual teaching and speed training. As a result, the inefficiency of reading made students absorb and comprehend the entire meaning superficially. (Wu Yulin, Zhu Yihua, 2006)

In order to make up the limitation of this model, Goodman and Smith promoted their ideas about reading which were divergent from previous Gough’s idea.

Goodman’s Reading Theory is mainly focused on two aspects: the reading process and reading miscue analysis. The first one is known as the famous psycholinguistic guessing game which in the definition of Goodman, is a psycholinguistic process by which the reader, a language user, reconstructs, as best as he can, a message which has been encoded by a reader as a graphic display (Goodman, 1976, p.10). In a reading process, a reader collects samples from the text and predicts the meaning of the samples with his own background knowledge. If the prediction is disconfirmed, the reader may reread, rethink, or stop reading to gather more information to make sense of the text. In the opposite, if a meaning is not obtained, the reader may continue reading to unearth additional clues from the next sentence or

paragraph. Through this process of trial-and-error, the reader confirms the prediction and integrates it into his schemata. Thus comes to his advanced theory about reading—an integrated process of sampling, predicting, confirming and correcting to reach a meaning (Goodman, 1982, p. 14).

Reading miscue analysis is Goodman's another outstanding theory about reading. He believed that we could not have successful reading curricula without knowledge of what reading is. A miscue is "an actual observed response in oral reading which does not match the expected response" (Goodman, 1973, p.5), and has often been described as a "window" to understanding the reading process. Goodman doesn't consider miscues errors because they reveal the reader's strengths rather than his weaknesses. Miscues are the best possible indicators of how efficiently and effectively the reader is using the reading process (Goodman, 1974, p.7).

An analysis of these miscues led to Goodman's conclusion that reading could be characterized as a "psycholinguistic guessing game". Miscue analysis has revealed that all three cueing systems (graph- phonic, syntactic and semantic cues) are used in an integrated fashion. This interaction between the reader and the written text is best described in Goodman's own words:

"[The reader] makes predictions of the grammatical structure; using the control over language structure he learned when he learned oral language. He supplied semantic concepts to get meaning from the structure. In turn, his sense of syntactic structure and meaning make it possible to predict the graphic input so he is highly selective, sampling the print to confirm his prediction (Goodman, 1973, p.9)."

Meanwhile, Smith has promoted his theory about reading. He thought that reading is regarded as an interaction between the reader and written language, through which the reader attempts to reconstruct a message from the reader. That means reading is without nonsense. Reading depends more on what is behind the eyes- non-visual information- than on the visual information in front of them (Smith, 1985). Excessive reliance on visual information can overwhelm the brain's decision-making ability and result in tunnel vision when only a few letters rather than entire phrases can be seen at one time. Both visual and non-visual information are essential to the reading process,

and effective reading comprehension requires an effective balance between the two. The basis of comprehension is prediction, the prior elimination of unlikely alternatives (Smith, 1985). Predictions are questions that we ask the world, and comprehension is receiving relevant answers to those questions. Slow reading interferes with comprehension. Neither closer scrutiny of the text nor increasing the fixation rate will make reading more efficient or learning to read easier. This view is very essential in constructing language learning in English learning class as it gives a balance between reading and thinking.

Smith then proposed a feature identification model for letter identification. Words, like letters, can be identified directly from the distinctive features that are the visual information of print. Mediated word identification is a temporary aid for identifying unfamiliar words within a process of establishing feature lists for immediate identification. Attempts to decode isolated words to sound rarely succeed because of the number, complexity, and unreliability of phonic generalizations. Better ways of identifying unfamiliar words exist, such as asking someone, using contextual clues, and comparing with known words of similar construction. Reliance on phonics interferes with the process of learning to read. Comprehension is not dependent on word identification, which in turn does not require letter identification. As a result, in our present English reading, standards concentrated on words and sentences inevitably lead to the neglect of comprehension about the whole passage.

With the similar importance of Gough's and Smith's theory of reading, Davies presented his interactive model. In interactive model, reading involves processing text and using one's background knowledge and language ability. It holds the theoretical background that top-down and bottom-up processes are used. And reading is considered by some to be an active, constructive process, with the focus on the reader, whose experiences, cultural background, and point of view will play a part in her or his comprehension of a written piece (Davies, 1995). Though these three approaches existed for many years, teachers didn't reach congruence in language teaching and the pendulum keeps swinging from phonics to whole language to balanced instruction. In other words, teachers who believe in behaviorism are likely to adopt bottom-up model

of teaching; those who believe in Innatism tend to use top-down model; and those who believe in Interactionism might take balanced approach in language teaching. Thus, teachers' beliefs do make a difference.

The term "schema" was first used by Piaget in 1926; the theory of schema was developed by R. C. Anderson, a respected educational psychologist. It refers to all human beings possessing categorical rules or scripts that they use to interpret the world. New information is processed according to how it fits into these rules, called schema.

This schema can be used not only to interpret but also to predict situation occurring in our environment. Each individual's schema is unique and depends on that individual's experiences and cognitive processes. Information that does not fit into these schemata may not be comprehended, or may not be comprehended correctly.

In contrast, to Piaget, most schema theorists postulate that there is not just one body of knowledge available to learners at any given stage of development, but rather a network on context-specific bodies of knowledge that earners apply to specific situations. There is an important implication of schema theory — the recognition of the role that culture and experience play in creating an individual's knowledge. Educators must pay attention to the cultural references in the material we present to our students and avoid potential cultural-biases. In this stage, instructor began to realize the role of the teacher and the leaner. In acceptance, learners take the new input and assimilate it into their existing schema without making any changes to the overall schema. Tuning is when learners realize that their existing schema is inadequate for the new knowledge and modify their existing schema accordingly. Restructuring is the process of creating a new schema addressing the inconsistencies between the old schema and the newly acquired information.

The way that learners acquire knowledge under schema theory is quite similar to Piaget's model of the process of development. In essence, there are three different reactions that a learner can have new information: acceptance, tuning, and restructuring.

Therefore, when we communicate with others, and when we are about to encounter certain types of discourse, when we want to transfer some new information,

if we want to be comprehended correctly, we should realize that the role of culture and experience play in creating an individual's knowledge. So using deterministic schemata should be very helpful and useful.

After schema stage, discourse analysis has been gained a re-attention by many linguists. It is both a new and old discipline which can be traced back to more than 2000 years ago. In history it is from the study of language, public speaking and literature, one major study is classical rhetoric. Van Dijk (1985: 1) remarks: The Latin word 'grammatical' includes two aspects. One is linguistics, which was concerned with the speech in political and legal setting. In this sense, classical rhetoric both anticipates contemporary stylistics and structural analysis of discourse and contains intuitive, cognitive and social psychological notion about memory organization and attitude change in communicative context. The other aspect was concerned with the normative rules of correct language use. (Gillian Brown, 1983, p.59) According to Brown and Yule (1983: 1) they stated that: the analysis of discourse is necessarily the analysis of language in use. As such it can not be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which those are designed to serve in human affairs.

The definition by Stubbs (1983: 1) is: discourse analysis is attempts to study the organization of language about the sentence or about the clause and therefore to study larger linguistic units such as conversational exchanges or written text. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use, in social contexts and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers. (Gillian Brown, 1983, p.61)

At modern time, some scholars believe it is Zellig Harris, in his article 'discourse analysis' written in 1952, which first used the term. In the past fifty years, it is used in a much larger scope such as: sociolinguistics, philosophical linguistics, psycholinguistics and computational linguistics. In the different disciplines, scholars have been observing the different aspects of discourse and many theories have been developed.

And also in different countries, linguists have been doing some researches on many aspects of discourse analysis. In Britain, discourse analysis is greatly influenced

---

by M.A.K. Halliday's functional approach to language, which emphasized the social functions of language and the thematic and informational structure of speech and reading. Sinclair and Coulthard's model for the description of discourse is based on a hierarchy of discourse units, which is regarded as a relatively simple and powerful approach to discourse analysis, though not the only valid one. In America, in 1972 Labov designed a narrative model based on investigation into conversational storytelling. Grumperz and Hymes did researches on some kinds of speech events such as greeting rituals, verbal duels and storytelling in different cultural and social settings. Goffman, Sacks et al studied conversational norms, turn-taking and other aspects of spoken interaction. All the emphases are laid on the research method of close observation of groups of people communicating in natural settings (Halliday, 1976; McCarthy, 1991; Coulthard, 1987).

Van Dijk's perspective on discourse analysis emphasizes proposition from philosophical point of view. Van Dijk, Halliday and Hasan are sometimes referring to as text grammarians because of their working mainly on written discourse. They do great contributions to the development of discourse analysis. They view discourses as textual segment bound together in relationships with one another that can be defined. In their approach to discourses, logical sequencing and matching are two basic categories (Van Dijk, 1997).

### **2.3.2 “Scaffolding” in Reading Instruction**

Trends in the teaching of reading in ESL and other foreign languages have, not surprisingly, coincided with the above teaching skills. “Scaffolding” consists of teaching new skills by engaging students collaboratively in tasks that would be difficult for them to complete on their own. The teacher initially provides extensive instructional “Scaffolding”-giving information, prompts, reminders, and encouragement at the right time and in the right amounts. The students learn how to link the old information of familiar situations with new knowledge through verbal and nonverbal communication and modeling behaviors, and build their understanding of new content and process. Once the students internalize the content and process, they

gradually do more and more on their own. The temporary “Scaffold” provided by the teacher is removed to reveal the impressive permanent structure of students understanding. The “Scaffold” provided are activities and tasks that motivate or enlist the child's interest related to the tasks; Simplify the tasks to make it more manageable and achievable for a child; Provide some directions in order to help the child focus on achieving the goal; Clearly indicate differences between the child's work and the standard or desired solution; Reduce frustration and risk; Model and clearly define the expectations of the activity to be performed. (Applebee, A. & J. Langer, 1983)

“Scaffolding” works as a teaching strategy involves two major steps. The first step is the development of instructional plans to lead the students from what they already know to a deep understanding of the new material. “Scaffolding” plans must be drafted carefully, so that each new skill or bit of information that the students learns serves as a logical next step, based upon what they already known or are able to know. The instructor must prepare both to continuously assess student learning and to connect new information to the students' prior knowledge.

The second major step is execution of the plans, wherein the teacher provides support to the students at every step of the learning process, there are five difficult instructional techniques: model, explanations, students' participation, verify and clarifying students' understanding, and inviting students to contribute clues.

Modeling is generally the first step in instructional “Scaffolding”. It is defined as "Teaching behavior that shows how one should feel, think or act within a given situation," There are three types of modeling: Think-aloud modeling, talk-aloud modeling and performance modeling(Langer, 1983).

In additional to modeling, it is extremely important for the teachers to offer explanations. When the students have been modeled by their teachers, they begin to imitate. At the beginning, explanations should be thorough and must be repeated. As the learners gain explanations consisting of only hints or key words, which prompt the learners to, recall important information. Eventually, explanations are removed altogether.

Hogan and Pressley (1997) think that in the early stages of “Scaffolding”, an instructor must invite students' participation in the task at hand. This practice engages the student in learning and provides him or her with ownership of the learning experience. If the students' understandings are incorrect to them and they can tailor their explanation based upon whatever the students have brought to the discussion.

As the students gain experience with new material, it is important for the instructor to continuously assess their understanding and offer feedback, “verifying and clarifying student understanding” is essentially offering affirmative feedback to reasonable understanding, or correcting feedback to unreasonable understandings. Finally, production scaffolds are tools that prompt the student to convey what they have learned in an effective way. They can then perform the new task without any more help from the instructor (Hogan and Pressley, 1997).

According to McKenzie (1999), Scaffolding principal characteristics can be listed below:

1 Provide clear direction and reduces students' confusion---Educators anticipate problems that students might encounter and then develop step by step instructions, which explain what a student must do to meet expectations.

2 Clarify purpose---Scaffolding helps students understand why they are doing the work and why it is important. “Why are we doing this?” Scaffolding keeps purpose and motivation in the forefront. Rather than offering up one more empty school ritual like the state report.

3 Keep students on task---By providing structure, the scaffolded lesson or research project, provides pathways for the learners. The student can make decisions about which path to choose or what things to explore along the path but they cannot wander off of the path, which is the designed task.

4 Clarify expectations and incorporate assessment and feedback--Expectations are clear from the beginning of the activity since examples of exemplary work, rubrics, and standards of excellence are shown to the students. Work is done by others. Right from the beginning, students are shown rubrics and standards that define excellence. In

traditional school research, students were often kept in the dark until the product was completed.

5 Point students to worthy sources--Educators provide sources to reduce confusion, frustration, and time. The students may then decide which of these sources to use.

6 Reduce uncertainty, surprise, and disappointment--Educators test their lessons to determine difficulties so that learning is maximized. The operating design concept for scaffolded lessons is the "Teflon lesson" - no stick, no bum and no trouble. Lesson designers are expected to test each and every step, in the lesson to see what might possibly go wrong. The idea is to eliminate distracting frustrations to the extent this is possible. The goal is to maximize learning and efficiency. Once the lesson is ready for trial with students, the lesson is refined at least one more time based on the new insights gained by watching students actually try the activities.

7 Scaffolding delivers efficiency --If done well, a scaffolded lesson should nearly scream with efficiency. Teachers and students should shake their heads in disbelief. "It felt like we completed ten hours of work in just two!" "How did we get so much done?" This perception is achieved, in part, by virtue of comparison with the old kind of school research that was mostly about wandering and scooping. Boredom fed by irrelevance slowed the passage of time. It took forever to get the job done.

8 Scaffolding creates momentum. In contrast to traditional research experiences, throughout which much of the energy was dispersed and dissipated during the wandering phases, the channeling achieved through Scaffolding concentrates and directs energy in ways that actually build into momentum. It is almost like an avalanche of thoughts, accumulating insight and understanding. "Students in Resonance," the work gathers speed. The drive toward meaning is accelerated. The essential question and its subsidiary questions create suction, drive, urgency and motivation. The search for understanding inspires and provokes (McKenzie, 1999).

# Chapter Three Research Design and Methodology

## 3.1 Research Design

“Scaffolding” is one process which allows the teacher to help students transform from assisted tasks to independent performances. It is a step-by-step process that provides the learner with sufficient guidance until the process is finished and then gradually removes the supports in order to transfer the responsibility for completing the task to the student.

### 3.1.1 Purpose of Study

The “Scaffolding” instruction provides with a kind of conceptual framework for the learner to construct the meaning of knowledge. The concept in this kind of frame is required for the development of learner's further understanding of the question so that the complicated study task should be dissolved in advance in order to progressively guide the learner's understanding into depth. Once students build knowledge and develop skills on their own, elements of the framework are dismantled. Eventually, the initial scaffolding is removed altogether. Students no longer need it. The “Scaffolding” reading model is to improve students reading ability in English classroom instruction and at the same time to enhance the other language skills.

### 3.1.2 Research Questions

The research attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the differences between “Scaffolding” reading class model and the traditional reading class model in facilitating students' reading competence?
2. Can “Scaffolding” increase the students' motivation and interests in English reading class instruction?
3. Can “Scaffolding” facilitate students' cooperative skills in English reading class instruction?

4. Whether there are differences between students or not in English reading classroom.

### **3.1.3 Research Setting**

This study was conducted in the Zhengde College in Nanjing, which is a school where two-thirds of students come from Jiangsu Province and one third of the students from other provinces in China. The students have different backgrounds, and they have different proficiency in English reading.

In this school, there is a big computer room with eighty computers connected to the Internet, the students can go there to load or check some information they need every day. In addition, there is a grand school library, which opens to the students every day. Furthermore, most of the students could search on the Internet outside for the convenience of the Internet bar near the school. So it is possible for the project participants to surf the Internet when they needed.

### **3.1.4 Subject Selection**

The study was conducted during the academic year 2008 (Feb.-Apr.) among 47 freshmen in vocational college. The students involved in this study were in two classes taught by the same researcher. These subjects were between ages of 18-22 years old. And these two classes were classified as control class (CC) and experimental class (EC). At the time when the data of the present study were collected, most of these learners had been learning English as a foreign language for at least 6 years in middle schools. None of them had ever been to an English-speaking country and therefore they had little opportunity to use English for communicative purposes outside the classroom.

### **3.1.5 Instructional Materials**

The main instructional material employed in this study was the textbook for first grade English which was published by Shanghai Foreign language Education Press (2004). The textbook presents selected topics carefully that is of the interests of

young learners in each unit. Learning tasks were designed by the researcher around these topics and there are also extended reading materials ranging from the Internet, magazines, and newspapers to library books.

### **3.1.6 Research Instruments**

Three instruments were employed in the present research: tests, which were divided into pre-test and post test held before and after the experiment, aiming to compare the effect of the experiment, an interview, which was administered at the end of the experiment among the students in EC, and a case study, which was conducted during the teaching period to give a comparison between an advanced student and a weak student.

### **3.1.7 Research Procedures**

The purpose of applying “Scaffolding” in the study was to provide the participants with an opportunity to develop reading skills through “Scaffolding” to across ZPD with the cooperation of other fellow students. The researcher explained the study early in the semester in the class with the selected subjects. Many students showed great interests in the study. The classes were classified as control class and experimental one.

According to David Leat and Adam Nicols, “Scaffolding” is a method to first get the students involved in using a mystery, or detective plot. Instead of having students merely answer questions, they must use context and supplemental clues (given in the form of quotes from the text) to solve an umbrella mystery that not only gets them to critically analyze the text, but gets them involved, furthers their understanding of vocabulary and literary terms. This approach also sub-divides the learning groups into different categories of study, or rather, differentiated learning groups. This enables the teacher to keep the class organized with minimal class management, while furthering the education processes of the students. This way, the teacher also knows the ZPD for each group and can assist them easier. From this point of view, instruction cannot be identified as development, but properly organized instruction will result in the child's intellectual development, and it will

bring into being an entire series of such developmental processes, which were not possible without instruction"(Vgotsky, p.121).

47 students were involved in the present research. The control class consisted of 24 students, of whom 18 were girls, 6 were boys. The experimental class had 23 students, of whom 16 were girls, 7 were boys.

Both EC and CC used the College English Intensive Reading Book1, published by the Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. The text contained 10 units made up of text, vocabulary, structure, reading activity and guided reading. Both EC and CC had 4 periods per week, and the teaching time of the term was 16 weeks. The two classes were taught by the present researcher herself.

In EC, the instruction of each unit followed the "Scaffolding" described in Chapter 2, which fell into three main stages of learning before class, learning in class and learning after class. Each stage involved some tasks. In contrast with the treatment in EC, the traditional teaching Model was carried out in CC. From the questionnaire the researcher found most of the students had little basic computer skills. So training on the usage of the computer and Internet was necessary. Students were made to know how to use the Internet, how to read, how to search the important information resources. Surely, teacher will give them some guidance and useful Internet addresses such as Economist, National Geographic, Times, etc. Thus students were given the chance to get familiar with the Internet searching and library searching during the first two weeks.

The reading procedure is seen as thinking, as discovery. Reading is the result of employing strategies to manage the analyzing process. Just like the mentioned approaches above, there is no agreed list of reading processes among researches and even less agreement about exactly what the reading curriculum should consist of. In the comprehension of the previous research accomplished by other experts and the abundant experience of English teaching, the researcher instruct the first step, that is, the development of instructional plans to lead the students from what they already know to a deep understanding of the new material. So every day's preview is crucial. Students should read the article by themselves before each English reading class. The

---

powerful assessment of preview is the demand of pre-summary which is compulsory to every student. In the preview process, students can use each new skill or bit of information which have already been drafted carefully by the teacher. These skills and information will be served as logical next steps, based upon what they already known or are able to know. After these preparations, the instructor begins to show the class with continuous assessment about student learning and connecting new information to the students' prior knowledge. For example, students will be asked to explain some sentences with new words which just be explained by the instructor.

Meanwhile, the second major step is paralleling in the execution of the first step. Supports provided by teacher and other advanced peers to the students are at every step of the learning process. Students are divided into several groups randomly on the basis of at least one student being considered as proficient for the expectation of peer-cooperation and peer-assessment. Teacher expects the participation of the students, verifies and clarifies students' understanding, and invites students to contribute clues. He or she organizes a reading activity systematically to meet the needs of all students, "give more help when the learner gets into difficulty, and offer less help as they gain in proficiency" (Wood, p.7). With the growing number of clues found by the students, the zone of proximal development is across and students will passionately be pushed forward to another aim.

The test items of the two examination papers were roughly the same, which contained listening, reading, multiple choice (vocabulary and structure), cloze and translation. The total score of each test amounted to 100 points. The interview of the learners (Appendix1) was a self-designed one based on the related literature: (1) the description of "Scaffolding" study, (2) the theory of "Zone of Proximal Development". (3) Related studies (4) the researcher's own teaching and learning experience. For the case study, two students, chosen from the EC, were observed during the teaching process and also interviewed at the end of the research. Besides, their assignments after class and the results of their tests were included in the following analysis.

### 3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

The pre-test, also the proficiency test for the freshmen, was administered on October 10, 2007 and the post-test on June 30, 2008. The time limit for each test was 2 hours. The pre-test paper was the final examination paper of second semester on 2007, and the final-test paper was the final examination paper of first semester on 2008. The papers were produced collectively by all the teachers from English Department of Zhengde College, based on the English book published by the Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. Each part of those two papers was similar in proportion. All the students took part in the tests, and the correction of the two tests was done in the flow process immediately after the tests. So the reliability and validity were guaranteed. The total score and the score of the respective item for each student of EC and CC were calculated and collected by the present researcher (see Appendix 2). The software of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16.0) was used to make an independent samples t-test for the scores of both tests of EC and CC.

The administration of the questionnaire was conducted in the students' regular English class on June 15, 2008, near the end of the term. The subjects were informed of the purpose of the survey and that there was no right or wrong answer to each statement. In the meanwhile they were also assured that their names would be kept anonymous in order for them to truly express their opinions. The subjects responded in a selective form — “totally agreed”, “agreed”, “almost agreed”, “not agreed”, “totally not agreed”. The responses to some of the statements were recorded considering the opposite direction of the questions. After the administration of the questionnaire, a statistic check was conducted for internal consistency. Altogether 47 questionnaire sheets from the two classes were collected, computed and analyzed with SPSS 16.0 to examine whether there are significant differences in the categories between EC and CC.

## Chapter Four Results and Discussion

This chapter intends to provide the results and discussion of pre-test, post-test and questionnaire.

### 4.1 Results

#### 4.1.1 Results of the Pre-test

Following the research design in Chapter 3, the pre-test was held to determine the English level of EC (experimental class) and CC (control class) before the experiment was carried out. Numbers of the students, means, standard deviations, values of T and P are shown in Table 4.1

**Table 4.1 Independent samples t-test: differences of the total scores of EC and CC in the pre-test**

Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	P(2-tailed)
EC	23	63.37	6.881	.854	-.650	124	.519
CC	22	64.30	6.756	.851			

As is shown in table 4.1, the similar mean values of EC (mean=63.37) and CC (mean=64.30) in the pre-test clearly show that the two classes are nearly at the same starting point. The values of SD (Std. Deviation) of EC and CC are close to each other, showing the similar distribution in both classes. The P value is 0.517, higher than 0.05, which indicates that the scores of EC and CC in the pre-test have no significant difference.

Details of statistics in every section of the pre-test are presented in Table 4.2 so as to provide an overview of the English proficiency of EC and CC.

As clearly seen in table 4.2, the mean values and SD values of each section of the two classes, in spite of their slight differences, are quite close to each other, also no significant differences are found in p values, thus further confirming that EC and CC were at the same level in the English proficiency before the experiment was conducted.

**Table 4.2 Independent samples t-test: differences of EC and CC in each section of the pre-test**

Section	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	P(2-tailed)
Listening	EC	23	12.13	2.070	.245	-.152	124	.880
	CC	24	12.18	1.726	.214			
Reading	EC	23	25.31	3.735	.463	-.663	124	.506
	CC	24	25.77	3.992	.504			
Multiple-choice	EC	23	10.13	1.642	.201	-.934	124	.514
	CC	24	10.32	1.709	.214			
Cloze	EC	23	7.84	1.046	.129	-.936	124	.356
	CC	24	7.67	1.048	.134			
Translation	EC	23	8.14	1.467	.184	-1.107	124	.268
	CC	24	8.40	1.144	.148			

Note: the five sections respectively account for 20% (listening), 40% (reading), 15 (multiple choice), 10% (cloze) and 15% (translation).

### 4.1.2 Results of the Post-test

The post-test was intended to see the respective effect of the different treatments of EC and CC. Table 4.3 displays the mean values, SD values, t values and p values to make a comparative analysis of the performances of EC and CC in the post-test.

**Table 4.3 Independent samples t-test: differences of the total scores of EC and CC in the post-test**

Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	P (2-tailed)
EC	23	70.32	6.408	.793	2.478	124	.017
CC	24	57.54	6.424	.814			

Note: The total mark of the post-test paper is 100 points.

As we can see from table 4.3, the mean of EC (mean=70.32) is much higher than that of CC (=57.54), suggesting that EC outperformed CC in the post-test. The SD values of the two classes are similar to each other. The P value is .017, which is much lower than 0.05, indicating that there exists significant difference between the two classes and that the treatment of EC had a better effect on the students' performance. So we can draw the conclusion that compared with the traditional model, "Scaffolding" brought about remarkable improvement in the English performance of EC.

Similar to the pre-test, descriptive statistics of EC and CC in each section of the post-test are provided in the following table.

**Table 4.4 Independent samples t-test: descriptive statistics of EC and CC in each section of the post-test**

Sections	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	P(2-tailed)
Listening	EC	23	13.08	1.444	.177	1.397	124	.164
	CC	24	12.73	1.364	.174			
Reading	EC	23	29.27	3.525	.437	3.873	124	.000
	CC	24	26.83	3.744	.473			
Multiple choice	EC	23	10.94	1.473	.183	-1.67	124	0.96
	CC	24	11.43	1.920	.229	6		
Cloze	EC	23	7.88	.859	.107	-1.45	124	.146
	CC	24	8.09	.878	.111	8		
Translation	EC	23	9.18	1.476	.187	2.960	124	.006
	CC	24	8.85	1.216	.153			

Note: the five sections respectively account for 20% (listening), 40% (reading), 15 (multiple choice), 10% (cloze) and 15% (reading).

As is shown in table 4.4, EC (mean=13.08) did slightly better in listening than CC (mean=12.73) while CC was a little better than EC in multiple choice (EC= 10.94, CC=11.43) and cloze (EC=7.88, CC=8.09). The differences are not significant as the p values of these sections indicate. However, EC (mean= 29.27) is significantly different from CC (mean=26.83) in reading ( $p=0.000<0.05$ ) and translation (EC=9.18, CC=8.85) ( $p=0.006<0.05$ ). The statistics reveal that compared with the common model, “Scaffolding” brings about great progress in the overall English competence of the students in EC, especially in reading.

#### 4.1.3 Results of the Interview

What are the students' perceptions of "Scaffolding" in the EFL classroom? To get the answer to the question, an interview was conducted among the 23 students from the EC. The interview was based on three questions referring to the feedback after the experiment. (1) Are there some differences between "Scaffolding" and the traditional teaching in English reading classroom? (2) Can "Scaffolding" increase motivation and interest in English reading class instruction? (3) Do you like cooperative learning in "Scaffolding"?

For Question 1, most students showed their positive attitudes towards "Scaffolding". 70% of the students were not satisfied with the traditional way of English reading. Three aspects were generalized as follows:

First, they thought the teaching method is less satisfactory. Years of the domestic teaching method of English is fixed in the same pattern, the teacher dominates it from the beginning. Teacher often assigns a reading task, gives much lectures and explanations, and then asks the students to finish the reading tasks individually within a given time. Finally they hand in their homework to the teacher for evaluations with the dominant focus on language factors while neglect the authenticity and practicality of reading activities. As a result, the students can't find interests in English reading class and gradually they are bored at it. They hope that a new teaching method will emerge.

Second, the rough evaluation system can not meet the demand of the students. Although six students who are advanced ones like to see the marks and praises given by the teacher, 17 students considered the current evaluation system which always was conducted by the teacher alone should be improved. Here are some of their complaints:

"...My reading homework is often full of mistakes, so I feel very frustrated."

"... I just write the corrected reading answers and never look at it again."

".... The correction is worthless, and the same mistakes will appear again in my following reading assignment."

Third, "Scaffolding" provides students with the opportunities to take active part in the classroom activities. In the past, most of the classroom activities

organized mainly by the teacher, and often the higher-level students have the opportunities to participate. As for those whose personalities are in traversing or shy students can hardly have the chance. Luckily, over half of the students prefer to the classroom activity, which indicates that “Scaffolding” reading can find the participants here. It has not only improved their reading skills but also their independent abilities. At the same time, they build their confidence especially for the weak students. They can progressively develop their understanding of various concepts with proper assistance from peers or teachers. But, still some students deny it just because they haven't accustomed themselves to the new reading way.

For question 2, most of the students claimed that they got more interested in English reading and they are willing to read some extended English materials from newspapers and Internet after class. The reasons are as follows:

First, the complex roles of teacher and students gave them a lot of chances to develop their English reading abilities. Before each class, students should preview the reading materials with some hints from the teacher, which means they should go deep into those articles for the assignment of summary told by the teacher. In this progress, students need to consult many tools such as the dictionary, Internet and the suggestions from their peers. Thus, they extend their knowledge virtually as well as the motivation and interests.

Second, the guidance and appreciation of the teacher sharply increase their confidence. Every student, no matter advanced or weak, if fully prepared, is sufficient to finish the tasks, then teacher will give his or her warm praise to them. Although some weak students can not finish the tasks very well, they can also get improved with the guidance of the teacher and the help of their advanced peers. Most of the students showed their joys about their development after one semester's “Scaffolding” teaching. Furthermore, they are willing to be taught in “Scaffolding” in future English reading class.

For question 3, students have divergent opinions towards cooperative learning. About ten of the students most of whom are weak students, had no experiences of collaborating with others in English reading class before. They think reading is their

own business, they should do it independently. Besides, they think they ought to read in their own styles and express out their own feelings. They are under the illusion that if they talk about the assignment with others, teacher will say them copying from each other. The rest of students said that they will ask for help when they meet difficulty, because they consider “Scaffolding” as a good way to improve their English reading skills. Nearly six of the advanced students were unanimous in considering peer-assessment as necessary factors to their reading. They like to take peers' suggestions into account. And they felt it is easier for them to stimulate good ideas with other advanced students. Here are some comments about cooperative learning:

“...it is very powerful for me to solve the problems of words and sentences. If I consult each unfamiliar word in the dictionary, it is very time-consuming. But with the help of others, we make our minds collectively, and the comprehension of the passage becomes no more obstacle.”

“...I feel not so afraid when discussed with other students, and everyone understands the passage in a different way. I think it is a good way to present our diversity.”

#### **4.1.4 Results of the Case Study**

In order to get a profound understanding about in what extend can “Scaffolding” affect the students, a case study was conceived on two students, the advanced one and the weak one. The case study will give a comparison between the two students based on three instruments: test, class observation and assignment.

The scores of pre-test and post test, especially of the reading part were recorded in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5 the score of each part of Student A and B in pre-test and post-test**

## Applying Scaffolding in English Reading Classroom Instruction

Student (in EC)		Listening	Multiple-choice	Cloze	Reading	Translation
A	Pre-test	17	15	8	22	15
	Post-test	18	14	9	30	15
B	Pre-test	16	12	8	20	4
	Post-test	17	11	7	21	5

As we can see from Table 4.5, the score of reading significantly increased by 8. Except for reading, the other four parts waved slightly in these two tests. That means student A tentatively made progress in English reading during the teaching of “Scaffolding”. In contrast to student A, student B almost maintained the score of each part in the post-test. And the reading part only increased by 1 score than before which we can conclude that student B have just made a little progress during the teaching of “Scaffolding”. The reasons why student A attained more achievement than student B were possibly as follows based on the class observation and after-class assignment.

First, student A is more active in classroom reading activities. Thanks to the confidence and experience of English reading, student A showed more passion in the collaborative reading activities. He always talked with other students and gave his opinion about some topics. As a return, he could draw the strength from other students. Compared to student A, student B always keep silent in group discussion and be reluctant to take part in the reading activities in the class. When comes to his underperformance in the class, student B said that he feel very uncomfortable if he expressed the improper idea or had no idea at all, especially confronted with the advanced students. According to the record of students’ performance in the reading class, the average speaking opportunity of an advanced student is five to six times during each group discussion in the reading class while that of the weak one is less than twice.

Second, student A was always sufficient to finish the reading tasks. With full preparation before class, he could easily accomplish the demand from the teacher. Furthermore, he kept questions before each reading class and had questions solved by teacher or other peers in the class. In this process, the guidance from teacher and other peers pointed a bright direction for the continuing of his improvement. So his after-class assignment could always get high levels and the praise from teacher, which extremely stimulates his confidence and interest for English reading.

Third, student A always became the leader in group discussion. It will greatly enhance his ability of analysis and cooperative studying. Besides, he always consult teacher' advice when faced with difficulties, which saved his a lot of time and energy. While student B always kept his position as the audience. The cooperative learning is greatly curbed by his language competence and his motivation of acquiring knowledge. Luckily, he considered the advice from other students as useful in his reading tasks. Here are some of his expressions of English reading.

“...I don't like group discussion. I have no idea what to say. ...I felt very embarrassed if I was asked to talk something about the topic.”

“...English reading should let us read 'silently'.”

“...but what other people said seems good for my understanding of the passage.”

Fourth, the attitudes toward English reading are much vital in English reading. Student A had a strong affection toward reading no matter in English or Chinese.

“... I like reading very much. Reading is the main way to gain the knowledge of profound tradition concerning both China and other regions and the world as a whole.”

“...Reading will give me the motivation to explore more new things”

However, student B just considers English reading as one part of examination. He said that if there is no examination, he would like to abandon English reading because it was very boring sometimes. He found the reading assignment was a burden in his daily life, and he just finished them but never to ponder how to

improve his reading skills and never extend his reading material.

Although the case study was conducted carefully by the researcher, many elements can not be completely accounted. The tentative result of the case study is that the effect of “Scaffolding” is more significant for the advanced students than the weak students in English reading class.

## **4.2 Discussion**

### **4.2.1 The Effect of Scaffolding on English Reading Class Instruction**

From the p value, .017 of the post-test in table 4.3 showed that there is significant difference between EC and CC. And this result also gives a positive answer to the first research question that there exist some differences between “Scaffolding” and the traditional model in facilitating students’ comprehensive language competence, especially in reading. Based on SLA theories, “Scaffolding” exposes students to abundant authentic language samples, multiplying the input channels; “Scaffolding” strengthens the interaction by providing a diet of tasks which have inviting and motivating goals; “Scaffolding” intensifies the output which displays the outcome of tasks and the efficiency of learning. With “Scaffolding”, the language practiced in the classroom is not predetermined, but rather derived from what happens in the classroom. The relationship between teacher and students are turned into guidance and cooperation. Necessary explanation and highlight of language forms and practices are given at the beginning and the end of the task cycle, which raises students’ consciousness for relevant linguistic features, thus achieving the balance between fluency, accuracy and complexity and moving from fluency to accuracy. This is obviously in consistent with “Scaffolding” which achieves the aim of integrating all language skills and promoting the development of students’ reading competence.

The reason why students in EC did much better particularly in reading is that the usage of “Scaffolding” encourages students in EC to have more access to

authentic material by reading extensively before and after class and that the requirement of homework in the form of reading helps to push them to look for more material before and after class, show much more concern with various themes and reading format. What's more important, in EC, the reading theme is usually based on the thorough discussion in class, through which students can not only think independently but also broaden their views by absorbing other's opinions, thus contributing to the comprehension of their reading. The advanced students always became the beginner of each task, thus gives the following guidance and suggestion to deepen the clues.

#### **4.2.2 The Effect of Scaffolding on Students**

There are two vital achievements in conducting "Scaffolding" on students.

First, students succeed in performing the reading tasks independently. "Scaffolding" has not only improved their reading skill, but also developed their independent abilities. At the same time, they build the confidence especially the weak students. They said that peer assessment in reading process was the most impressive process and it put students in the position of activating their cognitive faculty. They were the center of the class, the teacher worked as a facilitator or guider for developing students' reading potential. While in the class dominated by the teachers, they were dependent on the teachers for everything.

Second, it minimizes the level of frustration of the learner especially the failing students. It is not difficult to find that "Scaffolding" has different effect on different students. It is especially useful to the weak students. Though they can't catch up with the top students in a short time, they can make greater progress than the failing students in the control class.

Reasons for the results are as follows:

First, "Scaffolding" can build students' confidence. In the process of cooperation, every student is allowed to express their ideas that give the less advanced students opportunities to challenge themselves. While in the past, those students are afraid to talk in the class. Integrating with the ideas from other advanced

students, they are fueled to share their own thoughts and they get extremely excited when their thoughts are better than that of the advanced ones.

Second, “Scaffolding” alters the traditional teacher-centered model into a brand new model. In traditional classroom instruction, the learner passively listens to the information presented instead of teacher’s prompting which help the learner build on prior knowledge and forms new knowledge. In working with students who have low self-esteem and learning disabilities, it provides an opportunity to give positive feedback to the students and motivates them so that they want to learn. Warping the “Scaffolding” simile a bit, we can say that “Scaffolding” is like a ladder, where the teacher assesses the student’s ability to get to the next rung, and what help they will need to get there. This may involve first a series of diagnostic tests, or even a self-analyzing paper where a student expresses their beliefs in a set of strong skills and a set of skills that need improvement. Once the teacher realizes where a student is at as far as skills go, she can then request assignments that require the student not only to expend their energy and talent to the achievement of a specific goal, but also require additional support from the teacher to get the student where she needs to be. In this manner, the student does not get bored with an assignment, but also is not frustrated with a seemingly impossible task, especially if the teacher is there to assist him or her.

## Chapter Five Conclusions

### 5.1 Research Findings

This thesis mainly focuses on the application of “Scaffolding” in senior English reading. As time goes on and experiments build on previous knowledge, assistance from the teacher is decreased allowing the students to rely on their past knowledge and previous experiences.

Through one-semester experiment, the results have been found that “Scaffolding” reading activities can improve the students' reading skills. And the complex sentences are digested much better and the content can be controlled greatly. It is also found that the less advanced students develop self-esteem, and they become more independent. Furthermore, other teaching strategies can also be applied in “Scaffolding” effectively. In an effort to meet students' need of getting excited about acquiring new skills, they should be suited in proper learning environment which is interesting, level-appropriate, and enriching. Learner-centered schools and classrooms create a safe environment where students feel like its okay to open themselves up to new educational experiences and ideas. Conversely, a constricting learning environment will never be a safe place to think freely. A teacher cannot ignore the knowledge basis that students bring about to their educational experiences. This means that stereotypes and similar misconceptions must also be taken into account before students can acquire new knowledge. Once a learner has the benefit of both prior knowledge and a guide which help connect prior knowledge to new knowledge, he will find both kinds of knowledge becoming more meaningful to him. The confusion and frustration that often accompanies being assigned a task that is too hard to complete can be avoided.

Main findings of the present study can be seen from the results:

Firstly, “Scaffolding” proves a proper and more effective way to implement in college English reading class and helps to improve students' comprehension ability of English reading. After the experiment, more students believe that they show more interests in English reading than before. They can see the achievements from reading.

They assume that “Scaffolding” can help them get high mark in reading as well as the ability to learn other subjects.

Secondly, “Scaffolding” can significantly stimulate their motivation and interest for English reading. Based on the results of the questionnaire and the interview, most of the students in EC show great interests in tasks and they take more initiative and willingness to learn both inside and outside the class. Also, they take greater charge of their own learning and develop better studying habits and learning autonomy. “Scaffolding” greatly fosters students’ autonomous learning by providing opportunities to interact and develop effective learning strategies.

Thirdly, “Scaffolding” helps to enhance students’ collaborative learning and allow them to navigate their own paths in English reaing. Through pair work or group work, “Scaffolding” creates a relaxed and amicable climate which helps students to onvercome anxiety, reduce psychological tension and give students confidence to try out whatever language they know in the relative privacy. Group work involves mutual support and interdependence, and such an embracing atmosphere promotes their cooperation because it enables them not only practice language but also to learn from each other.

Fourthly, “Scaffolding” can especially benefit the advanced and intermediate students in English reading class. From the result of the experiment, it is believed that “Scaffolding” has deep positive influence on the those students. These students, equipped with superior language foundation and competence, cherish more confidence and enthusiasm to learn English, thus contributing to their remarkable progress.

## **5.2 Implications and Suggestions for Classroom Instruction**

### **5.2.1 Implications**

In line with the results drawn from the experimental study, we may find some useful implications for EFL in China.

1. "Scaffolding" should be strongly advocated and widely enforced in the Chinese EFL context to improve students' comprehension ability of English reading. The most valuable ration of "Scaffolding" is learning through doing, so teachers should create more opportunities close to real life to provoke students' engagement in negotiations and push them to mobilize and manipulate the language so as to enable them to construct knowledge actively. The result of the post-test that students in EC don't have the advantage over students in CC in the sections of multiple choice and cloze indicates that a good balance should be achieved between meaning and form because fluency and accuracy are compementary, and students must have a good command of language form if they are to understand and express meaning effectively.

2. Proper teaching strategies should be employed in language teaching. Teachers are required to make considerable efforts to instruct students how to learn. It is acknowledged that students vary in proficiency levels, learning styles and learning needs, so it is vital for the teacher to take the individual characteristics and differences of their students into consideration. It is necessary for the teacher to get a picture of what problems students have first and take corresponding measures to solve them. Special concern, respect and encouragement should go to students at low level. In teaching process, relatively simple tasks should be designed and assigned to low achievers in order to reduce their anxiety, enhance their interest and confidence and enable them to enjoy the success and pleasure of learning. Although "Scaffolding" is considered as an effective method to enhance English reading class, other teaching methods can not be afforded to neglet.

3. The role between teacher and students should be properly balanced. Teacher should give students guidance when necessary and encourage other peer's participation to enhance students' autonomous leaning and cooperative learning. Then students can free themselves from the limitations such as anxiety, depression, etc.

4. Though Scaffolding has been advocated and considered a growing tendency in EFL teaching, its implementation in a wider scale should be a gradual transition

because there still exist some inadaptable factors such as materials, students' proficiency, learning environment, teachers' attitude, etc. What's more, the implementation of "Scaffolding" doesn't mean the absolute negative to other teaching models but indicates the brand-new perspective for language teaching and learning. Therefore teachers have a lone way to explore an effective way in Chinese EFL context.

### 5.2.2 Suggestions

"Scaffolding" has presented many clues for the futher teaching.

First, the center-role of the teacher should be transformed. The teacher must be careful not to offer too much assistance for too long, at the risk of making students overly dependent rather than independent. Following the early stages of modeling, he suggests that teachers should start a problem and have the students finish it, or perhaps give hints when a student gets off track. The instructor should not, however, perform the task in its entirety for any student after the initial modeling phase is completed. Without doubt, the analogies above speak highly of the teacher's dedicatory sprits. On the other hand, "the tragedy hero role" puts the teachers under the pressure to devote them to work. Especially in reading task, the teachers used to work a lot while students get a little. In the traditional way, the teacher spent much time telling the students how to read between the lines, then assigned the reading task to the students. Within the given time, the students handed in their assignments, which will cost the teacher some time to check. Most students find it very dispiriting if they get a piece of written work back and it is covered in red ink, crossing out, it is a powerful visual statement of the fact their reading English is terrible. The students put their exercise books into the desk quickly. Without communication between the teacher and students, reading can't be effective. So teacher's job should not be dull and instructed as "the role of teachers in supporting the learner's development and providing support structures to get to that next stage or level." The teacher is not the tragedy hero again, he is seen as the scaffolds itself organizing ideas about the task at

hand, sharing them with students, incorporating what knowledge the students have and present the tasks that are within their ZPD.

The second is that the level of instruction should always be within the zone of proximal development and, therefore, challenging to the students. Material presented at or below the student's level of mastery will cause him or her to become frustrated and disengaged. In either case, no growth can occur.

Thirdly, it is critically important for instructors to repeatedly confront their students with scientific concepts in order to prevent them from falling back on their naive ideas of spontaneous concepts. Students should be encouraged to explore the subjects. Whenever possible, try to introduce a subject which interests the students. They will then find it interesting to explore the subject. Even more important, try to introducing a subject that they should at least have indirect experience-knowledge gained through thinking, understanding, or talking about the subject. Without direct or indirect experience, or both, they will not be able to provide the specific evidence needed to develop whatever point they are trying to make. Their reading will be starved for specifics.

Lastly, students should be encouraged to have right attitudes of English reading. The way to wreck the students' chances of learning how to read competently is to believe that reading is a natural gift. People with this attitude think that they are the only ones whose reading is an unbearably difficult activity. They feel that everyone else find reading easy or at least tolerable. Such people typically say, "I'm not any good at reading" or "English was not one of my good subjects." They imply that they simply do not have a talent for reading, while others do. The result of this attitude is that people don't do their best when they read, or, even worse, they hardly try at all. Their self-defeating attitude becomes a reality; their reading fails chiefly because they have brainwashed themselves into thinking that they don't have the natural talent needed to read. Until their attitude is changed, they probably will not learn how to read effectively. First, reading is a hard work for almost everyone. It is painful to do the intense and active thinking that clear reading demands. (Perhaps television has made us all so passive that the active thinking necessary in reading

now seems doubly hard) It is scary to sit down before a full-word paper and know that, an hour later, nothing on it may be worth keeping. It is frustrating to discover how difficult it is to transfer thoughts and feelings from a sheet of paper onto one's head. It is upsetting to find how an apparently simple reading subject often turns out to be complicated. But reading is not an automatic process: we will not get something for nothing, and we cannot expect something for nothing. Competent reading results only through plain hard work-through determination, sweat and head-on battle.

### **5.3 Limitations of the Study**

Several limitations constrain the context to which the findings of the study are generalized.

First, the small sample size doesn't allow generalization to other students in other contexts. The two experimented classes are freshmen from Zhengde College and can only represent college students of intermediate level. The results might vary if the sample size is enlarged and enriched and the subjects of other levels are involved.

Second, "Scaffolding" has been a debate since its introduction to China and attitudes towards it vary from person to person. So far there hasn't been a fixed and authoritative teaching model to follow. The teaching setup unit was based on the researcher's personal understanding and teaching experience, which might be a little far from comprehensive. Team work and collective effort may lay a solid foundation and yield more convincing results. The experiment focuses on the effect of "Scaffolding" on college English intensive reading course whose aim is to integrate the four language skills, that is, listening, speaking, reading and writing. In the present study, the leading items only covered a little. Because of the lack of systematic and valid assessment models, it fails to identify the correlation between the speaking competence with "Scaffolding".

No one particular teaching strategy is perfect. “Scaffolding” is a wonderful tool for getting students to obtain critical thinking skills and to develop a problem-solving mentality. The main problem with “Scaffolding” is that it doesn't show immediate improvement on the part of a student, and therefore is called into question by administrators who must see results in the form of standardized tests and not the growth of an individual, their understanding of the material, or a student's overall development. Thus, “Scaffolding” gets put on the shelves until a group of students are sure to pass a test using more didactic teaching to the test. And there exist deficiencies in the process of performing the experiment: the author cares too much about the theoretical aspects but pays less attention to concrete practice. The author has not done enough work in distinguishing the ZPD between the students, and especially not giving enough considerations on these advanced students. Besides, the participants come from only one college which is an ordinary school; they can't be representative for all the students.

In future research, the integration of reading with other language skills will be emphasized in order to applying “Scaffolding” into all-round English teaching.

## References

- [1] Rutland, A. F. & Campbell, R. N. (1996) The Relevance of Vygotsky's Theory of the 'Zone of Proximal Development' to the Assessment of Children with Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. Vol.40 p151-158
- [2] Applebee, A. and J. Langer (1983) Instructional Scaffolding: Reading and Writing as Natural Language Activities. *Language Arts* 60: 168-175.
- [3] Bruner, J. (1978) The Role of Dialogue in Language Acquisition In Sinclair, A., Jaevella, R. and W. Levelt (eds.) *The Child's Conception of Language*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- [4] Bruner, J. (1985) Vygotsky: a Historical and Conceptual Perspective. In Wertsch, J. (ed.) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Carter R. & McCarthy M. (1995). *Grammar and the Spoken Language*. *Applied Linguistics* 16/2.
- [6] Coulthard, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Burnt Mill, Harlow: Longman. New Edition.
- [7] Coltman, P., Petaeva, D. & Anghileri, J. (2002) Scaffolding Learning through Meaningful Tasks and Adult Interaction. *Early Years*, Vol.22, No. 1
- [8] Donato, R. (1994) Collective Scaffolding in Second Language Learning. In Lantolf, J. and G. Appel (eds.) *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Press. 33-56.
- [9] Edwards, D. and N. Mercer (1987) *Common Knowledge: the Development of Understanding in the Classroom*. London: Routledge.
- [10] Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching* Oxford: Oxford University Press Harland, T 2003. Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and Problem-based Learning: Linking a Theoretical Concept with Practice through Action Research *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8:2, 263-272
- [11] Foley, J. (1994) Key Concepts in ELT: Scaffolding. *ELT Journal* 48/1: 101-102.
- [12] Gibbons, P. (2002) *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- [13]Gibbons, P. (2003) *Mediation Language Learning: Teacher Interaction with ESL Students in a Content-based Classroom. TESOL Quarterly* 37/2: 247-273
- [14]Halliday , M. ,Hasan , R. (2000) *Cohesion in English* . Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press .
- [15]Hogan,K.& Pressley,M (1997) *Scaffolding Student Learning:Instructional Approaches & Issues* Cambridge,MA:Brookline Books,Inc
- [16]Johnson, D. W.; Johnson, R. T.; Stanne, M. E. (2000). *Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-analysis*. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis: Cooperative Learning Center  
[online] Available from: <http://www.cooperation.org/pages/cl-methods.html>
- [17]Johnson, K. (1995) *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [18]Kinginger, C. (2002). Defining the Zone of Proximal Development on US Foreign Language Education *Applied Linguistics* 23/2: 240-261
- [19]Ko, J. Schallert, D. and K. Walters (2003) Rethinking Scaffolding: Examining Negotiation of Meaning in an ESL Storytelling Task. *TESOL Quarterly* 37/2: 303-324.
- [20]Lantolf, L.P. (ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- [21]Maybin, J., N. Mercer and B. Stierer (1992) Scaffolding Learning in the Classroom. In Norman, K.(ed) *Thinking Voices: the Work of the National Oracy Project*. Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton. 186-195.
- [22]McCormick, D. and R. Donaton (2000) Teacher Questions as Scaffolded Assistance in an ESL Classroom. In Hall, J. and L. Verplaetse (eds.) *Second and Foreign Language Learning through Classroom Interaction*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbawn Associates. 183-202.
- [23]McKenzie,J (1999) Scaffolding for Success Educational Technology
- [24]Meijier, J. (2001). The Predictive and Discriminant Validity of the Zone of Proximal Development *British Journal Educational Psychology*. 71, 93-113
- [25]Mercer, N. (1995) *The Guided Construction of Knowledge: Talk amongst Teachers and Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- [26]Mercer, N. (2000) *Words and Minds: How We Use Language to Think Together*. London: Routledge.

- [27]Nassaji, H& Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian on Corrective Feedback in L2: the Effect of Random Versus Negotiated Help on the Learning of English Articles *Language Awareness* Vol9, No.1
- [28]Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publisher
- [29]Nuom, B. (2001). Task-based Methodology and Sociocultural Theory(I) [online] Available from: <http://www.chinaetr.com/Article/class6/200404/305.html>
- [30]Nuom, B. (2001). Task-based Methodology and Sociocultural Theory(I) [online] Available from: <http://www.chinaetr.com/Article/class6/200404/305.html>
- [31]Nuom, B. (2001). Task-based Methodology and Sociocultural Theory(II) [online] Available from: <http://www.chinaetr.com/Article/class6/200404/306.html>
- [32]Nuom, B. (2001). Task-based Methodology and Sociocultural Theory(III) [online] Available from: <http://www.chinaetr.com/Article/class6/200404/307.html>
- [33]Palinscar, A. (1986) The Role of Dialogue in Providing Scaffolded Instruction. *Educational Psychologist* 21: 73-98.
- [34]Skehan, P. (1998a). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- [35]Stone, C.A. (1993). What is Missing in the Metaphor of Scaffolding. E.A. Forman, N. Minick, & C.A. Stone (Eds.)
- [36]Rasmussen, J.. (2001). The Importance of Communication in Teaching: a System-theory Approach to the Scaffolding Metaphor. *J. Curriculum Studies*. 33 (5)
- [37]Roberto Bartholo, Elizabeth Tunes & Maria Carmen Villela Rosa Tacca. (2007) Vygotsky's and Buber's Pedagogical Perspectives: Some Affinities. *Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia*. [Journal compilation]
- [38]Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Study of Discourse* London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1-34.
- [39]Van Lier, L. (1996) *Interaction in the Language Classroom*. Harlow: Longman.
- [40]Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in Society*. London: Harvard University Press.
- [41]Williams, M. and R. Burden (1997) *Psychology for Language Teachers: a Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [42]Wood, D., Bruner. J. and G. Ross (1976) The Role of Tutoring in Problem-solving.' *Journal of*

*Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 17:89-100.

- [43]裘晶. 社会文化发展理论指导下的二语习得研究及教学[J]. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2006, (3): 54-61
- [44]吴均. 浅析任务教学法在大学英语教学中的应用[J]. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2006, (3): 127-135
- [45]郭易平. 合作学习模式中大学英语教材的有效使用[J]. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2006, (3): 78-86
- [46]李红梅 任务型教学在大学英语精读课堂中的运用[MA] 扬州大学 2007
- [47]冯相如 维果茨基教学与发展思想试探析——从“最近发展区”的视角[MA] 北京师范大学 2004
- [48]刘薇 发挥教师的中介作用帮助学生通过最近发展区 辽宁师范大学[MA] 2004
- [49]聂青华 运用任务型教学方式培养学生自主学习能力的实验研究[MA] 首都师范大学 2007
- [50]王立忠 任务型语言教学在高中英语教学中的应用研究[MA] 西北师范大学 2005
- [51]李颖 论大学英语教学中的合作学习[MA] 长春理工大学 2006
- [52]王斌 合作学习在大学英语教学中的有效性研究[MA] 外交学院
- [53]廖雪美 二语教学中合作学习法的研究[MA] 复旦大学 2006
- [54]陈咏涛 大学英语教学中实施课外协作性学习的研究[MA] 湖南师范大学 2005
- [55]梁鹏程 大学英语课堂自主学习促进——教师话语分析[MA] 南京师范大学 2004
- [56]郑笑然 大学英语课堂培养自主学习的探索性实践[MA] 辽宁师范大学 2006
- [57]彭雪蓉 合作学习小组互动的话语分析[MA] 南京师范大学 2006
- [58]吴玉玲 朱益华英语阅读理论研究的历史回顾及其对外语教学的影响[J] *教学与管理*,2007,(3)
- [59]李霞 兰英. 基于社会文化学派理论的第二语言学习观及其述评[J] *国外外语教学*,2007,(2)
- [60]徐江 郑莉 最近发展区对英语教学的启示[J] *安徽工业大学学报* 2007,(24)
- [61]胡壮麟 语言学教程[M] 北京大学出版社 2001
- [62]中华人民共和国教育部:《英语课程标准》(试验稿) [M] 北京师范大学出版社, 2001

## Appendix 1

Raw data of the post-test

Class	Listening	Multiple	Cloze	Reading	Translation	Total
EC1	18	14	9	30	15	86
EC2	5	5	6	27	9	52
EC3	12	14	10	31	12	79
EC4	10	9	6	22	9	56
EC5	13	10	8	35	14	80
EC6	15	12	7	24	11	69
EC7	6	9	6	30	6	57
EC8	6	7	9	34	5	61
EC9	19	10	10	32	15	86
EC10	5	6	7	36	10	64
EC11	11	10	8	36	11	76
EC12	16	11	6	31	12	76
EC13	15	12	7	28	12	74
EC14	13	11	5	32	8	69
EC15	10	6	8	28	10	62
EC16	17	11	7	21	5	61
EC17	10	7	5	30	6	58
EC18	18	14	11	25	11	79
EC19	6	7	5	24	4	46
EC20	8	7	4	21	5	45
EC21	9	6	6	30	5	56
EC22	18	13	11	29	13	84
EC23	10	7	7	26	8	58
CC1	11	6	8	21	9	55
CC2	14	7	5	30	10	66

CC3	14	10	8	28	10	70
CC4	11	6	8	20	9	54
CC5	18	11	12	27	7	75
CC6	13	12	14	29	9	77
CC7	12	9	10	23	6	60
CC8	15	14	10	31	7	77
CC9	14	10	12	36	14	86
CC10	16	9	8	26	10	69
CC11	13	10	9	25	10	67
CC12	15	11	10	29	15	80
CC13	8	4	7	17	10	46
CC14	11	10	8	27	8	64
CC15	13	6	12	32	12	75
CC16	9	6	11	31	10	67
CC17	10	8	8	25	10	61
CC18	13	11	7	19	11	61
CC19	12	8	6	26	8	60
CC20	14	10	8	34	13	79
CC21	11	9	6	27	8	61
CC22	10	6	9	26	9	60
CC23	9	8	5	23	10	55
CC24	11	8	7	23	11	60

## **Publication**

第一作者 《从合作学习论和任务性教学的视角看最近发展区对二语教学的意义》

江苏外语教学研究 2008 年 6 月第 4 期 25 页