

منى محمود عمرو، وميادة محمد الناظور\*

( )  
(30) :  
(30)

( )  
( )

-1

(Mercer, 1997)

:	:	-	"
:	:	-	"
:	:	-	
			*
(Mercer,1997)		.2005/3/2	2004/9/27

.Johnson, 1984)

)

.(1992

(Gajria and Salvia, 1992)

:

:

.1

)

(1992

.

.(1998 )

:

.2

.

)

:

.3

(Learner, 2000 1995

.(1992 )

(Durkin and Dolores, 1995; Baumann and .

.Johnson, 1984)

:

(1992 )

)

.(1995

.(1992 Wong, 1998)

.(Learner, 2000)

(1985)

(Baumann and

.Johnson, 1984; Burns, Roe and Ross, 1988)

"

.(1998 )

:

(1992 )

**The Bottom –**

:

" :

**up Model**

.(13 :1992 ) "

(Mercer,

1997)

(1992 )

(Baumann and

(1992)	:	.(Catts and Kamhi, 1999)	:
	:	<b>The Top –</b>	<b>down Model</b>
	:	(Mercer, 1997)	
	:	.(1992 )	
	:	.(Mercer, 1997; Catts and Kamhi, 1999)	
	:	<b>Interactive Model</b>	:
	:	.1	
	:	.2	.(Mercer, 1997)
	:	.3	
( )	:	.4	
(Catts and Kamhi,	:	.1999)	
	:	(Catts and Kamhi,	
	:	1999; Glover, Ronning and Bruning, 1990	
	:	.1	.(1992
	:	.2	
	:	.(Mercer, 1997)	
	:	.3	
	:	.4	Catts and Kamhi, 1999 1998 )
.(Wong, 1998 1999 )	:		.(1992
	:	<b>(1998)</b>	
	:		
	:		.1
	:		
(Lapp and Flood, 1990)	:		.2
	:		
	:	.1	: .3
	:		
	:		: .4
	:	.2	
	:		
	:	.(1998 )	

: .3

: .4

WalkeField, 1996)

.(Mccormick and Pressly, 1997 2001

Lapp and Flood, 1990; 1990 )

.(Learner, 2000

**(Bumann and Johnson, 1984)**

:

:

:

-

.

:

-

-

.(Pressly and Woloshyn, 1995 2001 )

(Glover

et al., 1990)

.(Funnel and Stuart, 1995)

.(1990 )

(Burns et al., 1988; 1999 )

.(Pressly and Woloshyn, 1995)

Mccormick and Pressly, 1997)

.(2001

(Schema) )

(Burns et al., 1988; Pressly and

.(2001

"

.Woloshyn, 1995) )

(

) "

)

.(358 2001

.(1995 ) (

(Pressly and Woloshyn, 1995; McCormick and Pressly, 1997)

(1999 )

:(Vaidya, 1999)

(Wong, 1998)

(Thoreson, Lipman and Magnuson, 1997)

:(Montague, 2000)

(Vaidya, 1999)

:(Burns et al.,1988 1999)

(Walkfield, 1996)

:(Vaidya, 1999)

:(Woloshyn and Pressly, 1995)

:(Gajria and Salvia, 1992)

(De Witz

and Carr, 1987)

.(Woloshyn and Pressly, 1995)

:(KWL)

(Burns et al., 1988; Glover et al., 1990; Pressly and

.Woloshyn, 1995)

:(WHAT DO I KNOW?)

.1

.(Asha 1998; Gajria and Salvia, 1992)

(WHAT DO I

.2

WANT TO KNOW)

.(Wong, 1998 1999 )

:(WHAT DID I LEARN?)

.3

-2

)

(

.(Woloshyn and Pressly, 1995; Learner, 2000)

.(1990 2000 )

.(Burns et al., 1988)

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

)

:

•

.(1990 )

)

(

(

(

)

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

•

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

•

.(1998 )

(%20-%15)

:

-

.(Learner, 2000)

:

-

:

-

:

-

:

-

: -

( )

.(KWL)

: -

45

:(KWL)

-

(Thoreson, Lippman

-

and Magnuson, 1997)

)

-3

(

(24)

):

:

.(

:

(Spires and Donley,

-

1998)

(112)

- )

(

( )  
(Pearson and Hansen, 1983)  
(Al - Zubaidi, 1995)  
150 300  
( )  
10

:  
(Gardill and Asha, 1999) (Hollingsworth and Rutzel, 1990)  
(Story Maps) ) (Mathewson,1985)  
( )  
(78)  
( )  
( )  
( )  
( )  
( )

---

10

(Shimabakuro, Serna, 1999)

-

(2000)

-

(122)

"

"

(2000)

-

(Asha, 1998)

-

(71)

.( )

3

2001/2000 ) (1992) -

(

/

:

( 15 15) (30) (240)

( 15 15) (30)

:

(1)

)

(

:

( ) :

:

( )

-

( )

-

:

:

.1

.2

-

.1

.2

.3

)

:  
 / ) : - ( )  
 / ( )  
 ( )  
 .%80 ( )  
 : - ( ) .%75

20 :  
 ( 9 11) . 20  
 .(0,90)

(6-1) :  
 (16-11)  
 (10-7)  
 (20-17)

40

(20- )  
 (13-6)

:

(What Did I Learn?)

.

:

:

-

( )

:

-

( ) :

(KWL)

(16)

(KWL)

:

(What Do I Know?)

-

:

-

(What Do I Want

-

.to Know?)

:

=  $\alpha$ ) .2  
(0.05

=  $\alpha$ ) .3  
(0.05

)  
(11.32) (16.234) ( ) -  
(KWL)

(0.05=  $\alpha$ ) (KWL)  
(ANCOVA)  
(2)

( )  
( ) -

(191.814)  
(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

(16.234)  
(11.32) ( )  
(20-13) (14-9)

(8.097) (10.269) -5

:  
=  $\alpha$ ) .1  
( ) (0.05  
( ) ( )  
(0.05=  $\alpha$ ) ( )  
(3) (ANCOVA) ( )

) ( ( (

(0.05= $\alpha$ )

( )

(.40.382)  
(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

(10.269)  
(.8.097)

(2.924)

(5.976)

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )  
(4)

The Top -

Down Model

(102.719)  
(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

( )

(5.976)  
(.2.924)

-6

) : (0.05= $\alpha$ )

)  
(

(Santose, 1989)

(Spires and Donely, 1998)

(Al-Zubaidi, 1995)

(Gardill and

(Shimabakuro

(Asha, 1998)

(Malone and Masteropieri, 1992)

(Gajria and Salvia, 1992)

Asha, 1999)

and Serna, 1999)

(Hollingsworth and Rutzel, 1990)

(Dewitz and Carr, 1987)

( )

(Pearson and Hansen, 1983)

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

-7

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

(Dewitz and Carr, 1987)

(Davis, 1994)

(1)

( )

1	3	2	2	4			1
5	1	3	3	6			2
5	3	4	4	8	(1)		3
2	2	2	2	4	(2)		4
4	2	3	3	6			5
--	4	2	2	4			6
3	1	2	2	4			7
--	2	1	1	2			8
1	1	1	1	2			9

2	2	2	2	4			10
2	4	3	3	6			11
1	3	2	2	4			12
2	2	2	2	4			13
2	--	1	1	2			14
30	30	30	30	60		14	

(2)

( )

0.000	*56.150	118.536	118.536	1	
0.000	*191.814	404.932	404.932	1	
		2.111	120.230	57	
			643.798	59	

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

\*

(3)

*,001	12.900	22.545	22.545	1	( )
*0,000	40.382	70.578	70.578	1	
		1.748	99.621	57	
			192.744	59	

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

\*

(4)

0.601	0.276	0.370	0.370	1	( )
*0.000	102.719	137.793	137.793	1	
		1.341	76.463	57	
			214.626	59	

(0.05 =  $\alpha$ )

\*

- Writing Quarterly*, 14, (4).P:374 -397. -7
- Baumann, J. and Johnson, D. 1984. *Reading Instruction and the Beginning Teacher*, Burgess Publishing Company, U.S.A. 1992
- Burns, P., Roe, B. and Ross, E. 1988. *Teaching Students in Today Elementary School*, Houghton Mifflin Company. U.S.A. 44-9 40
- Catts, H. and Kamhi, A. 1999. *Language and Reading Disabilities*, Allyn and Bacon Company, U.S.A. 2001 2000
- Davis, Z. 1994. Effects of Pre- Reading Story Mapping on Elementary Reader Comprehension, *Journal of Educational Research*, 87, (6).P:353-360.
- Dewitz, P. and Carr, E. 1987. Effects of Inference Training on Comprehension and Comprehension Monitoring. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22 (5). 2000
- Durkin, Dolores. 1995. *Teaching Them to Read*, Allyn Bacon Company, U.S.A. 1995
- Funnell, Elaine and Stuart, Moorage. 1995. *Learning to Read*, Blackwell Publisher. U.S.A. 1995
- Gajria, M. and Salvia, J. 1992. The Effects of Summarization Instruction on Text Comprehension of Students with Learning Disabilities. *Journal of Exceptional Children*, 58, (2), P: 508-515. 1994
- Gardill, M. and Asha, K. 1999. Advanced Map Instruction: Effects on the Reading Comprehension of Students with Learning Disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 33, (1), P: 2-18. 1992 1990
- Glover, J., Ronning, R. and Bruning, R. 1990. *Cognitive Psychology for Teachers*, Macmillan Publishing Company. U.S.A. 1999
- Grellet, F. 1995. *Developing Reading Skills, A Practical Guide to Reading Comprehension*, Cambridge University Press, U.K. 1998
- Hollingsworth, P. and Reutzell, D. 1990. Prior Knowledge, Content-Related Attitude, Reading Comprehension: Testing Mathewson's Affective Model of Reading. *Journal of Educational Research*, 83, (3), P: 194-199. 1998 1999
- Lapp, D. and Flood, J. 1990. Reading Comprehension Instruction for at Risk Student, *Journal of Reading Research*, 36, (6): 490-495.
- Learner, J. 2000. *Learning Disabilities, Theories, Diagnoses and Teaching Strategies*. Houghton Mifflin Company, U.S.A.
- Malone, L. and Mastropieri, M. 1992. Reading Comprehension Instruction: Summarization and Self-  
Al-Zubaidi, Hayat. 1995. *The Effect of Background Knowledge on Reading Comprehension*. "M.A". Thesis Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Asha, K. 1998. Effects of Direct Instruction Main Idea Summarization Program and Self - Monitoring on Reading Comprehension of Middle School Students With Learning Disabilities, *Journal of Reading and*

- Santos, Olga. 1989. Language Skills and Cognitive Processes Related to Poor Reading Comprehension Performance. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 22, (2), P: 131-133.
- Shimabakuro, P. and Serna, M. 1999. The Effects of Self-Monitoring of Academic Performance on Students with Learning Disabilities, *Journal of Education and Treatment of Children*, 22, (4): 397-415.
- Spires, H. and Donley, J. 1998. Prior Knowledge Activation: Inducing Engagement with Informal Text, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, (2), P: 249-258.
- Sternberg, R. 1994. Thinking and Problem Solving. U.S.A, Academic Press.
- Thoreson, C., Lippman, M. and Magnuson, D. 1997. Windows on Comprehension: Reading Comprehension Processes as Revealed by Two Think-Aloud Producers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, (4): 579-589.
- Vaidya, Sheila. 1999. Metaognitive Learning Strategies for Students With Learning Disabilities. *Education*, 120, (1).
- Walkfiled, J. 1996. Educational Psychology, Learning to be Problem Solver, Houghton Mifflin Company, U.S.A.
- Wong, B. 1998. *Learning About Learning Disabilities*, Academic Press, U.S.A.
- Monitoring Training for Students with Learning Disabilities. *Journal of Exceptional Children*, 58, (3): 490-495.
- Mccormick, C. and Pressly, M. 1997. *Educational Psychology Learning, Instruction, Assessment*. An Imprint of Addison Wesley Longman, U.S.A.
- Mercer, C. 1997. *Students with Learning Disabilities*, Prentice Hall Inc, New Jersey.
- Mohidat, Mohammed. 1997. *The Impact of Brainstorming on the Development of Reading Comprehension*, "M.A." Thesis Mu'tah University - Jordan.
- Montague, M. 2000. Cognitive Strategy Instruction in Mathematics for Students with Learning Disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30, (2).
- Nabeel, May. 1994. *The Effect of Training in Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies on Ninth Grade Student Comprehension Abilities in English*, "M.A." Thesis University of Jordan - Jordan.
- Pearson, P. and Hansen, J. 1983. An Instruction Study, Improving the Inferential Comprehension of Good and Poor Fourth Grade Readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, (75).
- Pressly, M. and Woloshyn, V. 1995. Cognitive Strategy, Bookline Books, U.K.

## **The Effect of Activating the Previous Knowledge on the Reading Comprehension in a Sample of Students with Learning Disabilities in Amman City**

*Muna M. Amro and Mayada M. Al-Natour\**

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aims at exploring the effect of activating the previous knowledge on reading comprehension for a student sample who are having learning disabilities in the fourth grade level. Moreover, the study tried to discover the effect of activating the previous knowledge on both the comprehensive reading within its lateral level and its inferential level and to investigate whether there are any differences due to the student's gender.

The study sample consisted of sixty students (30 males and 30 females) with learning disabilities who can read at the fourth grade level and are placed in resource rooms in fourteen public and private schools which were randomly chosen from Amman's educational directorates.

The sample members were distributed into two groups: an experimental group (30 students) who were educated by using the previous activation strategy, and a control group (30 students) who were taught by using the ordinary method. The comprehensive reading was measured for students by using a multiple choice test, which is intended to measure the comprehensive reading task in both levels (the lateral and the inferential), where this test has shown the required reliability and validity.

In addition, the analysis results showed the effectiveness of using the activating previous knowledge method in improving the comprehensive reading skill in both levels (the lateral and the inferential) in students with learning disabilities. Moreover, the results of the study showed no effect for gender on the students' comprehensive reading.

Finally, the study recommended that teachers of learning disabilities students should activate their students' knowledge through providing them with previous knowledge on the topics which they study, as well as providing the essential training to use the strategy of activating the previous knowledge so as to improve their comprehension.

**KEYWORDS:** Learning Disabilities, Reading Comprehension.

---

\* Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Jordan. Received on 27/9/2004 and Accepted for Publication on 2/3/2005.