

# Developing a Teaching Model for Critical Literacy Infusion into Conventional Reading Class: Framing SQ3R within the four resources framework

Endang Setyaningsih  
English Education Department  
Sebelas Maret University  
Surakarta, Indonesia  
endang\_setyaningsih@staff.uns.ac.id

Nenden Sri Lengkanawati, Bachrudin Musthafa  
English Education Department  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia  
Bandung, Indonesia

**Abstract**—This paper forwards a prototype of critical literacy (CL) model and its implementation in a Reading class. The model is developed by infusing a teaching approach to critical literacy namely the Four Resources (FRF) into a prominent reading strategy i.e. Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review (SQ3R). The FRF balances conventional and critical literacy which theoretically has the potential to shift the conventional practice of Reading class. Meanwhile, SQ3R was opted for its prominence and ease of independent use for both teacher and students. SQ3R provides a clear syntax which the Four Resources is lacking. The prototype was tried out in a tertiary EFL Reading class and involved 40 students with differing CL baselines. Data were collected by means of observation, questionnaire, and interview. The paper concludes that the developed prototype for CL teaching was not only applicable in a conventional Reading class but it also allowed independent use by the students. However, engagement in the CL was inconsistent thus finding on its effectiveness was inconclusive. The study implies that mindful material selection, amount and intensity of practice are required for future use of the prototype.

**Keywords**—critical literacy; four resources; SQ3R

## I. INTRODUCTION

This study aims at developing a model for Critical Literacy (CL henceforth) teaching which is infuse-able into conventional Reading class. The model highlights the ease of use to minimize resistance to CL in the context of EFL teaching. The study opted the use of Four Resources as the framework for CL teaching because it provides a balance between the conventional and critical end of literacy. Such balance theoretically supports gradual shift toward CL. Studies found that EFL students' learning benefits from a simultaneous emphasis on both critical and conventional literacy presented in the four resources model [1-3]

As a teaching approach, the Four Resources does not provide a clear syntax of CL teaching, which might be problematic for teachers, particularly who are novice in the practice of CL teaching [4]. The Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review (SQ3R) as a reading strategy, on the other hand, provided a clear step-by-step procedure of implementation. It is also acknowledged for its ease of

independent use [5]. Framing the SQ3R critically using the Four Resources is then considered a promising effort and doable move to bring CL into EFL classrooms.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. CL and the FRF

Critical literacy is more than just conventional reading or writing or the combination of the two. Shor stated that essentially, critical literacy is "language use that questions the social construction of the self. When we are critically literate, we examine our ongoing development, to reveal the subjective positions from which we make sense of the world and act in it" [6]. McDaniel mentioned that critical literacy "transcends conventional notions of reading and writing to incorporate critical thinking, questioning, and transformation of self or one's world" [7].

This study adopted Four Resources Framework (FRF) which was proposed by Luke and Freebody [4]. Within FRF, effective readers are characterized as a code breaker, meaning maker, and text user and critical practice of code analyst. As code breaker (CB), the reader is concerned with cracking the code. It is a matter of understanding the symbolic graphic conventions which make up the code. The reader recognizes and use fundamental features and architecture, including alphabet, sounds in words, spelling and structural convention and patterns. As text participant (TP), the reader participates in understanding the meanings within the text (interior meaning) and how the text corresponds to the reader's experiences and knowledge of other cultural discourses, texts, and meaning systems. This involves the way the text is constructed to make meaning including literal and figurative meanings within the text.

As a text user (TU), the reader uses text functionally. It involves reader's understanding on social function (which is sensitive to culture) of texts and how the functions shape the text structure, tone, degree of formality. This involves using the text in different social situations to achieve social purposes and participating in events in which the text plays a part. And as text analyst (TA), the reader critically analyzes and transforms texts in novel / hybrid ways based on understanding

and recognition that no text is value-free. It is concerned with knowing how the text attempts to position the reader and what other viewpoints are absent or silenced from the text. This involves looking for implicit meanings, opinions, and bias, and either endorsing or rejecting the point of view put forward by the text.

**B. SQ3R and its Modification**

The acronym SQ3R was coined by Robinson in 1941 and it stands for Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review; five steps of reading/ study skills (table 1) [8].

TABLE I. THE SQ3R

Step	Process	Goal
S	Pre-reading. Examination of content. Previewing text; surveying headings, pictures, lay out, charts, figures, identified words, summaries.	Establish a purpose for reading the text
Q	Form questions to be answered while reading	Facilitate active reading, provide target.
R	Read material with intent of answering previously developed questions	First exposure to full content of text.
R	Produce a verbal and/ or written answer and summary of what has been read	Organize and summarize information
R	Re-read to solidify understanding and retention	Integrate information in broader context; implement mnemonic strategies

Adapted from Carlston [9]

Pauk, however, doubted that surveying without proper reflection and note taking are prone to forgetting [10]. This kind of surveying step provides shaky base for the next step: Question. Against this reasoning, Pauk suggested the use of the questions-in-margin system. In this system, as students read a paragraph, s/he raised questions that are answered by the paragraph. The question is then written in the margin. In Pauk system, questioning (and note-taking) comes while and after the reading stage and it is recorded in the margin. This gives birth to a modified system consisting of Survey- Question – Read- Record- Recite – Reflecting known as SQ4R which Pauk introduced in 1984 [10]. While the original version of the SQ3R and SQ4R do not attempt to address CL but it provides slots for critical incorporation.

**III. METHOD**

**A. Procedure**

The method used in this study is design and development research. It was carried out in two stages: (1) development of the teaching model prototype and (2) implementation of the prototype to examine its feasibility. The first stage involved revisiting related and relevant literature and careful examination of the choice of framework and existing method for teaching reading that was used by the class teacher. Once the model was set, a series of lesson plans were developed for the model implementation. At the second stage, data on the model feasibility were collected and served as a formative assessment on the model prototype.

**B. Participants**

The participants of this study were 40 first year university students majoring English Education under Teacher Training Faculty of a University in Indonesia. They were taking a compulsory course labeled Intensive Reading. As stated in the syllabus, this course emphasizes conventional reading with the major aim to train students with skills to get basic comprehension of texts. The students were identified as having different baseline competence in CL.

**C. Data Collection**

To collect data on the model feasibility, participatory observation was carried out and recorded in the field notes. Questionnaires were distributed at the beginning and end of the model implementation to allow comparison on how students perceived the reading activities before and after the implementation of the model. The questionnaires also captured the students’ shifting definition of Reading which reflects the students’ journey in CL. Meanwhile, interviews were conducted during the implementation to solicit genetics of students’ responses toward the activity. This way, data on model feasibility obtained from observation could be clarified and enriched.

**IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**A. The Design/ Model**

This study incorporated the steps of the SQ3R into the FRF. Each step of the reading strategy is approached critically by endorsing the engagement into the four roles of reader (table 2).

TABLE II. THE SQ3R AND THE FRF

SURVEY	FRF	Process	Task sample
	CB	Examining identified words, charts, picture, layout, headings.	Filling the S-section of SQ3R worksheet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-read, scan the material then examine the title/ subtitles, picture, diagrams, bold, italic, upper/lowercase, and other peculiar layout. Ponder on what could be the effect and underlying motive of the text construction.</li> <li>• Write your surveying points</li> <li>• Write your prediction and the cues you identified.</li> </ul>
	TP	Understanding the message obtained from previewing by reflecting to background knowledge/ stored information, relate to other text, to self, to world	
	TU	Recognize/ identify headings, lay out/ organization and its effect.	
	TA	Questioning the motive right from the beginning, identify stereotype that might be addressed and predict if it will be maintained or challenged.	

Table 2. Cont.

<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>CB</b>	Question choice of words, meaning of words/ terms used	Filling the Q-section of the SQ3R worksheet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you want to know more or confirm about the text?</li> <li>• List your top five questions</li> </ul>
	<b>TP</b>	Question main ideas/ gist, questions detail information, questions relation to previously stored knowledge, questions example/ non example.	
	<b>TU</b>	Question purpose and how it is achieved through text structuring, question the style/ language used for delivering the purpose	
	<b>TA</b>	Question what/who is addressed and what is not addressed, question the motive/ intention/ attitude, question text genetics, question the impact and consequences of the text	
<b>READ</b>	<b>ALL</b>	First intense exposure to full content of text. Getting answer of previously asked questions and construct questions from the text: questions which is answered by the section read and critical questions that emerge during reading.	Filling the Read-section of SQ3R worksheet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read the text and note key points that answer your questions</li> <li>• As you read, formulate a question that is answered by a particular section</li> <li>• Write emerging questions</li> </ul>
<b>RECITE</b>	<b>CB</b>	Produce a verbal and/ or written answer on questions related to code breaking	Filling the Recite-section of the SQ3R worksheet. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cover answers of your pre-developed questions and the emerging ones. Use the note and write/ report answers of the questions in your own words.</li> </ul>
	<b>TP</b>	Produce a verbal and/ or written answer/ summary to show understanding on the content of the text e.g. main ideas and detail information	
	<b>TU</b>	Produce a verbal and/ or written text response (e.g. reply, poster, summary) using the learned structure and or modify the learned structure to achieve the intended goal.	
	<b>TA</b>	Produce a verbal and/ or written answer on text analyst questions; state/ write/ challenge recognition of intention/ motive, stereotype, unjust positioning, silenced/echoed point of view.	
<b>REVIEW</b>	<b>CB</b>	Solidify the meta-knowledge/ strategy and engagement in code breaker role.	Filling the Review-section of the SQ3R worksheet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Go over the reading passage again and write a review. Mind the following: Identify the main point the author convey and his/ her intention. Relate the text to other texts, your background knowledge, and current context. Uncover the writer's attitude toward the topic and your standing. Examine the trustworthiness or currency of the text and sources.</li> </ul>
	<b>TP</b>	Solidify the meta-knowledge and engagement in comprehending the text and make relation of the information obtained in broader social political ideological context.	
	<b>TU</b>	Solidify the meta-knowledge and engagement in recognizing text purpose and structure; and show ability to use the text for intended purpose.	
	<b>TA</b>	Solidify the meta-knowledge and engagement in text analyst; show/ do/ come up with ideas to act for change.	

The role of the teacher in this design is central particularly at the early sessions. Teacher is required to pose critical questions that direct the students to move toward the critical end of literacy while at the same time also poses and encourages construction of 'conventional' questions to ensure that critical assessment on the text is based on well-founded basic comprehension. As the sessions progress, the agency in raising critical questions is shifted to the students.

### *B. Design Implementation*

The implementation of the model prototype was carried out in six sessions which were divided into two introductory sessions and four practice sessions. In the introductory sessions, explicit teaching on CL was conducted. The discussion in introductory sessions was mainly teacher led. In the practice sessions, the students were presented with texts accompanied by the SQ3R worksheet. Unlike in the introductory sessions, the arrangements in practice sessions began from cooperative discussion then individual assignment.

The cooperative discussions were conducted in class and it began from the Survey up to Recite. Meanwhile, the Review stage was set as an individual assignment to be accomplished outside the class period.

The observation revealed that the students benefitted the dedicated introductory sessions. The explicit teaching and questions posed resulted in immediate awakening on CL. The students indicated an awareness on multiple perspectives and framing of text as a crafted object. As recorded in the field note, the students were able to discuss the idea of a topic 'gender roles' from different perspectives which eventually leads them to the recognition of stereotyping.

The prototype model was also comfortably applied by the students. The provision of worksheets guided them to follow the step by step procedure. Approaching the end of the model try-out, the worksheet was no longer provided but students at diverging baselines indicated an ability to use the model independently.

The data from the observation however bared inconsistent engagement to CL. At the Survey stage, students did not consistently pay attention to the effect of form or layout to represent engagement in the text user role. Nor at the Question stage that they consistently listed question addressing the author's intention or agenda in choosing a certain form or in writing a text. Similarly, analysis on two students' review assignments revealed that the address to the TP, TU and TA roles was shaky. Two contradictory points were observed from the students' review assignments. At one point, they the students did not indicate engagement in CL and produced a review which mainly echoed the author. At another point, they denoted attempt to be critical but the criticality was off-mark due to failure in gaining basic comprehension of the text.

Regardless of the inconsistency of engagement in the CL framework, data obtained from questionnaire and interview confirms each other. All students noted that the way they perceived reading shifted after the implementation of the model. Before the instruction, one student, Mey, noted that "Reading is when I gain some information for a text so that I understand the content of the text, either for entertainment or information" but at the end of the model try-out she stated that "Reading is not only read but also speak, write and listen. Because in this course I had seen many perspectives from different people who tried to cross their line of thinking to produce a new text as well. Produce here also means when we speak up our mind and debate our ideas."

Data from the interview reinforced the students' changing view on reading. A student, Ratu, articulated that the criticality is incorporated in the reading. She said that "now when I predict the information uhm... I mean when I constructed question I cannot help not to wonder whether this text is trusted or thinking what the author is really trying to convey. It's like automatic that I get suspicious to the text. It's kinda annoying, though."

All in all, the data from the model implementation indicated the ease of use of the model but its effectiveness for building students CL required further and prolonged investigation. This finding could be approached using DeKeyser's skill acquisition theory. Viewed from DeKeyser's theory, the students' shift in their perception of reading, and their 'on and off' engagement to CL indicated that the CL skill is at the level of cognition and it required practice to achieve automation [11]. The amount of time and the intensity of the practice, however, is yet to be covered in this implementation stage.

## V. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the model prototype for CL teaching is applicable in a conventional Reading class. The

applicability is supported by a dedicated CL introductory sessions. Students at diverging baseline showcased the independent use of the model. While the model has observably come in handy, findings on the students' engagement in the CL was inconsistent thus inconclusive. This implies that the model required care handling particularly on its balance between the conventional and critical end of literacy. Without deep traditional engagement with the text, critical assessment tended to be off target or baseless. Since most classrooms are characterized by heterogeneous students in terms of proficiency and socio-economic, and cultural background, the time needed for the students to be able to engage in all four roles of a reader (CB, TP, TU, and TA) is likely varied. This brings another consequence on the type of activity for the class which could accommodate each category of students. Having differentiated material, in this case, is not favored for it creates marginalization that CL fights.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S.Y. Huang, "Critical Literacy Helps Wipe Away the Dirt on Our Glasses," *Towards an Understanding of Reading as Ideological Practice. English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 140-164, 2011.
- [2] S. Huh, "Instructional model of critical literacy in an EFL context: Balancing conventional and critical literacy," *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 210-35, 2016.
- [3] S.M. Lau, "A study of critical literacy work with beginning English language learners: An integrated approach," *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1-30, 2013.
- [4] P. Freebody and A. Luke, "Literacies programs: Debates and demands in cultural context," *Prospect: An Australian Journal of TESOL*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 7-16, 1990.
- [5] J.A. Huber, "A closer look at SQ3R. Reading Improvement," vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 108-113, 2004.
- [6] I. Shor, "What is Critical Literacy?," *Journal of Pedagogy, Pluralism, and Practice*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1999.
- [7] C. McDaniel, "A questioning stance and the possibility for change," *The Reading Teacher*, vol.57, no 5, 2004.
- [8] F.P. Robinson, *Diagnostic and remedial techniques for effective study*. New York: Harper and Bros, 1941.
- [9] D.L. Carlston, "Benefits of student-generated note packets: A preliminary investigation of SQ3R implementation," *Teaching of Psychology*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 142-46, 2011.
- [10] W. Pauk, *How the SQ3R came to be in Dugan, JoAnn R., ed. Advancing the world of literacy: Moving into the 21st century. Yearbook of the College Reading Association 21. Harrisonburg, Va: The College Reading Association, 1999.*
- [11] R. DeKeyser, "Skills Acquisition Theory," *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction.(second edition)*. B.VanPattern and J. Williams (eds). New York: Routledge, 2014.